1

2

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT Trustee Council

3

4

5

Egan Civic & Conference Center Space 4 555 West Fifth Avenue Anchorage, Alaska February 10, 1992 3:30 o'clock p.m.

6

7

IN ATTENDANCE:

State of Alaska 8

and Game

MR. CHARLES COLE Attorney General Council Meeting Chairman

9 10

State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

Mr. JOHN SANDOR Commission

11 12

Alaska Department of Fish

MR. CARL ROSIER

13

USDA Forest Service

Commissioner

14

MR. MICHAEL BARTON MR. DAVE GIBBONS Regional Forester

15 16

National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration MR. STEVEN PENNOYER Regional Director

17 18 United States Department of the Interior

MR. CURTIS MCVEE Special Assistant to the Secretary

20

19

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

MR. PENNOYER: Barton, Regional Forest Service
Regional Forester, representing the U.S. Department of
Agriculture; Mr. Carl Rosier, Commissioner of the Alaska
Department of Fish & Game; Mr. Charles Cole, Attorney General
of the State of Alaska; John Sandor, Commissioner of the Alaska
Department of Environmental Conservation, and I believe Curt
McVee in Anchorage who's showing us (ph) representative of the
Department of the Interior.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Steve, I'm here.

MR. PENNOYER: Also, a settlement Trustee Council meeting that was taking place February 5th and 6th in Anchorage was to finalize recommendations on damage assessment continuation and close-out studies of the 1992 season. And we had asked our chief scientist, Dr. Robert Spies, to give us his evaluation of the merits of continuing these various studies. We took extensive public testimony in Anchorage at the two days we had up there. We are also going to take these studies and along with the rest of our decisions, send them out to public review before finalizing the program for the 1992 season.

We have a meeting on February 27th and 28th in Anchorage where we'll look at the restoration monitoring and the restoration implementation projects; and again, those will become part of the package that will go out to public review. Our time is limited tonight, it was not my intention to have a

public review session at this particular part of the meeting.

If Council members have anything to add to that, and then perhaps we can get started going down through our list of projects. Does anybody wish to comment? Curt, you have to hear my cues because I can't see you nod.

MR. McVEE: I have no comments.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Fine. Then, perhaps we could go ahead and get started. If you recall, we had two lists of -two pages of project listings to do with damage assessment; one
was labeled continuation and as well as being provided with
back-up information, there are about 11 projects on the
continuation sheet. And then under close-out, we have a very
substantial number of projects, I didn't add them up, there are
probably 30 or more projects for close-out.

Dr. Spies, are you ready to give us some -- lead us through this process and your thinking on it?

DR. SPIES: Yes. I have just recently faxed to the Trustee Council a relatively substantial memo that summarizes what I've done. I'm not sure if you all have it available to you but that has gone out within the last hour.

MR. PENNOYER: I don't know who it was faxed to (ph) but none of us have a copy of it.

DR. SPIES: Okay. It has gone out within the last hour to the fax numbers supplied to me by Rebecca Winns (ph); nonetheless, I think we could proceed to discuss what I've done

R & R COURT REPORTERS

in general terms and perhaps your staff will provide those documents to you quickly. Is there a fax number that I could have here that would reach at least the -- all the Trustees in Juneau in one place?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes. 465-0 -- hold on a half a second, we're getting it. I came to the Trustee Council from the teleconferencing group and we are asked to please use the microphone habitats (ph) and speak very directly into the microphone. Apparently, there was a lot of break up in our transmission at the last meeting, so I'll just pass that on while we're waiting.

MR. BARTON: Were we going to have also a review of the recovery monitoring?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: We didn't ask Dr. Spies to do that at this session, that was supposed to be the subject, I thought, of the 27th and 28th because the workload involved, he had indicated he wanted to take more time with those projects. So, my understanding for this meeting was we agreed on the damage assessment close-out and continuation. Does anybody have that number? Here it comes. The number, Bob, is 465-3444, and if you can -- 907 of course, if you can send that right now, we'll have it before the meeting goes on too much longer.

DR. SPIES: Okay. It's on it's way.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, Steve, this is Curt.

DR. SPIES: Describing the general terms that I've done for the evaluation of the close-out and continuation (indiscernible - telephone cutout)

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, this is McVee. Yeah. Mr. Chairman, this is Curt McVee.

DR. SPIES: I made some judgment as to the series (indiscernible - telephone cutout). What I've done this is presented the Trustees with a series of options, seven options in all, that will provide them with a choice based on the degree of injury.

And the first option would be to finish all the damage assessments studies. The second option would be to finish only those studies with potentials for demonstrating injury. third option would be to finish studies that we are sure will demonstrate some significant injury -- lethal effect through some (indiscernible) or population (ph) effects such as we saw The fourth would deal only with those in otters and birds. studies demonstrating anything more serious than adult mortality, that would include adult mortality, population declines of various kinds. The fifth would be to finish those studies demonstrating significant population decline and chronic population decline. The sixth would finish those studies demonstrating only population decline, chronic population decline. And the seventh would be those studies

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that would be needed for restoration actions beside restoration monitoring.

And what I have done then is under each of those options in a spreadsheet that will be coming with the memo is identify which studies would fall into each of those options. Now there is a series of studies that deal with the fate of petroleum in the environment, and I have noted those in the options. I think, in some cases, it'll be important to have that supporting information that's available from those studies in order to interpret the data -- the biological data from the injury studies themselves. And those will fall out according to which options they support.

Just to give you a brief summary of where this whole thing came out in terms of budget, because I understand that the budgetary considerations are primary here. If one completes all studies as proposed, the cost of course would be 5.2 -- 5.1 -- 5.2 million dollars. If one takes Option 2 there's a slight reduction to about 5.16. Option 3, which would be any significant injury would be 4.92. Option 4, which would deal only with those studies that have anything more (indiscernible) -- adult mortality or anything more serious would be 4.36. Option 5 was significant populations declines that have been measured by way of census (ph), for instance, that option would include studies that would total about 3.85 or 3.9 million. And chronic population declines would be

R&R COURT REPORTERS

3.56. And the link to upland habitat, which would, in fact, be provided only by one or two studies, particularly the sea ducks and the Marble merlet (ph) studies, the proposed budget for that would be \$38,000.00.

Now, I must say that the thing that drives this analysis, the one study that makes the largest affect on this is the coastal habitat study and its proposed close-out cost of 2.95 million dollars is the single largest study.

MR. COLE: I've got to say (ph) -- Dr. Spies, this is Charlie Cole. Why does it drive all of these studies?

DR. SPIES: Well it doesn't drive all the studies but it's the biggest consideration if one is trying to come to grips with a budget. If the Trustee Council wishes to see a smaller budget, you can affect the largest change with that -- with some kind of savings in the coastal habitat study.

MR. COLE: All right. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Bob, a couple of questions. First, you mentioned 5.2 million, but actually is that -- that's just for close-out? And that's -- you're dealing with close-out by itself not continuation at this stage?

DR. SPIES: Dealing with close-out first and then with continuation studies second.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. And would you repeat what Item 5 was, Option 5?

DR. SPIES: That would be studies that have

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

demonstrated significant population loss, and what I mean here is any kind of census.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, then how did that differ from 6?

DR. SPIES: That would be the chronic population, that's where there's been a loss and the loss is continuing.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McVEE: Bob, this is Curt McVee in Anchorage, we've got a fax number.

DR. SPIES: Okay.

MR. McVEE: The number is 562-4376.

DR. SPIES: I'll have Barbara send that up right now.

MR. McVEE: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Bob, I didn't hear one other category of things. Many of these close-out studies, and maybe they're not worth spending much time on, are not major amounts of money but rather are finalizing a report to tell you exactly what type of damage occurred and didn't occur. And that seems to me to be - I'm thinking (ph) in terms of tying up and telling the world what really happened in our view on this Spill. As you go through, if you're doing project by project, you might identify that, too, because some of these are just to tie up the final report.

DR. SPIES: I'll try to. If you want to proceed,
Steve, by going through them one by one, I'll try to the best
of my ability to give you some opinion in each case as to

whether there's -- whether it's just report-wide (ph) or analysis. I'm not sure I can do that in every case without a little bit more preparation.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Well how would you suggest we proceed so we can understand what you've done here? I know what the totals are but I don't know what we'd gain or lose by doing the various levels (ph) that you've suggested as part of the options.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I have a suggestion, why don't we go down the close-out list and put a number on our papers which corresponds to the close-out options opposite each proposal. We can do that, then that would be a start. Like for inst---for example, in the close-out Number AW-1 (ph) Surface Oil Maps, what category would that come under, 1 through 7, for example?

DR. SPIES: That is a study of the fate of the oil that is needed to complete the sea otter study, and the sea otters are -- as far was we know, they've got a chronic population decline, so I put that up under the Option 6.

The fax from my office to Juneau has been completed 15 to 20 seconds ago, so that should be available shortly to you.

MR. PENNOYER: That's fine. Can we see from what you've done from the fax or shall we go down -- as Mr. Cole

suggested down the list?

DR. SPIES: If the fax is there, it will be -- Table 1 will have it in it, and Table 1 has the number of the studies is short title (ph) in the request as per the memo from the last Trustee Council meeting, and it also has the ranking of seriousness of injury. I note whether it's a study of fate of oil that's needed to support some of the other damage assessment studies. And then it remarks which of the options each of the studies would fall under.

MR. COLE: I've got some questions.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, Charlie Cole again. One of my concerns is a ranking of these studies based upon those projects which would support a restoration project, is that what's only in Number 7?

DR. SPIES: Yes. And it specifically links to upland habitat. I think in many cases we already know the injury pretty well, so we can proceed with some restoration without completions of the final study report.

CONFERENCE OPERATOR: Excuse me, this is the Conference Operator (indiscernible)

DR. SPIES: That is the only criteria, that it identifies the seriousness of injury; I think we know that for most resources now. But if you want to have a strong rationale, for instance, for the acquisition of timber rights,

one would want to have the results, for instance, from the Marble merlet study and the sea duck study, in the case of Harlequin ducks which use a stream-side habitat away from the Sound, perhaps also with river otters; although, I think that that study's been pretty much complete. Those three studies would give you that link, and that's a very small option of course in terms of the dollar figures.

MR. PENNOYER: Well I guess I'm confused then. We have recovery monitoring projects coming up pretty soon that are takeoffs on what we know about damage assessment, then we have restoration implementation projects that are further iteration of that. It seems to me sort of a sequence. Are you saying basically that without (indiscernible - telephone cutout) -- was and sort of verbalize it and go on from there (indiscernible).

DR. SPIES: Well I meant Mr. Cole's question to implicate what -- real actions and restoration, not necessarily just the imp- -- just the restoration monitoring. To implement all the restoration monitoring, I think you'll need to bring a logical close to the damage assessment studies that would support that. Does that answer your question?

MR. PENNOYER: Well it does sort of. I guess we haven't yet decided whether certain forms of restoration might actually be management programs that would better enable us to manage around possible damage assessment or for particular

R&R COURT REPORTERS

stocks. And I don't know how you do that based on, again, sort of a verbal summary of damages. It still seems to me that we have some obligations to finalize these damage assessment projects. I don't know if that means continuation or umpteen (ph) amount of money, but it seems to me a lot of these are -- close-out studies are just that; they're to close out our assessment of what happened in the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill.

