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

# EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT TRUSTEE COUNCIL

RESTORATION OFFICE 645 G Street Anchorage, Alaska June 29, 1992 8:00 a.m.



EXXON VALUEZ OF SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

## TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS:

State of Alaska MR. CHARLES COLE Attorney General

State of Alaska Department MR. JOHN SANDOR of Environmental Commissioner Conservation

Alaska Department of MR. CARL ROSIER Fish and Game Commissioner

USDA Forest Service MR. JIM WOLFE

National Oceanic and MR. DON COLLINSWORTH Atmospheric Administration Deputy Regional Director National Marine Fisheries Service

United States Department MR. CURTIS MCVEE of the Interior Special Assistant to the Secretary

## PROCEEDINGS

MR. McVEE: I would like to call this meeting of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustee Council to order. And here today on the Trustee Council is Carl Rosier, Commissioner of Fish and Game; Jim Wolfe, representing the Regional Forester, Mike Barton; John Sandor, Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources; Attorney General Charlie Cole; and representing Steve Pennoyer, Don Collinsworth, NOAA. I'm Curt McVee with the Secretary's Office, Department of Interior, and I've been drafted today to chair the meeting.

We rotate that chairmanship around. I guess I'll have to admit it probably was about my turn, so -- Carl and I have cut a deal. He'll do it next week. I'll get that on record early. Or next -- the next meeting.

In response to -- to comment and -- public comment and request, I think it was at the last meeting, we have scheduled a public comment period starting at the beginning of the meeting today, and maybe just before I do that, I'll ask Dr. Gibbons if he has any announcements that we should make at this time? Do you have anything?

DR. GIBBONS: Nothing at this time. Just that, you know, the -- the public session at the beginning of the meeting is -- was the -- from the request of the public to provide input before we get to the agenda items as -- as we move through the -- through the agenda. So if -- if the public

has any comments on the agenda items, just -- you know, for -- for consideration, this would be the time to make those and then again afterwards, the from five to seven teleconferencing.

MR. McVEE: Yes, this -- this early public comment period is not teleconferenced, so it would be just for those that are -- that are present here in Anchorage. Is there anyone that wishes -- wishes to make comment on the agenda items at this time? Yes?

MS. McGEE: This is not an agenda item, just an item of -- of note for all of you.

My name is Mary McGee, otherwise known as Mo, and I have been the director of the Oil Spill Public Information Center, and most recently the project manager here in the building for both the library and the support staff for the agencies.

As of Wednesday I will be leaving this job and moving over as the director of Anchorage Municipal Libraries, so being an information provider for the City, I'll keep track of all of what you're all doing.

But at this point I want to introduce my successor in the library, Kerry Holba, and Ron Beuyer will be doing the project manager for the building. Ron? Thank you both.

And I just wanted to thank you all for your support for the library and the project here; show you in case you haven't had as chance to see what the science studies look

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

like. This is a sample, very nicely done by the State through the offices of Preston, Thorgrimson. They're color-coded as to the studies. The blue happens to be -- be marine mammals. And each one is color-coded depending on the type of studies.

Inside are tabs for the dates and the study plans, interim studies and the final report.

And for those of you that have not had a chance to see

And for those of you that have not had a chance to see them, I invite you over at your break or the lunch time over to the library to have a chance to see those.

At one of the early meetings in discussing the budget, Mr. Cole was very interested in the student packets and the information packets given to teachers. This is a sample of a student package. It's sent out to students that request information about the spill.

This is a sample of the packet that goes out to teachers. It has curriculum packets for units K through 12 as well as information for them. These will also be over in the library available for you all to have a chance to look at.

MR. COLE: About how many of each have been sent?

MS. McGEE: Altogether?

MR. COLE: Yes.

MS. McGEE: May I refer this question to Kerry?

MR. COLE: Sure.

MS. HOLBA: Many, many. Some -- our largest

## 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

+	group of patrons, if we were going to group patrons, probably
2	are students and teachers, librarians, students from elementary
3	school all the way through graduate school.
4	MR. COLE: And a couple more questions. Well,
5	about I mean, "many, many," is that 50 or 1,000 or more?
6	MS. HOLBA: We've probably sent about, oh, I
7	would say 20 to 30 a month.
8	MR. COLE: So in a year you've sent around 250?
9	MS. HOLBA: Uh-huh. Now, this this varies
10	according to the time of year, of course.
11	MR. COLE: Of course.
12	MS. HOLBA: We don't according to the school
13	year.
14	MR. COLE: And and most have been from the
15	students or the teachers, and what is the geographic
16	distribution? Have have those ben generally throughout the
17	United States?
18	MS. HOLBA: Throughout the United States and
19	Alaska including Alaska. We have we work closely with
20	the the teachers in Alaska especially in Anchorage working
21	on curriculum (indiscernible) teaching (indiscernible).
22	MR. COLE: Thank you.
23	MS. McGEE: You might be interested, it was the
24	Gruening School in Eagle River?
25	MS. HOLBA: Gruening.