And you're no -- in other words, you're simply responding to the one question. For something as specific as habitat acquisition there is one or two studies in the close-out that would help us on that?

DR. SPIES: Yes. That's correct.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: What does close-out mean? Does this mean this is the last year for any of these studies and there will not be the necessity for a similar study next year? Or is this they're just finishing one study this year and then we will have another study of the injury to rock fish next year because it would be well to know it next year as well as '89,'90 and '91? So what does close-out mean?

MR. PENNOYER: Do you want to try it?

DR. SPIES: Do you want me to answer that,

Mr. Pennoyer, (indiscernible - interrupted)

MR. PENNOYER: Well Mr. Barton is tugging at the

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

microphone, I'm wondering if he has something to say.

MR. BARTON: I thought that this was the final activity for this partic- -- for these particular projects. If we decide to fund, for example, AW-1 of \$15,000.00 that's it, we're done after that \$15,000.00. The other option is not give it 15,000 (indiscernible - telephone cutout) -- by giving them a 15 thou- -- giving that project the \$15,000.00 would bring it to some sort of logical conclusion.

MR. PENNOYER: Dr. Spies, do you want to comment on that?

DR. SPIES: Yes. This essentially is finishing the damage assessment studies and it's mostly data analysis and report writing for most of these. There is some further sample analysis and there is, I believe no fieldwork in any of these. It's essentially dealing with what we have in terms of analysis, of samples and analysis of data and writing of reports.

MR. BARTON: But in fact, if nothing changes, this would be the last year for that activity, is that correct?

DR. SPIES: Yes. Except in those cases where the populations are further studied under the restoration monitoring programs, and those would be fewer than those listed here.

MR. PENNOYER: In other words, in some case where you close out the damage assessment that results (ph) as there may

R&R COURT REPORTERS

still be some type of chronic or continuing injury going on, and then you would go, perhaps, to recovery monitoring and see if, in fact, the resource is recovery or it's changing for the worse?

DR. SPIES: Yes. And then there's also -- not to confuse things (ph), but there's also the damage assessment continuation options. The -- there's been a few -- in the case of a few studies, it has been recommended that further damage assessment type studies do on.

MR. COLE: Could we i- -- Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Dr. Spies, could we itemize those so we know what we're dealing with? My concern is that we'll approve these close-outs so as to wind up in a full fashion these studies which are not yet completed. Next year (indiscernible - telephone cutout) come to us, commendation (ph), further say, for example, herring study in FS-11, for example. I mean that's what I would like some assurance of. That this is truly the end, that it is not next year again and said well we would like to know what's happening here. Now can someone give me that assurance?

MR. BARTON: Well that's my understanding of what the intent is.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess my understanding of the intent is that this closes out a damage assessment process. If you're

R&R COURT REPORTERS

going to either through recovery monitoring or studies under restoration implementation -- for example, herring appears under restoration implementation, I'm not sure that study is building (ph) herring racks or improving the management of herring in response a suspected injury.

So those are subsequent decisions. The first decision is are you going to close out (indiscernible - telephone cutout) I think on the 27th and 28th or whether we would allow any type of recovery monitoring which might also be on the same resource.

MR. COLE: Well Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: It's not just the decision on the 28th that troubles me. I am concerned about next year being presented with proposals to say we really need to study herring injury in 1993. So, you know, just putting another label on it, changing it from the name of the study from close-out to restoration monitoring, s far I am concerned doesn't quite address the problem.

What I need comfort about is that if we close out these studies, I mean that's the end of injury study to these various species. (Indiscernible - telephone cutout) but somehow it does to me. If it's -- the result is well we'll just have another study to monitor injury to herring or see what the water quality is next year and then the next year that we must

R&R COURT REPORTERS

tie these to some form of restoration at some point other than simply studies. This is the thing that continues to trouble me.

DR. SPIES: I think that it's difficult to assure

Mr. Cole about the outcome of each of these resources in the

study scheme without going into what's proposed for restoration

programs next year, specifically the monitoring aspects of

restoration. And I have done a preliminary analysis on that,

and that's actually in Table 3, and whether we get around to

doing that or not is difficult to say if we'll have enough time

to get there today. But

MR. PENNOYER: Our assumption now that there would be no more damage assessment done on the close-out, and that, in fact, that is our intent. If somebody comes back and wants to continue damage assessment or if we don't agree with the recovery monitoring aspect, if there is one, we're not going to come back and do that. I mean we close it out, done, unless for some reason we find some unsuspected change in the resource in the future that we wanted to look at. But otherwise, I assume damage assessment is closed out.

Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Well first of all, I think we can define it however we want to. (Indiscernible - telephone cutout).

But that raises another question in mind that I'm puzzled by we're going to discuss the close-out studies and continuation

R&R COURT REPORTERS

studies today, recovery monitoring for these seven (ph). I'm puzzled by why we have a proposal to finance this project and close it out (indiscernible - telephone cutout) -- project then will come up on the 27th financing to open it up. The one that caught my eye specifically is Project B-2 (ph) in comparing that to Project R-13.

(Pause)

MR. BARTON: To my simple mind (ph) it -- why do we close it out and then start it up? Why don't we just -- if we want to start it up, start it up, why do we need to spend \$60,000.00 to close it out when we then start it up?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. Yeah. This is Curt.

MR. PENNOYER: Curt.

MR. McVEE: Yeah. Let me have Carol address that, explain why there's two of those.

MS. GORBIES: This is Carol Gorbies with the Fish & Wildlife Service. This is an example of a study that we are proposing to continue under Restoration; however, we have three years of data; it's a very complex study, several hundred birds and mammal species were looked at in the course of these boat surveys over many transacts (ph) throughout Prince William Sound. We've done preliminary progress reports each year, but in the mode that we were in, those progress reports were focused on providing the lawyers with the kind of information they wanted.

We feel it's very important to spend some more time with this study to finish the statistical analysis and to pull all of that data together into a form that would be usable for the Restoration program. For instance, we collected a lot of information on species of birds that we will target in restoration, and we'd like that information to be not just sitting in a stack of computer data but to be available for the Restoration managers as well.

We will propose the study goes on in additional years, whether it's this year or next year or alternate years has yet to be determined by you. And the reason we will continue -- or the reason we will request that it be continued is because we think that it's a good tool for monitoring the recovery of many bird species.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: See, I think this gets to the heart of the problem. I see it we're facing (ph) that we want to simply (ph) monitor the recovery, tools that will enable us to restore the damaged resources; that's the reason I think we must have a link between these studies and certainly continued studies, and a method of restoring the damaged species or stock. That's what gives me the trouble. But a lot of these studies it's nice to know the nature and extent of injuries and continue to study it year after year. But our assignment under the Federal

R&R COURT REPORTERS

Statutes and the Settlement is to restore these resources. And we must, as I see it, have a substantial link between the (indiscernible - telephone cutout) which we know determined by studies and three years of studies and our restoration project. And I think that our assignment is to get on with the restoration.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say that, you know, at least my understanding of what close-out is it was pretty much as it's been explained. (Indiscernible - telephone cutout) particular studies. Once we have, in fact, completed the analysis on some of these, who knows what we're left with (ph). So in order to put (indiscernible - telephone cutout) best about what's going to follow on this in the way of in tying these directly to the work I think is contingent upon what, in fact, shows up in some final analysis in the close-out that we're talking about on these particular projects.

So to say that we're not going to study herring, we're not going to study -- at this point I think is a bit premature because we don't know for sure what we've got. Assessments of damage, we've heard from Dr. Spies at the Anchorage meeting that what his general assessment was in Anchorage. But certainly, it seems necessary to me to, in fact, move on with these understanding that they are close-out on this. We get a shot as a Council of reviewing the other projects that come

before us on this. And it would seem to be that our advisors should (indiscernible - background coughing) to be able to make the linkage -- restoration, if that's the desire of the Council.

So it just seems to me that this is -- this to me is a fairly straightforward action as far as close-out is concerned.

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Dr. Spies, I've taken the time to read through the narrative in your fax and the whole presentation, and I must say that in the three day period of time you've (indiscernible - telephone cutout). The specific question with regard to the first paragraph on Page 2. You make the point, as you've already explained to us, that in that first paragraph on Page 2 you point out that the adoption of one of these options is not satisfactory you would have two recommendations for further refining the damage assessment budget; first, conduct a detailed audit of the proposed costs associated with each of these programs to the goal of eliminating unnecessary duplicate expenditures. Specific (ph) examination of the largest program, comprehensive coastal habitat program, to identify cost savings that may be implemented without losing information on potentially important injuries equipped with the help (ph) of one or two -- one or more of the peer reviewers undertake the latter evaluation.

That coastal habitat program I presume is CH-1A the

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comprehensive assessment of coastal habitat, USFS (ph) 2,950,000, which as you pointed out earlier is the -- is, you know, the primary program. I guess the question is -- and I guess I'm -- I'd like to -- my own mind is focused on this, and the question is how long would it take to actually do that second item, conduct a specific examination of this largest program to make certain that we're not losing information on potentially important injuries?

That's my bottom line, I don't want to lose potentially important injuries. And if we had that, that would really be helpful. How long would it take to do that?

DR. SPIES: I estimated that I could complete that evaluation by the end of this month.

MR. SANDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that for that one item, at least, that we should remain -- that we should not take action on that until the end of the month. The other projects I think we could go through on a point by point basis, but I would not be comfortable (indiscernible - telephone cutout) the project without the kind of analysis that Dr. Spies said they could make by the end of the month.

MR. BARTON: I welcome that further evaluation also, first as a contract with the University of Alaska, and I would think any help Dr. Spies could give us (indiscernible - telephone cutout) cost effective (indiscernible - telephone cutout).

R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion of the proposal to 1 2 take an evaluation by Dr. Spies before preceding with coastal habitat? 3 Dr. Spies, I imagine then you mean by our meeting on 4 the 27th or 28th you could do that? 5 I think I can get it done by then. 6 DR. SPIES: Yes. Is there further discussion or 7 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. 8 questions of either Mr. Barton or Dr. Spies on the coastal habitat motion and delay consideration of this until the end of 9 the month when Dr. Spies and appropriate peer reviewer has a 10 chance to undertake a further evaluation of the project? 11 12 MR. ROSIER: Yeah. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier. 13 Thank you. I guess the question I would 14 MR. ROSIER: 15 have, perhaps, the Staff in on this; is there anything that's associated with this project that's again on the bid issue as 16 of March 1 or 17 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons. Would you use the 18 19 microphone, please. 20 MR. GIBBONS: Yes. This is Dave Gibbons. That project -- the contract for that project right now terminates at the 21 There's about 70 plus people involved in 22 end of this month. that project at the University of Alaska. And so we would need 23 them some kind of assurance that at some level the project 24

would continue so they don't go to -- in the process right now

of starting laying off a lot of people associated with the 1 2 project. MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 3 4 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. Dr. Spies, can you give us that assurance? 5 MR. COLE: I've read this proposal. The thing that troubles 6 (indiscernible - telephone cutout) troubles (indiscernible -7 8 telephone cutout). DR. SPIES: Mr. Chairman. 9 10 (Pause) 11 DR. SPIES: Mr. Chairman? 12 MR. PENNOYER: Bob Spies, go ahead. DR. SPIES: Yeah. Mr. Cole's comments were quite 13 broken up over the telephone line, I heard something about a 14 reassurance but I didn't hear much more of the rest of the --15 16 his question or comment. 17 They aren't worth repeating. MR. COLE: 18 MR. PENNOYER: Actually (indiscernible - telephone 19 cutout) -- completed with the project or didn't make a decision 20 on any continuation 'til March 1st it was going to be very disruptive. So the question was of Dr. Spies in your review do 21 22 you see that there would be continuation at some level; is this project important enough at some level, even if it's refined or 23

R&R COURT REPORTERS

Well I think so, we're going to need to

changed or whatever, that it would be continued?