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

Gruening Junior High did a MS. McGEE: 1 2 coordinated curriculum unit in which they used math, science, social studies, and they had a mock -- mock trial that the 3 students put together. This was last year. And it was so 4 successful in the school that the teachers came back again this 5 year to pull together more materials and do the same kind of 6 7 units, so they're using it in a variety of ways to support 8 their curriculum. 9 MR. COLE: Thank you. MS. McGEE: Thank you very much and the best of 10 luck to all of you. 11 MR. McVEE: Good luck to you, Mary, on your 12 13 new -- new job. That's a real challenge. MS. McGEE: 14 Thank you. MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman? 15 16 MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole? 17 MR. COLE: When -- you know, you -- you remarked about public comment on the agenda, but should --18 would it be all right if we expanded that public comment on any 19 subject having to do with the -- you know, with this Trustee 20 21 Council? I mean, it's -- you know, we can sort of open it up for whatever is coming? 22 Yeah, that's fine. Any -- I'll 23 MR. McVEE:

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

call again then for public comment and expand it beyond the

agenda? Is there any- -- anyone who wishes to make public

24

1	comment?
2	MR. COLE: Senator, tell us
3	SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: I'll be back
4	MR. COLE: what you have in mind?
5	SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: I'll be back at 5:00
6	o'clock, okay? I just want to kind of case the place.
7	MR. McVEE: That figures. Okay.
8	I guess we have no one at this time. We will have the
9	5:00 o'clock till 7:00 o'clock public comment period then this
10	afternoon.
11	With that then I'd like to start down through the
12	agenda. Is there Do Council members have any changes or
13	or that they want to make in the agenda, or additions to the
14	agenda at this time? One that I would like to suggest is that
15	we move the financial operating procedures up to item four,
16	ahead of the '93 work plan since those procedures do dictate
17	some of the sequence of some of the schedules within the
18	'93 work plan. Is that is that acceptable to everyone?
19	MR. SANDOR: Would you repeat that?
20	MR. McVEE: The the financial operating
21	procedures
22	MR. COLE: Number nine.
23	MR. SANDOR: Number number nine would
24	go
25	MR. McVEE: Which is now item nine, I'd

MR. SANDOR: Okay. 1 ..... like to move up just to 2 MR. McVEE: follow item three, make it item four. If that is acceptable 3 4 to .... MR. WOLFE: Okay. 5 6 MR. MCVEE: .... the Counsel? MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman? 7 MR. MCVEE: 8 Yes. 9 MR. COLE: I -- I would like to thank the staff, and compliment the staff for the fine series of 10 notebooks given to us earlier for this past week in prepar- --11 so we could utilize them to prepare for this meeting. 12 exactly what I had in mind. I think it's very well done. 13 And secondly, if we could plan on lunch at -- a lunch 14 break at 12:00 to 1:15, I'd like to do that, if that's 15 agreeable to everyone. 16 MR. McVEE: It's fine with the Chairman. 17 Ιf it's acceptable to everyone else, we will break at 12:00 18 19 o'clock until 1:15. Any other comments from Council members before we go on 20 into the ....? 21 22 The first item on the agenda is the status of the public participation working group, and one of the big 23 notebooks that Attorney General Cole refers to has been put 24 together by that -- that group, and to make that presentation 25

is Marty Rutherford. Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Just to quickly reiterate what was in the memo that was attached to the booklet, there are three tables. The first is an alphabetical listing and in that is an indication of their address, of each nomine's address, of their principal interests, affiliations, who they were nominated or endorsed by, and whether or not their information was complete. At one point in time the chart indicated that several were incomplete, but we were able to get all -- everyone's packet of information, so they are now all complete.

I do want -- on this chart there's a couple of things

I'd like to not. We drew from this chart the information for

the following two tables, that was the listing of all principal
interests and the communities.

I think it's important to note here that some people listed more than one community as their address. We simply took the one that they listed first. So, for instance, if Brad Phillips had listed Anchorage and then Valdez, we took Anchorage, so he's -- he's reflected in the Anchorage community chart, so there may be people who actually consider themselves citizens of both communities.

The other thing that I wanted to point out to you is when someone indicated that they were affiliated with or endorsed by a particular group, but there was no letter

substantiating that, we did take their word for it and reflected that in this alphabetical table.

And finally, in some of the letters that came in, it was a little unclear as to what principal interests nominees wanted to be associated with, so I did call every single one of them, and what is reflected on this table is exactly what they told me in person, except for Mr. Knecht out of Kodiak. And that is the only person I did not talk to. Other than that, it is an accurate reflection of their -- what they feel they should be associated with.

At the April 27th Trustee Council meeting you had asked that as part of our nomination process -- as part of our nomination process, we query the public as to whether or not they felt that there should be designated seats on the public advisory group, and if so, how many seats per principal interest. We did ask that -- for that information, and we did get responses back. I think we got eight responses in all.

The public -- seven -- seven of them said that the public advisory group should have designated seats. One said -- made the statement that just a broad spectrum of interests should be reflected as part of the -- of the public advisory group. And finally one of them said that municipal government should not be considered a principal interest, that they should be a partner in your deliberations.

We did not receive any comments on how many seats per

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

specific principal interest.

Again, each of the tables has a number next to it, and that number is associated with the number of the nominee with - where you will find all the information that we received on that particular nominee.

I think that's all I have to -- oh, one other thing.

The public only received the alphabetical chart, so that is all that the public has in hand, although that is by far and away the most comprehensive table.

MR. McVEE: Okay.

MS. RUTHERFORD: I'm available for questions if you have them.

MR. McVEE: Does the Council have any questions at this time?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I just -- I guess I have a comment. This comprehensive package is just really remarkable. A tremendous amount of work both in the format and content, but I guess I'd just make the observation, Mr. Chairman, although, you know, hundreds did not indicate an interest, somewhat over 30, I thought the -- the -- that the -- that the range of interest was broad. I thought the -- the tremendous level of interest represented by very qualified people, and I think the numbers of -- what impressed me perhaps most of all was the extent of the endorsements of -- which broadened even the focus of attention on this.

Marty, is this -- how do you feel about this total package of -- of nominees? Do you feel we have met the objective of breadth and -- and depth, or are you disappointed that there aren't more or -- any observations?

MS. RUTHERFORD: I was also impressed with the -- with the endorsements and the affiliations. I thought it was very broad.

I was -- I was surprised that there were not more, frankly. I did expect upwards -- closer to 100, so when there were only 31, I was -- I was somewhat surprised, but I thought the quality of -- of the nominees was very good also.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes?

MR. COLE: I like Ms. Rutherford am a little disappointed that we did not get more nominees. I mean, if you review these documents presented to us and see the interest which so many people have in the work of this Council, I mean ranging from "don't buy habitat" to "buy more habitat," from "don't have so many studies" to "more studies," et cetera, et cetera, then I'm surprised that we didn't have more people come forward and offer to help us and advise us in making what they view as the proper decisions. It's a little disappointing to me.

MR. McVEE: Yes, I -- I was expecting that we'd get quite a few more also. I found quite use the -- the break

-- the analysis by principal interest and by community, and -and I guess -- I think it was important to look at the
participation by community as we go through the selection
process so that we can get a good representation, and it seems
like that -- that although in many cases we haven't got a lot
of people, that, you know, -- that we have got -- we have got
a couple choices at least.

MR. SANDOR: I -- Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: A reason why I brought up this -this matter of the number of candidates, I want to put to rest
unless -- or I guess the decision of the group that the -- that
the nominees is more than adequate to -- to continue the -- the
selection process as opposed to re-opening it to expand the
number. Is the disappoint of -- of anyone on the Council such
that, you know, they -- they believe we can't go forward with
these selections? Marty, would you have any recommendation in
that regard?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair, we have not gotten any indication that people missed the timeline. We -- if they had have, if we'd gotten that, I would have asked for their information and -- and included it as a supplementary and told you they'd missed it, but we have not gotten an indication that anyone missed it, or that there was -- if we went back out for an advertisement that there would be any number in addition to

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

this, so I'm not -- we might, if we -- if you wanted to pursue a larger number, we'd probably have to figure out another way to -- to try to garner that interest.