DR. SPIES:

24

continue it somewhat, but the Trustee Council may want to consider some partial funding for several months or -- I don't know what you -- what options are available to you. But in my mind it's likely that we're going to want to continue this in some form through the next year.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Dr. Spies, I was just going to say when I look at the budget for 227,000 and it includes laboratory space for two labs, I'd like you to take a careful look at what the cost breakout for those two labs is -- we're in that category.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Yes. When that project was originally conceived, it provided the linkage to a number of other projects. And it was an effort to eliminate duplication within those projects. But I think at this point in time what we have now is the cataloging and analysis of a large number of samples from previous field studies. Is that not right, Dave? And then the subsequent evaluation and report.

We've talked conceptually that perhaps not all those samples need to be analyzed at this point in time. And I think that Dr. Spies could give us any insights as to his opinion of that, it would be very helpful. I would urge, though, that Dr. Spies -- that you work with the individual who has been acting as the contracting officer, representative, or liaison

or whatever with the University as you put together your approach to this effort. I think the University will be more comfortable for one thing, and for another, you might get some insights as to areas of improvement.

DR. SPIES: Okay. I can make two comments with regard to Mr. Barton's statements. First of all, he's right, there is possibly some categorization and ranking of the importance of the various goals. And in fact, we had a meeting in Anchorage -- excuse me -- in Fairbanks last summer and did some prioritization (ph) according to sub-habitat and according to the time that the samples were collected because they have been sampling twice a field season and we get a agreed on consensus as far as what samples should be analyzed first. And taking -- that would certainly be the start of a way to prioritize those remaining samples and some judgment as to where we could cut things off.

Secondly, I would certainly welcome any help I could get in this. It's a very complex, large study. It's got a very complex budget, a lot of different tasks. So, I would welcome the help of anybody that could provide information on (indiscernible - telephone cutout) on the budgetary aspects of it because the aspects I haven't been closely associated with in my review of this program.

MR. PENNOYER: Well then I guess I can assume -- do I have any objections to the motion as made regarding coastal

R&R COURT REPORTERS

habitat? I guess I can assume that that has been deferred now until our meeting on the 27th, at which time you will report back with a detailed review of the projects and components and a recommendation on its continuation and at what level. And you will work with the Restoration Team and the contracting office -- or from the Forest Service to do that.

(Indiscernible - telephone cutout) close-out. Perhaps we can do now is just go down through the list, one project at a time and see if there are any comments. Now, my assumption is looking just generally at your list of rankings, or option list, that one is sort of just do everything. And then from -well, particularly above 3, there are various types of injuries you're concerned about, population decline, chronic injuries, restoration actions. But you've got a number of Xs next to each one of these projects and perhaps we can just go down through them one at a time. We've got about an hour and 15 minutes left and I'd really like to get down through this list So maybe taking one project at a time you could if we can. just briefly comment on whether it fits in your option and we could ask question.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. Could you explain this (indiscernible) table to find where your recommendation is found (ph).

(Pause)

MR. COLE: Dr. Spies, this is Charlie Cole. Is there

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

anyplace on Table 1 where we can find your recommendation with respect to each of these proposed projects?

DR. SPIES: No. I explained my response in terms of various kinds of options the Trustee Council could make with regard to the whole package and that's summarized at the bottom with seven different options. And then I have not made particular recommendations one way or the other on each study.

MR. COLE: Are you prepared to do that today?

DR. SPIES: I'm prepared to tell you what the implications of canceling a particular project would be.

MR. COLE: Well, I'm not sure how to take that. Is that

MR. PENNOYER: Go ahead and tell us whether you think we're being unfair because the question comes, of course, whether it's a policy call on the type of thing you may lose if you don't it or it's just strictly a science call. And I don't -- so, you know, if you're hesitant, maybe as you get to each project you can kind of describe where it fits in the options and we can ask you that question.

DR. SPIES: Certainly. I have tried to leave the policy decisions up to the Trustee Council. I offered (indiscernible - interrupted)

MR. PENNOYER: Well, we may still put you a little more on the spot than you want to be but maybe we should do it one project at a time. Mr. Barton.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. BARTON: I have two comments. One, Bob, I think we the Trustee Council all understand that the final decisions on these -- each of these projects and the entire package are the responsibility of the Council. And we would welcome any help and advice you might have. But I'm sure -- you need to understand as we do, and I'm sure you do, that that responsibility is a responsibility of the Council and it's not your responsibility, but we do appreciate all the help.

And the second point -- or question I have. If you look at your Table 1, for example, there is no -- well look at ST-1A. You have Xs out through Option 5, does that mean then if we would select Option 6 that that would be it, there would be no more activity and no more dollars devoted to that project, that we would essentially just wash it down the drain today; is that correct?

DR. SPIES: Right.

MR. BARTON: Okay.

MR. PENNOYER: There are different notations here, we may want to ask about those. And like I say, there may be other reasons, such as just finalizing and tying up of projects.

DR. SPIES: Yeah. This looks at the whole collection in kind of one dimension. I mean there's some other comments that

MR. PENNOYER: Well I quess my point, Bob, is I'd like

R&R COURT REPORTERS

(ph) to get to those varices as we hit each individual project.

But why don't we start down the list because we do have to get through this. And the first one is surface oil maps for \$15,000.00, DEC, and you've got six Xs on it.

DR. SPIES: Right. That program is going forth to finalize damage assessment for the otter program in particular and for some of the bird programs because it's going to deal with all the DEC data of oil on water. And we need that because the NOAA maps -- NOAA has ma- -- outputs or the models, it is not sufficient by itself and in some cases may contradict what we know from DEC maps, so we need to finish those maps.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions on AW-1? Do you want to proceed then? Yes, Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Well I guess the point of your procedure or process -- well why don't we simply act on these if we can as we go by on a one by one basis? And I would move approval of this one.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: I don't have a second on Mr. Sandor's motion yet. It's been moved and seconded. Is there comment? Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. If we're going to start to take action on these, I guess I might mention because that there has

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

not been time probably for the reports from the NEPA (ph)

Subcommittee to get to everyone today, but there's -- I have

before me a document that was prepared by Ken Rice, this has

not gone before the RT. But basically this document that says

that they have conducted a review and that the damage

assessment continuation and close-out studies on these lists

have been determined that they should be categorically exempt

from the requirements of NEPA and in accordance with the

appropriate regulations. And it says there are no

extraordinary circumstances that would trigger a need for an

environmental impact statement for those few projects requiring

field work this year.

That's the recommendation of the NEPA Subcommittee but it has not had action by the RT. I guess we have a motion on the floor but before we take action on that motion I think that we should, you know, pro- -- or sanction the committee report so that we have something for the record.

MR. PENNOYER: Perhaps we could take action on this one motion since it's here and then go on and do that next. Is there any objection to the approval of AW-1, recognizing to go out to public review, it's not (indiscernible - telephone cutout) -- it may occasion (ph) some internal -- or interim expenditure that still has to go out to public review.

Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I think that is well

R&R COURT REPORTERS

made that this goes out now for public review and the approval 1 2 is for it to go out for public review. That's correct. We do understand and MR. PENNOYER: 3 commented at the last meeting that there may be some interim 4 expenditures for early starting project and we're going to get 5 a report on what those might be at our next meeting, as I 6 understand it. 7 8 MR. MCVEE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Green light, go (ph). Yes, Mr. McVee. 9 MR. PENNOYER: I guess my only problem with taking 10 MR. McVEE: Yeah. action before we just formalize this NEPA record is just a 11 procedural problem so that we do things in the right sequence. 12 And I probably should have brought this up earlier but I didn't 13 know what our procedure was going to be before we got here. 14 MR. PENNOYER: Do we have -- do I have a motion 15 (indiscernible - telephone cutout) 16 MR. SANDOR: As the maker (ph) of the motion 17 incorporates this approval of that Rice Report -- acceptance of 18 that Rice Report as a precondition to this and any other 19 20 approvals made this evening. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton. 21 22 MR. BARTON: Second. Agree. I'm not sure. I'm a little 23 24 MR. ROSIER: I second.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier, does the second agree?

1 MR. BARTON: All right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROSIER: (Indiscernible - telephone cutout).

MR. BARTON: I have a question when Mr. Rosier (indiscernible - telephone cutout)

MR. ROSIER: The second certainly agrees with the modified motion.

MR. McVEE: We're having a little trouble hearing Mike particularly.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

(Pause)

MR. PENNOYER: sign-off after public review.

Some of these projects have to be in the field in March. There will be some expenditures, so I assume that it is appropriate to go ahead with Mr. Rice's report. Is there any objection incorporating the total motion as agreed to by the maker of the motion and the second? The motion was to go ahead and approve AW-1 but with consideration of Mr. Rice's report and adoption of it. It's a preliminary review, it's shows the damage assessment, damage continuation studies would qualify for categorical exemption under NEPA not therefore requiring an environmental impact statement.

Okay. Fine, thank you very much. We have approved AW-1. Again, Restoration Team, my assumption is that at the next meeting we are going to get some report on what interim expenditures might be between the time that these are

tentatively approved for public review and the time we actually come back and make the final approval in May or whenever that's going to be.

Hello. So continuing down the list, the next one is injury to subtidal (ph) sediments, \$100,000.00; you've got five Xs.

DR. SPIES: Yes. This is -- it falls somewhat in the category of a fate (ph) although I did not mark it on my table as such but it's -- it measures the concentrations of hydrocarbons in sediments and is related to some of the injuries that have been described for the -- under the shell of (ph) subtidal studies and others. And it deals with essentially the changes of populations -- supports that level of effort. And my recommendation would be to complete this study.

MR. PENNOYER: Are there questions or comments?
Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Dr. Spies, is any more fieldwork required to complete this study?

DR. SPIES: No.

MR. COLE: I read the supporting documentation entitled Project Classification (ph) and I couldn't tell whether more samples were required.

DR. SPIES: Yeah. Unfortunately, the way the verbs are used there it's open to question as to what's going on. I

R&R COURT REPORTERS

think as far as I know for all these studies there is not further fieldwork. These are just analyses of the samples inhand, doing the statistical analysis as well and then reporting the results.

(Pause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SANDOR: Restoration Team members that are here is that, in fact, the case that there's no additional fieldwork required in all of these projects (ph)?

(Indiscernible - telephone cutout)

MR. SANDOR: So let me just identify even at this point when we get to that point the ones that will require additional fieldwork.

MR. PENNOYER: I'm having a little trouble wondering what close-out means if additional fieldwork is required this year. So if we were to close out next year to write the report. Anyway, we'll get into that as we get to each one.

MR. MONTAGUE: (Indiscernible - telephone cutout)

MR. PENNOYER: You'll have to come up to the microphone if you want to -- Mr. Montague.

MR. MONTAGUE: All -- this is Jerome Montague with the Department of Fish & Game. All the close-out projects were intended for the amounts -- total cost through the completion of a final report. So there is nothing in the close-out column that we anticipate needing funding next year.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. Any further

discussion of ST-1A injury to subtidal sediments? Do I have a 1 motion of some kind? Mr. Rosier. 2 MR. ROSIER: I would move approval of ST-1A. 3 MR. PENNOYER: Is there a second? 4 5 MR. BARTON: Second. Is there further discussion? Is there MR. PENNOYER: 6 7 any objection to approval of ST-1A to go out to public review? 8 MR. McVEE: No objection. ST-1B, hydrocarbon mineralization. 9 MR. PENNOYER: 10 DR. SPIES: This is the study of the activity of 11 hydrocarbon degrading bacteria in bottom sediments. 12 gives a good indication of the presence of oil. another component of understanding the fate of the oil and 13 14 something about its possible rate of breakdown. It does not support injury very well, although I've given it three Xs here. 15 16 It's a small amount of money, I would recommend its completion. 17 MR. PENNOYER: Are there questions for Dr. Spies or 18 others? Mr. Cole. MR. COLE: I will move that we proceed with this 19 20 project. MR. SANDOR: 21 Second. MR. PENNOYER: Is there a second? Mr. Sandor. 22 23 further discussion? Any objection. 24 MR. McVEE: No objection. 25 MR. PENNOYER: Then hydrocarbon mineralization, ST-1B

is approved to go out to public review. ST-2A shallow water 1 2 communities, \$125,000.00. This is a study that examines the shallow DR. SPIES: 3 water communities particularly in the Erl grass (ph) areas in 4 Our knowledge of the injury is from 1990 samples only. 5 And my understanding of this proposal is to complete analysis 6 of 1991 samples mainly. And it has documented some population 7 8 changes, and I've given it five Xs here. 9 (Pause) I don't hear anybody asking Dr. Spies 10 MR. PENNOYER: Any other questions on the budget detail the fateful question. 11 12 or the purpose of this study? Dr. Spies, do you think this study is essential then to 13 document injuries? 14 Well, we've got one year of injury 15 DR. SPIES: 16 documented, it's a question of whether we need the second year 17 or not. Let us know whether we're planning the same sort of thing in the second year or not. 18 So this is further field studies then? 19 MR. PENNOYER: No. It's analysis of samples that have 20 DR. SPIES: been collected but have not been analyzed. 21 I see. Okay. Fine, thank you. 22 MR. PENNOYER: recommendation. 23 MR. COLE: Excuse me, I didn't hear that. DR. SPIES: Was that --24

did Charlie Cole ask me for my recommendation?

1 MR. COLE: Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, Bob, that's correct.

DR. SPIES: That's a hard to call to make because it may not add that much to it; on the other hand, we only have one year of studies -- one year of information indicating a injury. So I'm kind of neutral on this, I could go either way.

(Pause)

MR. PENNOYER: Objection (ph)?

MR. COLE: Can I ask

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier, what is your thought on this, Commissioner?

MR. ROSIER: Well I'm kind of like our chief scientist here on this, I'm a little bit hesitant here. We have no analysis on the first year's data at all?

DR. SPIES: No, we do. We have a pretty good analysis by Steve Jewitt (ph) and Tom Jenings on this data. And we've got some changes in populations of animals, particularly crabs and anthrodods (ph) and some other animals. There's some uncertainty connected with some of the injury that's been identified, we don't know how much (indiscernible) playing in some of these differences between oiled/unoiled areas. But I think in my mind on the whole it's documented some injuries. The question is whether we need the second year or not.

MR. COLE: I have a question.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Had you finished, Commissioner?

MR. ROSIER: Yes.

MR. COLE: Well you see a study is -- it compliments in a sense, does it not, ST-2A, shallow communities, this is deep water. Don't those -- I mean should we draw a distinction between the two?

DR. SPIES: I was discussing -- my comments are directed at ST-2A, perhaps because of the breakup I'm a bit confused here.

MR. PENNOYER: The question, Bob, was are ST-2A and 2B related closely, you can't do one without the other? ST-2B, for example, you've only got two Xs next to it. Do we need to treat these in some aggregate?

DR. SPIES: I don't think it's wise because there is some questions about 2B. There's been a rather thorough analysis of the data but the reviewers have raised some serious questions about the interpretation. We don't know to what extent hydrocarbons got to the hundred meters of which this study was mainly carried out so far. And I think we -- the investigator needs to spend some more time analyzing the data, and he's waiting for some hydrocarbon data.

So in a sense, some of the money here would be usefully spent on further analysis of the data; however, further analysis samples would -- I would suggest waiting to see until

1	we have a more thorough analysis of the data and a further
2	review by the peer reviewers. That's in the case of ST-2B.
3	MR. PENNOYER: Your answer is we should take them
4	separately then? Okay. Back to ST-2A, further comment or
5	discussion?
6	MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I would move to defer all
7	action on 2A so that we can reflect on this between now and our
8	meeting on the 27th.
9	MR. PENNOYER: Any further discussion on this item?
10	Effects of deferral? Nobody seems to have an effects of
11	deferral. So Mr. Gibbons, did you want to say something?
12	MR. GIBBONS: Again, this is the University of Alaska
13	study. I'm not as familiar with this one as I was the coastal
14	habitat, but I know they have samples from 1991. And they have
15	some sorters working in a lab, I don't know how many sorters
16	they have, but there are people sorting samples from '91 data
17	on this one. Their contract I would assume would run out
18	March 1st.
19	MR. FRAKER: Dave, this is Mark Fraker (ph) here. The
20	contract period runs out on 30 April.
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mark
22	MR. PENNOYER: Well then we're March 1st (ph).
23	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you address the consequences
24	of deferral on that, Mark?
25	MR. FRAKER: Well deferral until what time?

1 MR. PENNOYER: Until our February 27th meeting, a 2 decision (ph). It's probably less critical in this case 3 MR. FRAKER: since they are ongoing with their work until the 30th of April. 4 5 I might point out that of course the effort that has been taken 6 to collect samples has already been expended, so the samples 7 are in-hand, now it's a matter of analyzing those samples. 8 MR. PENNOYER: I think that might be good commentary 9 for the 27th. We do have a motion for -- Mr. Montague, did you 10 want to make another comment? 11 MR. MONTAGUE: Mark was correct on the contract close-12 out on that but our funding is through a reimbursable services 13 agreement with DEC, and it explicitly states that there will not be funding beyond the oil year that isn't approved by the 14 15 Council. So despite the fact that their contract is open, we 16 couldn't make payments on it after March 1st (ph). 17 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, this is Curt. 18 MR. PENNOYER: Curt, go ahead. 19 MR. McVEE: Yeah. Does anyone know what kind of an 20 investment we've got in collecting those samples to this point? 21 Mark, do you have that? 22 MR. COLE: And could someone also answer how many samples are we talking about here? I would like to know that. 23 24 And also, is work going on on those samplings now? 25 MR. FRAKER: This is Mark Fraker. The sampling is not

going on now, that was done during the last summer's field season. Analysis of those samples is going on. And as far as the number of samples and the amount of money already invested in the project, I don't have a ready answer for either of those.

MR. PENNOYER: I'm not sure I heard what the impact of the deferral until February 27th was. It seems like it's potentially significant but I don't know that I actually heard an effect on the project.

(Pause)

MR. PENNOYER: Mark -- Mr. Sandor, first.

MR. SANDOR: I'm trying to choose my words carefully. This illustrates a problem; see, we're operating without adequate information even on this particular point. And I find it difficult to believe that today the 10th to the 27th until we get this additional information is going to have that significant of a consequence. And as I said in Anchorage the last -- it's disturbing to me, and I don't want to sound callous that we're making decisions on whether or not pink slips are issued on, you know, the end of the month or whatever else.

As we go through these, I would really prefer if we address the issue of whether or not the information that the studies are needed, in fact, meet the scientific objectives. And so impact on people is a problem. There can be a short-

term extension given but we've got to meet the two week notice.

And since this requirement -- the contact itself runs 'til

April 30 it seems to me then it's a matter of administrative

prerogative to extend, in fact, two weeks or whatever else.

But if we put the issue of potential adverse impact on

employees, which may or may not even be the case, we throw this

analysis off the track and it's disturbing.

So I think it's -- some are not to be addressing this other issue (ph). And if in fact, there's a potential violation of contracting, the administrative services people should have a mechanism in-place to extend their contracts for two weeks or whatever else so that there isn't any problem between now and the 30th.

Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Well I agree with Mr. Sandor, I think we ought to look at these projects on their merits and then sort out whatever damage they may have created after we get done looking at them on their merits. You know, we could take care of the pink slip problem by agreeing that we will allow hourly phase down on those that we want to eliminate.

MR. PENNOYER: Is the proposal that we -- that I hear being made that we adopt some type of interim funding this until we get past the February 27th period, and if so, what would it be? Or that we authorize contract negotiators to

authorize whatever minimum amount is necessary for the two week period after the 1st? Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: You said it. That we authorize our administrative services people to take whatever action is necessary to meet minimum contractual requirements and appropriate personnel -- professional personnel management.

MR. BARTON: We're talking right now about ST-2A, but I assume that your comment was aimed at all the rest of those studies; do you incorporate that into the motion that was made?

MR. PENNOYER: I'm sorry, all the rest of the studies even the ones we disapprove and decide shouldn't go forward?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Um-hum.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. I see what you're saying, yes, correct.

MR. BARTON: The mover agreed (ph) to that, does the second?

MR. MONTAGUE: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague, you had a comment?

MR. MONTAGUE: Yes. To date we didn't come here expecting to have to provide that information. But I think I can off-the-cuff it that it was probably on the order of seven or 800,000, maybe a million dollars. And that this amount asked here, the loss of deferral for a year, now the loss of deferral to February 27th is significant. The loss of deferral for a year would mean that we wouldn't have a document

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

expressing the results of that project.

MR. PENNOYER: I heard the motion to not include deferral for a year but simply deferral until February 27th for a final decision with the motion being that contract negotiators and personnel people would take care of whatever we had to do to cover the interim period of time from February 27th until we actually take a final decision.

So, is there any objection to the motion to defer ST-2A to February 27th on that basis, understanding there may be interim expenditures that we'll have to (indiscernible - telephone cutout)

Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. Is it my understanding that something will be done with respect to this proposed study between now and February 28th; and if so, what?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Well my presumption is is that the action continues on these projects as defined in the pink book in our previous contract running, in fact, from April 30th. The action here of deferring this to February 27th, our next Trustee Council meeting, is to give us the opportunity to (indiscernible) closely at these projects that are deferred until that time and make a more reasoned and sound judgment as to what action we finally take.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. 1 I guess Commissioner Sandor, the thrust of 2 MR. COLE: my question was is someone (indiscernible) be designated to 3 provide us with further information about this type of study or 4 this specific study between now and the 28th? 5 6 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor. MR. SANDOR: My understanding there is that the 7 Restoration Team leader will make the necessary assignments to 8 9 get whatever information that -- by this Trustee Council at 10 today's meeting and have that information provided the members 11 of -- in advance of that February 27 meeting. 12 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, does that respond to your 13 question? Yes, sir. 14 MR. COLE: Is there any objection to the motion? 15 MR. PENNOYER: 16 ST-2A is deferred then pending further study to the February 27th meeting (indiscernible - interrupted) 17 18 MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman. 19 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague. Is there additional information that the 20 MR. MONTAGUE: Council wishes on this project that we are to provide in the 21 interim? 22 23 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague, you were asked, as I 24 recall for one thing, the amount spent to date, what's lost, in

fact, if we don't do it for a second year instead of just one

year. More specifically, perhaps knowing the concern, you could come with a presentation on what we've gained from the project so far versus what we will lose if we don't do a second year analysis.

Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Dr. Montague, I think, you know, what is troubling me with respect to this study is we don't have recommendation either by the chief scientist or Commissioner Rosier that we should go ahead with it. And I think what I'd like to see is whether we can get a firmer, you might say, commitment either from the chief scientist or Commissioner Rosier at that time as to whether we should go ahead. If they can't recommend it firmly, then I don't think it would be well to go ahead with it.

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion of this motion? Is there any objection to the motion? All right. ST-2A then has been deferred. We'll go on to ST-2B, deep water benthos (ph), \$80,000.00, two Xs. Dr. Spies.

DR. SPIES: Yes. As I said before, and I'll try to be as brief as possible, this -- the results of this study need further analysis and further consideration of interpretation with further peer review; and therefore, I would recommend that that at least be done and that any further sample analysis for 1991, for example, be deferred until the completion and full interpretation of the 1990 results have been completed and

accepted by the peer reviewers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Dr. Spies, however, if we vote any money to this is that type of evaluation going to take place?

DR. SPIES: What I'm suggesting is that you somehow split this, and I can't tell you off the top of my head how to do this, but you somehow split the budget so that the damage assessment portion of this is completed; the report is completed (indiscernible - telephone cutout) -- further analysis of '91 samples, which I am assuming is included in this \$80,000.00 budget. So it's going to some fraction of \$80,000.00 that I am recommending be expended.

MR. PENNOYER: So then you're recommending that some time again in this interim period you come meet with the project leaders and Restoration Team and in fact break the budget down along the lines that you've specified?

DR. SPIES: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions of Dr. Spies? Agency?
Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Does the Agency have some estimate of what it would take to do what Dr. Spies suggests?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague.

(Pause)

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Fraker.

MR. MONTAGUE: Mark Fraker, did you hear the guestion?

MR. FRAKER: I did. I'm not sure offhand how to answer

it. I would guess somewhere on the order of \$10,000.00 or less to accomplish the review and sort of the reconciliation of the -- some of the criticisms of peer reviewers.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARTON: And at that point then we would make a decision as to -- upon completion of that, the idea is then that we would make a decision on whether we want it further (ph)?

MR. PENNOYER: Dr. Spies.

DR. SPIES: Well I don't want to get into recommending procedure, but somehow you've got to allow for the possibility that the further analysis of data will support a conclusion of injury here and perhaps justify further expenditures for the analysis of the '91 samples. However, I'm not prepared to recommend the whole amount to you at the present time because it's unsure in my mind whether the results of the '91 analysis can be, in fact, interpreted as indicating injury to the deep water benthos at this time.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: I'd move that we fund this project, ST-2B, at the level of \$10,000.00, give or take a little.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: Moved and seconded ST-2B be funded at the level of \$10,000.00 presumably to do the analysis to see if the balance of the proposed studies should be carried out. Any

further discussion? Is there any objection? Thank you. 1 2 Let's go on to ST-3A then, bile (ph) availability and transport of hydrocarbons, \$29,300.00, four Xs and a fate with 3 a cross. Go ahead, Bob. 4 This is a NOAA study that has analyzed the 5 DR. SPIES: accumulation of hydrocarbons by mussels. And it fits into the 6 total picture of understanding the fate of hydrocarbons in the 7 8 water and water quality. And I'm recommending that this be 9 completed. 10 MR. PENNOYER: Questions of Dr. Spies? 11 (Indiscernible - telephone cutout) 12 MR. SANDOR: I move acceptance of this. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second. 13 MR. PENNOYER: Moved and seconded to accept ST-3A. 14 Any further discussion? Is there any objection? 15 No objection. 16 MR. McVEE: 17 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Curt, I can't see you but I assume when I say there's any objection you will chime in if 18 there is one. So I didn't mean to pass you up -- pass you by. 19 MR. McVEE: I will. 20 MR. PENNOYER: 3B bile availability and trans- -- same 21 title, 6,700 and the same notations and four Xs. Dr. Spies. 22 This study looks at the hydrocarbons 23 DR. SPIES: Yes. accumulated in subtidal sediment traps (ph) and provides 24

information that's complimentary to the data on accumulation of

hydrocarbons by mussels. There are sediment traps out there and this cost includes the retrieval of sediment traps that are already in the field at this time. In other words, the traps that are over wear (ph) that give us some idea of mobilization of hydrocarbons in -- off beaches and so forth. And I would recommend that you go forward with this; although, my recommendation would not be perhaps as strong as some of the others but I would recommend going forward with those.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions of Dr. Spies? Agency?

MR. COLE: Commissioner.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'd like to ask Commissioner Sandor, since I see this is a DEC study, would you be looking forward to want to run a similar study to this next year?

(Pause)

MR. SANDOR: (indiscernible - telephone cutout) - I guess with Dr. Spies' recommendation, Mr. Chairman, even
though it may not be as strong as earlier recommendations, I
would believe that this project should be approved. But again,
I'm told -- I have the understanding that all of these closeouts -- are close-outs. And I noticed, in fact, in the
narrative Dr. Spies, in fact, in the next to the last paragraph
on Page 3 of his memo points out, quote: Most of the damage
assessment studies proposed for close-out are essentially
studies that were not completely timely and within budget.

This raised questions as to whether the restoration project 1 proposed for '92 will actually be finished with the resources 2 3 requested. I think my trusted representative on the Restoration 4 Team will help assure that this project will be done this year. 5 I move approval of this project. 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second. 7 MR. PENNOYER: It's been moved and seconded to approve 8 Is there further discussion? Mr. Cole, do you 9 this project. have a further question? 10 No, sir. 11 MR. COLE: ST-3B, is there any objection to 12 MR. PENNOYER: approval of its continuation? 13 No objection. 14 MR. McVEE: UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I move the approval (ph). 15 MR. PENNOYER: Get our terminology straight here. 16 17 Thank you. Okay. The next study is ST-6, injury to rock fish, 18 \$15,000.00. 19 I recommend that this study close-out. 20 DR. SPIES: There's a number of samples that have yet to be analyzed and 21 date to be analyzed. And there was a few dead rock fish found 22 after the Spill that we think were killed by the Spill, there 23 was evidence from 1990 samples that the rock fish were exposed 24

to hydrocarbons in their environment. The analys- -- the

completion of this study would include both analysis of -further analysis of hydrocarbons and exposure and also analysis
of sublethal -- just the pathological effects potentially
induced by the oil. It's a small amount of money, I therefore
recommend that we complete this study. We don't really know
what we have yet.

MR. PENNOYER: Further comment or question?
(Pause)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: It's moved and seconded that we fund the injury to rock fish study of \$15,000.00. Is there further discussion? Any objection?

MR. McVEE: No objection.

MR. PENNOYER: The next injured dimorsal (ph) fish, 66,100, it says two fate plus a star across (ph) plus two Xs, you're going to have to explain that one to me, Bob.

DR. SPIES: I'll try. There is little in the way of injury indicated here, there is some — these are mainly bottom fish like flounder. There's certainly some very good data that's coming out of analysis of hydrocarbons in their bile (ph) that help us understand how hydrocarbons in the subtidal area may be continued to be bile available to fish or not and how that is going down. So that's very interesting data and it puts a broader perspective in terms of the fate of the hydrocarbons and that explains my comment about fate. But they

R&R COURT REPORTERS

haven't really found much in the way of injury so far, mainly it's been examination of effects on reproductive parameters and just a pathological examination of other tissues such as gills. There have been some preliminary indication of an injury to gills.

I think that this sort of data is valuable to have, but I don't know what's involved in that \$66,000.00 figure. It seems a bit high to me at the present time, I don't know exactly what's involved in completing this study except that there is quite a bit of biological data to interpret here. I've got -- I'm fairly weak on -- I would like to see this completed but I'm fairly weak on assuring you that it's strongly related to potential injury.

MR. PENNOYER: Bob, can you comment on the need for this to actu- -- I know we've done a lot of dimorsal fish work to try and determine whether injury occurred. (Indiscernible - telephone cutout) like you exactly what's required to really (ph) close that out. Is this sample analysis or is it just closing out the data loop and writing the final report? And if so, does this help tie together the question of whether dimorsal fish in a spill like this are injured in a subarctic environment.

Byron Morris, do you want to comment on that, perhaps?
You'll have to come up to the microphone. Bob, do you want to
go first?

R&R COURT REPORTERS

DR. SPIES: I'll let Byron comment first.

MR. MORRIS: Yes. This study is for the Environmental Conservation Division, and as I look at their detailed budget for close-out it's approximately a month or a tenth of the year's time for a team of various people's salary, which adds up to approximately 59,000 of the total cost of the study. Their approach has been to study oil spills and other (ph) contaminants in a variety of areas including type (ph) environments to understand these type of effects. So I understand this is just to devote these people to the final analysis and interpretation of the data that they have on-hand.

MR. PENNOYER: The question is but if this is not funded, do we then end up with no report on all the work we've done on dimorsal fishes or where are we at?

MR. MORRIS: You would get no final report on this project.

MR. PENNOYER: Bob, do you want to try anymore?

DR. SPIES: I kind of leave it up to the Council to make the decision of whether I need this one or not. I'd like -- from a purely scientific point of view I think it's important to have this data to understand the Spill.

MR. COLE: Dr. Spies, this is Charlie Cole. What does it do for the restoration process?

DR. SPIES: Well as far as direct restoration I think that most scientists would agree with me there's probably not

R&R COURT REPORTERS

too much that could frankly (ph) be done on this environment of these particular fish. However, I would prefer to see some very, very limited sampling of dimorsal fish perhaps intermittently over the next several years to see if the hydrocarbons are still available to the bottom dwelling fish in the Spill so we can get a picture generally of what's going on with hydrocarbons and the bile availability of they hydrocarbons in the Sound. But -- does that answer your question?

MR. COLE: No.

MR. PENNOYER: Not totally.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. PENNOYER: I know again we've done a lot of work on looking at it to see if, in fact, the bottom fish were injured, even if we didn't know for sure how we were going to deal with it, we felt (ph) we had to know the injury. And I don't know if we've closed that loop out yet or not. If the reports that have been done already close that loop or if this 66,000 is necessary to do it.

Byron, maybe if we can't answer that question here, we'll have to come back and answer it at the next session. I don't have the answer to it off the top of my head. So it's sort of how important is this to close out the work on dimorsal fish.

DR. SPIES: I might make one comment here that might

save some money, and this is a professional judgment on my part. I've done studies on effects of contaminants on reproduction of bottom fish. And my judgment, and this is just strictly my judgment, it's unlikely that we'll see an affect on the reproduction of these bottom fish from the Spill. And it would therefore be my recommendation that we would delete that part of the study that give the reproductive effects.

I believe that there is some analysis of hormones in blood and so forth that would be included in this final figure, but that's -- I'm just going on my recollection because I don't have the detailed study plan in front of me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do we know

MR. PENNOYER: So we don't know then how much that might be of the total? Ask that question, what's lost if we wait to ask those questions and come back on the 27th?

MR. MORRIS: I think that would be satisfactory.

MR. PENNOYER: (Indiscernible - telephone cutout) some kind.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would move deferral to February 27th.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: Is there further discussion of this.

Byron, do you understand the (indiscernible - telephone cutout)

and the assignment?

MR. MORRIS: Yes, I do.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PENNOYER: Any further discussion of this? Is there any objection to the motion?

MR. McVEE: The motion is to defer, Steve?

MR. PENNOYER: The motion is to defer until the 27th, with the understanding that we're going to look at -- with Dr. Spies' help, look at the subsections of this that night not have to be pursued versus the need to close out this study and -- and put a cap on it.

MR. McVEE: No objection.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

Well, now if one looks at where we're going, MR. COLE: I think we're just in a sense almost wasting our time here. ought to just approve all studies and, you know, get on with If you look at category one, that's 5,180,000. Category two is 5,165,000. And if it's a matter essentially of policy, we accept everything in -- in category two and above as we seem to be heading, we ought to just save all the time and strain and emotional drain and, you know, just approve these. I mean, because it's obvious I think, isn't it, that -- that even when we get a category two study, approve it. You know, we ought to just approve them all and be done with it. We're only \$15,000.00 between category -- well, all -- all studies and those in category number two. And in fact only about, you know, \$180,000.00 between categories one, two and three. think it's just something to think about. I think

1	MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, since it's 25 to six, we may
2	not be far off from that requirement anyhow, but I guess we
3	have at least in talked about reductions in these. I don't
4	what the reductions going to be in ST-7. Maybe it will be a
5	\$10,000.00 proposal. But I yeah, Mr. Barton?
6	MR. BARTON: I think we keep losing sight of the fact
7	that all we're doing is approving these to go out for public
8	review. And and then let me finish here. I frankly
9	have no problem with sending all of these out for public
10	review. Once we get that review, then we start some
11	discussion, that's entirely appropriate. Anyway,
12	MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?
13	MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?
14	MR. COLE: I move we send all of the projects out to
15	public review.
16	MR. BARTON: Second.
17	MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, the previous (indiscernible)?
18	MR. PENNOYER: Yes.
19	MR. McVEE: We we didn't hear that in Anchorage.
20	MR. PENNOYER: (Indiscernible) again? Curt, was that
21	you?
22	MR. McVEE: Yes. Someone was speaking I think in
23	Juneau. We couldn't year.
24	MR. PENNOYER: The motion was to send all these
25	projects out to public review, including the ones that we

initially took action on to reduce or defer. And that's the 1 motion. It's been seconded, it's now being discussed. 2 I quess in our previous discussions 3 MR. McVEE: Yeah. that it seemed to me like that we're -- we were proposing that, 4 you know, we -- we'd close the loop on the close-out projects, 5 and that -- you know, that we'd go ahead and -- and 6 disapprove or approve and then they'd, you know, be included in 7 the -- in the framework document, but that if we go for public 8 review, I think we've got some timeframe problems unless we do 9 it on a -- on a pretty short -- a short timeframe. 10 Well, my understanding of the motion MR. PENNOYER: 11 12 would be we would approve them to go out to public review and therefore accepting interim expenditures between March and May 13 14 MR. McVEE: 15 Okay. MR. PENNOYER: for these projects, even ones we 16 17 might have turned down. 18 MR. McVEE: Okay. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor? 19 I object to the -- the motion and MR. SANDOR: Yeah. 20 cannot accept it, unless there's an understanding that we will 21 have the scientific information that we requested from 22 23 Dr. Spies. Mr. Sandor, we haven't requested it on 24 MR. PENNOYER: 25 some of these projects, but you mean specifically on coastal

habitat?

MR. SANDOR: Yes, especially on coastal habitat, but any others as well. I think this perhaps may be beneficial in giving them more time, but I think this clearly illustrates that, you know, if we had it to do over again, we would have had I think peer review and -- and Dr. Spies' review of all these projects. And I understand the reasons why that wasn't done, but I would not want to forego that opportunity.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor, I think we have identified additional questions we've got, but I believe they did have peer review by the Restoration Team with peers. I don't know about each individual project, and obviously Mr. Spies -- Dr. Spies has indicated few, that he would have done more, you know, given time.

Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: With the consent of the second, I would like to make it clear that the coastal habitat review be excluded from the motion. I think that \$3 million, which is more than half of the total proposed projects could properly be looked at as we discussed earlier.

We're talking about these others, and, Commissioner Sandor, I would -- I would like to say, you know, there's no use going through these, I mean, this debate when essentially all we do is discuss it and then approve it, even the category two numbers. And we're not really getting any place, and we

just as well get the whole public review instead of trying to save 20 or 30,000 and we just -- just as well send them all out to the public and have their review and -- and then make some hard calls.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton and then Mr. Rosier.

MR. BARTON: We've probably spent as much money as we've saved so far in reviewing these things.

I -- I certainly agree to the examination of the coastal habitat study for cost effectiveness, but it's a spendy project, (indiscernible) we examine.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I -- I think that -- that my colleague on my immediate left here is correct. We've probably spent more than we've saved here so far today on this. And I would agree, I think that we should send these out to the public. I think that they're going to make some additional demands on our chief scientist here on this, and this -- this will give him some additional time. He may appreciate the -- the opportunity for the public to review these as well. I think that's an important element here, and I -- I would certainly hope so.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: (Indiscernible) we will then continue excluding the coastal habitat. With the exception of that, the others would be continued, is that right?

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARTON: I want to be clear that I understand.

What I -- I under- -- understood was that the coastal habitat project would fall into the same category as all the rest, but would be scrutinized. In other words, we would not stop the coastal habitat project, but it would continue as all the rest of the projects that are authorized to continue. But it would be subjected to this -- this scrutiny by Dr. Spies and whatever.

MR. PENNOYER: A clarification of Mr. Barton. Does that mean that it would continue on until May or that we would have some of that scrutiny between now and February 27th?

MR. BARTON: Well, I would hope we would get the -Dr. Spies would be able to do that before February 27th. But
I do -- I do think it would fall into the same general trust
as all the projects, but that this specific scrutiny that we're
talking about for this project would be completed by the 27th
of May -- or, I mean, the 27th of February, I'm sorry.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, if I might, how many dollars have we spent on this coastal habitat study, total dollars?

MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chair?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons?

MR. GIBBONS: This -- this has been -- we spent \$17 million on this study in 1989, 1990 and 1991. So it's --

it's, like Mr. Barton said, it's a big ticket item. There's a lot of information here, and so it -- when you look in comparison, it's -- perhaps it's not, you know, -- we -- we can do the detail by the -- by the 27th. A problem with this is the contract expires March 1st, and so I would hope that if -- if we're going to do that, that the Trustee Council would give us some time so we can extend that contract for some period of time.

MR. PENNOYER: I believe the motion included the concept that we would extend it in whatever nec- -- way necessary so you don't have a two-week evil (ph), so we make our decision on February 27th, you're not faced with a two-week layoff period or something. The extension, contract and personnel people would be extended to the amount necessary to not get us in trouble between the time the decision is made and whenever, you know, you get it in place, two-week period.

MR. McVEE: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, this is Curt.

MR. PENNOYER: Curt.

MR. McVEE: When we do this, would we want to instruct the RT to develop an interim -- interim budget then, the kind of expenses or the costs that -- that will be associated, you know, to fund these projects for some interim period?

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Mr. McVee, I -- I was going to make a few comments at the end here, and I think that's entirely appropriate. We've been through this list, and I

R&R COURT REPORTERS

understand people's frustration with the slowness of process and the fact we haven't just wholesale eliminated a lot of projects, but we have in fact at this point put off expenditure of 125,000, eliminated potentially 70,000 and deferred expenditure of 66,000, so in reality we're looking at about 180, 200 and -- a quarter million dollars that we have either said you're not going to continue until we make a decision later, or -- and no other expenditures, or we've cut it back. And I'm bothered a little bit by what we've agreed to here, in extension of this whole list through May. I think it would be entirely appropriate if the Restoration Team by the February 27th meeting could come back to us and give us some fiscal indication of what a deferral until a May final cut-off decision date on these means. I agree the time we could have in looking at these probably the better, and we certainly don't have the time tonight to finish the list. So maybe given everything, that's the best course, but I -- I would totally agree, and if -- hopefully the maker of the motion would agree with that type of -- type of analysis so we could see in February and have identified by project which ones might be big ticket items. Maybe some of them could be completely done, or mostly done by May, so we ought to have a look at that and understand what we've done at that point.

Is that acceptable? At least could we get that type of report so on February 27th, we can revisit this decision to

R&R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that point at least?

MR. COLE: Would you mind saying specifically what (indiscernible)?

MR. PENNOYER: Specifically what I think Mr. McVee was suggesting, that on February -- the Restoration Team give us some accounting of what part of these project expenditures will have occurred by the time we make a final decision after it comes back from public review in May, understanding that when we -- we sent these to public review, we've understood that there would have to be expenditures in the interim on some of these projects. I don't know which ones are more or less spendy, or which ones we may want to make a different decision on.

For example, the 66,000 on injury to commercial fish, the 2-X one, maybe it doesn't make any difference if we don't expend anything until May on that one. On the other hand, maybe it -- we could spend a lot less -- a large amount of that expenditure is slated, and as Dr. Spies said, he thought part of that study could probably be eliminated. And I don't know what part, but maybe half or more of it.

So as an interim thing, 'cause we can't do it tonight anyway, and we're going to have to not be able (ph) to cut people off on March 1st. This is an interim measure, but I think I would like to see by the end of the month at least some concept of what type of expenditure was going to occur on these

projects in that interim, and I think we actually had requested that once before anyhow.

Mr. Cole?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Mr. Chairman, well, I agree, but like I said MR. COLE: last Thursday, it doesn't take a Ouija Board to see where we're It's virtually going to be impossible to cut off any of these proposed studies, because when we come to May, we will be told, well, "We have so much money invested in this already since February 1, that it would be a total loss to -- to cut off the study now. It will only take another week or two or a month or whatever to finish it up, " most of them, so, you know, it's -- it's just -- I say we ought to face now what we're doing, and when we can't even cut out these studies here which are -- only fall into category two, and -- and at that stage, say, well, maybe we better defer them, then I think we're just not getting any place, and as Mr. Barton said, spending more money holding these meetings, than we're doing, then we just as well take advantage of the public input since we're not cutting That's the reason I made the motion. out anything. But where we're going in May, it's fully predictable. So if we can't do anything tonight or on the 28th, we just as well fold the tent and say, you know, all these projects are going to be closed out and -- and that's that. Maybe I'm -- my bifocals are not focused, but I think that's the -- the way it is.

MR. PENNOYER: Is there further comment or discussion

on this motion? The concept (ph), the Restoration Team will give us some kind of accounting, and go forward and accept the whole list without modification except in the case of coastal habitat (indiscernible) motion. Including the full amount on deep water bathos? No further comment.

Mr. Barton?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I would presume that we would all MR. BARTON: act in good faith, that any of these studies that don't need to be cranked on March 1 and could wait until May, will wait until We're all honorable people as (indiscernible) not rash. A number of these studies that could possibly be completed between March 1 and May 1, or whenever it is in May. would hope that we would not do that unless it was necessary. But there's some of these studies that are small amounts of money. In a couple of months, you'd expend that and complete the project. I would hope that if it didn't -- that didn't need to be, it wouldn't be, and that we would have the opportunity to hear what the public had to say and to exercise some of our own judgment on thee studies, so -- you know, if we all act in good faith and as reasonable human beings, I think we can make the best of a bad situation I guess is what I'm saying.

MR. PENNOYER: Is there any further comment? Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Not on this motion, no, which I

(indiscernible) support. But I do have a problem or question before we adjourn.

MR. PENNOYER: We haven't dealt with damage assessment continuation yet unless that's also -- that wasn't that covered by the motion, or is it? Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: I would just ask a point of clarification here. Between now and the 27th, will Dr. Spies then be interacting with the Restoration Team or is he acting independently, or how are we -- how are we structuring the activities between now and the 27th?

MR. PENNOYER: What I heard in the motion, now correct me if I'm wrong, is that basically he -- he was dealing with the coastal habitat study, but I'm not sure that given the basis of the motion he's dealing with anything else with. The instructions on coastal habit I thought were fairly clear.

And that, of course, Dr. Spies, we haven't gotten to continuation or -- or res- -- or recovery yet. I mean, restoration yet, and we need to deal with those, at least and where we think we're going with them by the 27th.

Is there any objection to the motion? Hearing none, that's how we will -- Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Well, I -- I just want to say, you know, underlying the motion is these numbers at the bottom under the options, you see, and really not very much flexibility different in those -- the cost of the options, of exercising

R&R COURT REPORTERS

options, you know, one through six in any event, and certainly I don't think we would ever actually take out option seven. So therefore it seems best that we just -- other than the University of Alaska, put these out to the public and as Mr. Barton says see what best we can do between now and May and hope for some savings and exercise of good judgment along the way.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on this motion? Is there any objection to it? It's adopted.

Can we go on then and talk about what we're going to do with damage assessment continuation options? Mr. Gibbons?

MR. GIBBONS: I just wanted to make one point. There may be a misconception by the Trustee Council on what's occurred on the damage assessment studies. There has been thorough peer review of all the damage assessment studies, both the continuation and the close out. This was — the peer reviewers were brought in, reviewed extensively with the chief scientist, so these — this portion of the program has been thoroughly peer reviewed and has moved through that process. And I — I just thought I heard that there was a comment that perhaps that had not occurred.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons, does that include the continuation stu- -- damage assessment continuation as well?

MR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

DR. SPIES: Mr. Chairman, I just might mention that the peer reviewers have commented just on the scientific content of the proposals and have -- have not in general commented on the size of the budget request.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. How about the damage assessment continuation options in the last five minutes we've got here. Does anybody want to talk about \$3 million, that category? Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chair. Did I (indiscernible) from Dr. Spies' comment that (indiscernible) be in a position to furnish with evaluation with the cost proposals of these continuation studies?

MR. PENNOYER: Bob, are you going to answer that? Are you into budgeting?

DR. SPIES: That's a -- that makes the task a lot more complex and time consuming for my part. I would certainly -- would welcome the -- forming a team with the Restoration Team to get this -- this accomplished, if that's what the Trustee Counsel wishes, consideration of this. We could as we have in the first group of studies go through and with -- maybe with taking the commercial fish, we may want to consider whether we need the reproductive work any longer, and -- and we could adjust the budget perhaps in that way, and that way get into the content of each proposal rather than either taking the whole thing as proposed with the total request, or rejecting

it. Perhaps we can come back to you with a modified cost and scope, but I -- I don't feel I've got time between now and the end of the month as an individual to make all those sorts of judgments in -- without working with the Restoration Team.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chair, this is Curt.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: I just got a note here, it says "if necessary, the teleconference might be extended past six," but we'd have to let the operator know if that is the desire of the Council, but it could be extended. It can go till 8:00 o'clock.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, we've already discussed amongst the Trustee Council members (indiscernible), I'll have to ask individual members what their feelings are. We were originally told it was terminating at six.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, I think they've got a commitment at 6:15 and

MR. PENNOYER: I think the sense is we'll go for another 15 minutes, at least try to tie up our direction on these other packages of projects and instructions of what we expect in February -- at the February 27th meeting. Is that okay?

Do you want -- can we go on then to damage assessment continuation options, the total of \$3,127,700.00? And again with options with X's on them. Do you wish to go through

them, or do you wish to have the alternate proposal? How to handle these? (Indiscernible) here, vary from all studies, \$3,000,000.00. Item four, you go down to a million and a half, item seven, you're down to 184,000.

Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Dr. Spies, I (indiscernible) kind of question on FS-27, the sockeye salmon over escapement project, and that -- that over escapement, the damage from that is -- is -- is from the Exxon Valdez singularly, or is that over escapement from other causes as well?

DR. SPIES: The over escapement was the third year of over escapement into the Kenai River, where the damage has been most efficiently documented. I think it's impossible to say at that time -- or at this time how much was due specifically to the '89 over escapement versus the two other years. It could well be a situation where the first years may have not made a difference to the production of smolt, and the third year could have been the -- the straw that broke the camel's back so to speak.

MR. SANDOR: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I -- I have a question. I'm not sure about what we did in this last duration, a comment from what Dr.

Spies was to do with respect to cost involved. Was -- was that directed just to the damage assessment continuation options?

MR. PENNOYER: I don't know that we came to a specific instruction relative to costs involved on which projects except for coastal habitat right now as far as I -- I understood the only direction. Distinct direction Dr. Spies has at this moment is the coastal habitat. We still have to cover what we're going to do on restoration February 27th and any instructions we've got relative to that. And all of these other studies, continuation option -- my assumption is the damage assessment close out projects, we've accepted them except for coastal habitat until public review takes place. At least I thought that was -- and I -- Mr. Barton, maybe I'm wrong?

MR. BARTON: Well, I'm not sure again. I thought we agreed that Coastal habitat would go forward as all the others go forward, but subjected to specific scrutiny.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I -- I thought that we never said we were going to stop it. We said we were

MR. BARTON: Okay.

MR. PENNOYER: going to review it on the 27th and that it would go forward after, for some interim period of time people would have the assurance it was going to go forward. It's the only one though that might be at this time terminated before or major -- in a major way altered before the May date, because

MR. BARTON: Well, -- well,

R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: before it goes to public review 1 2 we're going to make some judgments on it. MR. BARTON: Okay. 3 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole? I had in mind that I thought this was what MR. COLE: 5 Dr. Spies was referring to, that he working with the 6 7 Restoration Group would be able to give us an evaluation of the 8 money which should be spent on the damage assessment 9 continuation options? Was I -- was that anyone else's 10 understanding? DR. SPIES: I -- I believe it was the -- the damage 11 12 assessment close-out options. MR. COLE: 13 All right. Well, that's what I wanted to -that's what I really had in mind, and that's what I would 14 15 prefer, so I will so move in order to get that resolved, that 16 we request Dr. Spies working either alone or with his peer reviewers or with the Restoration Team the earliest date 17 18 furnish us with that type of evaluation. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, how -- which suite of 19 20 projects? All of them or just 21 MR. COLE: The close-out studies. 22 MR. PENNOYER: The ones we've just approved? MR. COLE: Yes. 23 24 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. 25 MR. COLE: For public

MR. PENNOYER: Public review? 1 2 MR. COLE: For public review. By that I have in mind 3 is he -- he would -- we would be furnished with a more tailored 4 valuation of those studies rather than -- rather than just say 5 lump sum and approve say \$571,000.00, maybe he would say we 6 could truncate this project somewhat and wind it up for a cost 7 estimate of \$100,000.00. But 8 MR. PENNOYER: Now that motion is specific to just 9 damage assessment close-out or to continuation and restoration monitoring and the whole business or? 10 MR. COLE: Well, that's the pleasure of the Council 11 12 here. I MR. PENNOYER: But you're doing it for close out. 13 14 And -- and by when then? 15 MR. COLE: Well, when he can get it done. I think it 16 would be slightly presumptuous for us to say, well, we'd like 17 it by a certain date. He does say that it's a rather major 18 undertaking. 19 UNIDENTIFIED: Major (indiscernible) 20 MR. PENNOYER: Specific to a decision prior to them 21 going out to public review then? 22 MR. COLE: I doubt if he could complete that type of analysis and send it out to public review. 23 24 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Is there a second? Is there further discussion? 25

Yeah, I -- yeah, this is Curt. I'm not MR. McVEE: 1 quite clear yet what -- what we're doing, that we're -- we're 2 asking Dr. Spies for a project-by-project analysis that -- that 3 will help us in a decision after public review? This won't be done before public review, so we'll have it after public review 5 for our final cut? 6 MR. PENNOYER: That's my understanding of the motion. 7 MR. McVEE: Okay. 8 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman? 9 10 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole Curt -- Curt, here's what I have in mind is 11 MR. COLE: 12 we're presented with these project proposals. And in a sense 13 out decision is, you know, go or no go. And I -- I'm not sure that that -- that is the type of rough-cut decision that we 14 should be making. Perhaps we should -- what I would like to 15 know, whether it's possible to wind up some of these studies, 16 say sampling instead of 1,000 of these samples, sample a 17 18 hundred, 19 MR. McVEE: Uh-huh. MR. COLE: whether a statistical analysis of that 20 21

MR. COLE: whether a statistical analysis of that size would be adequate and therefore instead of a study costing a half a million dollars, it could cost 125. I -- I would like to see that type of report or advice from -- to us.

MR. McVEE: Okay. That's helpful. Thanks.

MR. PENNOYER: Any further discussion on the motion?

R&R COURT REPORTERS

22

23

24

This is relative to damage assessment close-out. Any objection to the motion? Okay.

Dr. Spies and the team, 'cause we certainly can't do projects tonight. Damage assessment continuation and what we expect to see on February 27th on the rest- -- recovery monitoring and the technical support and restoration implementation. Those are the categories left before us. Recovery, restoration projects and damage assessment continuation. Do we want specific instructions to the team, or can we -- or do we want to specifically approve these, or what action do we wish to take on that between now and the 27th? Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that we apply the same protocols and rationale to damage assessment continuation that we did to damage assessment close out.

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Moved and seconded that we basically sent the damage assessment continuation options out to public review with final decision to occur after that review, also given the fact that -- I suppose the same thing to the Restoration Team of reporting to us on what part of the funds might be expend- -- have to be expended between the March 1st, or the public review, the March 1st date and the final approval. And Dr. Spies' assessment of -- of the projects and their costs. Mr. Rosier?

R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. ROSIER: Yes. Mr. Cole talked about Dr. Spies working with the Restoration Team or peer reviewers or whatever to do these analyses on this. I guess from my perspective on this, it would seem to me that there had been a fair amount of activity that's gone on here within the -- the Restoration Team in reviewing these. I don't believe that Dr. Spies has in fact had the exposure to all of these projects. I think he indicated that to us at our last meeting. Certainly I would think that -- that the involvement of our Restoration Team as part of that review process is -- is an essential item.

MR. PENNOYER: And my assumption was the motion did include Dr. Spies working with the restoration team and/or peer reviewers as appropriate.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, this is Curt.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes. I think last Thursday as I recall, and -- and Marty was just refreshing my memory on it, that we -- we did ask Dr. Spies to work with the RT on an analysis of the restoration implementation projects, those projects that we were going to -- were going to consider on the 27th. Is that right, Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: That's correct.

MR. McVEE: So we've still got that in -- in -- on Dr. Spies' agenda, and I was just thinking of -- of the -- the number of assignments that we're proposing that -- that he

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would fulfill within given timeframes.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: I think -- I think what we were asking Dr. Spies for in terms of his -- to advise, et cetera, cost effectiveness, was not before the 27th, except in the case of the coastal habitat study.

MR. McVEE: Okay.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, well, I agree with Commissioner Rosier, that I did not contemplate in the motion that -- that Dr. Spies would make these determinations without close liaison with the Restoration Team. I -- I threw in the peer reviewers into my motion, that he -- he might need a little help, and that it would be a large project for he alone to accomplish, and therefore I mentioned that. But it certainly was within the contemplation that he would not make any such recommendations without discussing them first with the Restoration Team and soliciting their views.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. That's fine. So we have -- the motion is to send the damage assessment continuation options on out, approve them to go out to public review with the same caveats that we had on the damage assessment. In the interim, Dr. Spies will be looking at and recommending to us in -- in concert with the Restoration Team the appropriateness of the budgets and -- as well as conducting a general review of these

1 projects (indiscernible). 2 Any further discussion of the motion? Is there any 3 objection to the motion? 4 MR. McVEE: No objection. All right. Can we go on then to -- we 5 MR. PENNOYER: mentioned Dr. Spies was going to deal with the restoration 6 implementation projects for us by the 27th. What about the 7 8 recovery monitoring projects? Early in this discussion several people asked about the linkage between damage assessment close 9 10 out, continuation and recovery monitoring. I still see projects with generally the same names in some of these areas, 11 12 and also under restoration implementation. MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman? 13 14 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole? I move we disqualify all studies which Dr. 15 MR. COLE: Spies has recommended be disqualified: Number B-5, number R-16 17 17, number R-82, and number R-95. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, B-5? Or R-5 do you mean, the 18 19 brown bear monitoring? MR. COLE: It -- it looks like it's B-5 to me, but 20 21 22 MR. PENNOYER: Oh, I see. It's on this other list, 23 (indiscernible) 24 MR. COLE: (Indiscernible)

R&R COURT REPORTERS

(Indiscernible discussion in Juneau)

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, anyway, okay. Which ones are 1 2 those again, please? Would you repeat that? MR. COLE: B-5, R-sev- -- B-5, brown bear monitoring, 3 R-17, black oystercatcher restoration, R-22, killer whale 4 5 monitoring, and R-95, river otter restoration. Grounds for my That's exactly what we asked Dr. Spies to do. I'm 6 satisfied with his judgment. 7 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton? 8 9 MR. BARTON: (Indiscernible) to any of that, 10 (indiscernible) restoration (indiscernible). MR. COLE: I thought I'd leave that motion to you, Mr. 11 12 Barton. MR. McVEE: I didn't hear Mike. 13 MR. BARTON: I amend -- I move we amend the motion 14 15 (indiscernible). 16 MR. McVEE: Is anybody -- I -- I can't -- I didn't get 17 This is Curt. I -- we didn't hear that part. that. MR. BARTON: \dots R-20, R-52, R-58, R-59, and R-106, 18 19 also be disqualified. MR. PENNOYER: Well, we've got about three minutes left 20 21 to our self-appointed deadline. 22 DR. SPIES: My -- Mr. Chairman, might I make one comment? The -- and I know it's -- it's too late in the 23 meeting to deal with this, but there -- in the far right-hand 24 25 column is a notation that some of these studies that I have

recommended disqualification for do involve certain judgment calls on policy by the Trustee Council. For instance, in the rockfish restoration plan, it's based on we don't really have much of an injury yet until we've completed the damage assessment study; however, it has been noted by the Department of Fish and Game that there's been an increase in rock fishing activities since the spill due to a shifting of fishing effort, probably as a result of spill, and they need to formulate a management plan for rock fish. And that is in my mind a secondary effect of the spill, and I think the Trustee Council would need to make some determination whether that would be allowable under the criteria that you're considering for whether the projects are qualified or not for further funding.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Than you, Mr. Chairman. I would agree with the first part of the motion; however, the second part of it, the restoration planning I think would object to. We simply don't have the time, we've got two minutes to go here (indiscernible) think we need great deal more discussion (indiscernible) going into this at the present time (indiscernible).

MR. PENNOYER: I think that my standpoint, probably most of this I think (indiscernible) but again we had originally slated these for considered discussion on the 27th

R&R COURT REPORTERS

and 28th, and while those -- that -- the motion is a good base to build on, including Dr. Spies' comments, I practically would like to visit these individually before making up -- make a final decision in my mind, so I

MR. COLE: You object then, is that it?

MR. PENNOYER: I think I don't object to the concept, and I may not object to the motion when we get to it, but I kind of object to doing it in five minutes, yes.

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman? May I -- may I add to that

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague?

MR. MONTAGUE: thought process? The Restoration Team intends to receive Dr. Spies' recommendations by the 17th on all the restoration projects, both implementation and recovery monitoring, to the -- then Restoration Team meet without Dr. Spies for a couple of days to digest his comments and then to meet with him on the 20th to come to a consolidated opinion on -- for the Restoration Team and the chief scientist on all those projects, so that on the 27th the chief scientist and the Restoration Team would have a consolidated presentation for the Council.

MR. BARTON: (Indiscernible) restoration,

(indiscernible) recovery monitoring and restoration planning
have taken (indiscernible).

MR. PENNOYER: And restoration implementation as well.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. McVEE: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, this is Curt.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes. I -- you know, we need to look at -- at Dr. Spies' recommendation, because it's probably the best thing we've got so far in terms of trying to -- to, you know, take a cut at -- at this total program budget which I think we're all committed to -- to do something with, and -- but it seems like we're -- we've probably reached a point where we maybe can't give it the time and attention we need to now, so one possibility I guess would be to table the -- the motion and come back to -- to that on the 27th.

MR. PENNOYER: I -- I note that the motion included several studies Dr. Spies recommended to disqualify, but he has another column that's listed as "occasional," and I'm not sure whether occasional means next year

MR. McVEE: Yeah.

MR. PENNOYER: or the following year, so, like murre restoration was discussed at the last meeting, and I thought we were going to get a report of the necessity of spending 571,000 this year on murre restoration, so -- is

DR. SPIES: That column was meant to say occasional monitoring and what -- what I could -- and -- and this is included as a comment in my memo, and again I apologize for getting it out so late in the day, but we were trying to present as complete a product as possible, but what we had in

mind there is that there's in my mind some monitoring that should be done in the field of severely affected resources. The question is do we need to do it every year? And if how -- how often do we need to do each resource in terms of what we know about its life history and its rate of recovery, and what we might lose by doing -- by losing one year's data.

The second thing is that if the -- the restor- -- if the Trustee Council has some fiscal plan in mind in terms of perhaps minimizing spending at some point early in program in order to achieve some other goals, that we could take that as guides and -- and design a program of monitoring that would phase in these different programs and try to do things in a cost effective way while at the same time keeping track of how these severely affected resources are recovering.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Dr. Spies, are you going to be prepared to interact as was stated by the Restoration Team with them prior to the 27th and give us a more fully combined report at that time?

DR. SPIES: I'll do my best to do that, if that's the Trustee Council's wish.

MR. PENNOYER: Rather than deal with a vote on this motion, can we accept to table it until the 27th with those desires in mind, recognizing Dr. Spies' work and report is going to go to the Restoration Team, and we'll get a report back on it? Mr. Sandor?

R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: Motion to table actually takes precedent over the other motion, so -- but -- but the intent obviously is to -- to question in fact what we've asked Dr. Spies to do. I mean, he's done his job very well. We just have run out of I think the -- I would support the motion to table with the understanding that we in fact have (indiscernible) these and intend to eliminate them unless there's justification for retaining them. And so I move -- or vote for the motion to table that. MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think Dr. Spies has recommended disqualification. He said there may be other considerations for some form of continuation, but on the other hand -- other hand he has recommended that. And again under the occasional column, he hasn't recommended that we do those things every year, or maybe the next year. So Is there any further discussion? I think we're probably off the net, aren't we? MS. EVANS: No. No, you're MR. McVEE: MR. PENNOYER: Oh, good. MR. McVEE: you're still coming through in Anchorage.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

Oh, it takes precedence. Okay. Then it is tabled until the

Is there further discussion of the motion to table?

(Indiscernible) anyway, Curt.

MR. PENNOYER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	27th of February, and we will expect that type of combined
2	report from the restoration team, and with Dr. Spies'
3	assistance. You have his recommendations. Thank you.
4	Is there any further business for us tonight?
5	Mr. Sandor?
6	MR. SANDOR: Well, I would ask unanimous consent of the
7	Trustee Council to commend Dr. Spies for a remarkable analysis
8	in in really a very short time.
9	MR. PENNOYER: We're all in total agreement. Thank you
10	very much, Bob.
11	Okay. Then we're adjourned until the 27th in Anchorage
12	at I believe it was 10:00 a.m. Adjourned. Thank you.
13	(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
3	STATE OF ALASKA)
4	I, Karen E. Squiers, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do
5	hereby certify:
6	THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 87 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of Exxon Valdez Oil Spill
7	Settlement Trustee Council, taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 10th day of February, 1992, commencing at the
8 9	hour of 3:30 o'clock p.m., at the Egan Convention Center, Space 4, 555 West Fifth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska;
10	THAT the Transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by
11	Meredith Downing and myself to the best of our knowledge and ability.
12	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party
13	interested in any way in this action.
14	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 10th day of February, 1992.
15	
16	Karen & Squiers
17	Notary Public in and for Alaska
18	My Commission Expires: 03/29/94
19	Social section of the second section of the second section sec
20	OFFICIAL SEAL STATE OF ALASKA
21	OFFICIAL SEAL STATE OF ALASKA NOTORY KAREN E. SQUIERS
22	South the state of

R&R COURT REPORTERS

23

24