MR. McVEE: Any comments by Council members?

One of the jobs we have later on today is an executive session where we would sort through this list category by category, name by name I guess. We'll have to decide how we're going to do that, and I think at that time as we do -- go through that, we will be able to -- to specifically identify whether we have adequate representation or good candidates all the way through, but just in -- in looking at this over the weekend, it looked to me like that -- that we've got some, you know, some pretty good choices, that we have some good candidates to look at as -- as we get into that executive session. Other comments by ....?

I tried to call the Secretary's office, of Interior, this morning to see what -- if there's anything new on the status of the -- the P.A.G. charter and I wasn't able to make contact with the person. The charter was filed with -- with G.S.A., and I guess I could assume that since I haven't heard anything back in the last week that G.S.A. does not have a problem with it hopefully, and that they had given me a time line earlier of about two weeks before G.S.A. would act, so I don't think there's anything there that precludes us from moving ahead with -- with the selection and nomination process.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

Is there anything else on the public participation working group, Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Just -- just an update on the -- on the operating procedures. We have reworked them and they're in -- will be ready to go out to -- to you for information probably in the next week. We won't ask you to act on them, however, given your direction last meeting where you indicated that you -- once they were -- were reworked that you wanted the -- the sitting public advisory group to take a look at them before they came back to you for approval.

MR. McVEE: Very good.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Anything else? Thank you very much, Marty, for your information for .....

Moving on to the third item on the agenda is the 1992 draft work plan. I guess Byron Morris has that item?

MR. MORRIS: Yes. Is this on?

You received last week a package with the draft of the comments and the responses. There is the revised version that I guess is not quite ready yet. It should be a little bit later this morning. We're -- we're a little bit ahead of time here, on -- on the Council meeting. But we don't expect there to be any substantive changes. We had an editor look at this package for -- just to improve the -- the writing of it.

Let me just refresh your memories on the process that

# 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

we went through. We released the restoration framework document and the 1992 work plan, the two green books, for public review approximately March 26th with -- with comments due back on the 4th of June. We accepted comments that were postmarked on the 4th of June through the 8th of June and then convened a group to go over all the comments received, identify and code them as to whether they were on the 1992 or on the restoration framework document, or on something else such as public participation.

This group worked very hard for a period of approximately a week to get us a package on the -- the Restoration Team a package on the 17th of June to -- to then further review and -- and put into final form so we could get it to you last week. That's what you have before you.

Ninety-eight individuals or organizations commented on the '92 work plan, 67 by mail and 31 at public meetings that were held during the May scoping process. Approximately 85% of these comments were from Alaskans and 15% came from outside Alaska.

The comments that we received from the public were -were very consistent with the previous public testimonies that
we -- we had gathered and ranged across the wide spectrum of
issues that we have been dealing with. There were differing
views presented on almost every issue, and this reinforces our
belief of the necessity of continuing dialogue with the public

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

on -- on these many issues.

In the package that you have before you, the comments are organized into three groups. At the front is a summary of the comments and towards the end of the document are the specific comments that we gleaned from the letters arranged by topic and — and which identify the individual commenters by a code number. And the three sections are programmatic issues, the injury assessment studies and the restoration projects.

The programmatic issues were not directed at specific projects in the 1992 work plan, but relate to the approach to restoration that the Trustee Council has taken, and suggests changes or modifications of the process. Some of the issues of concern in this regard included more immediate restoration activities, attention to National Park lands, and suggestions on how the restoration money should best be spent.

Comments on the injury assessment aspect addressed the damage assessment close-out, and the damage assessment continuation studies. Again, there were divergent views expressed on whether they were needed or should be discontinued. Only a few mentioned specific projects by name. Certain commenters requested better injury information. Others felt that injury to services -- services was felt by some commentat- -- commenters to be a missing component of the study plan. Since, of course, these comments were made, the -- the study information has been released to the public as in the

OSPIC library.

Restoration issues received the bulk of the comments.

Many commenters suggested additional projects for consideration in 1992. These suggestions ranged from additional projects on specific noncommercial species, additional or modified projects on commercial species, inclusion of pollution prevention and clean-up projects, suggestions on archaeological projects, the need for subsistence studies, and the need for long-term monitoring of the ecosystem. Almost half the comments received, 46 of 98, addressed land acquisition. The majority of these, 32 in number, felt that land or habitat acquisition including timber was the best use of restoration funds.

The document in your hands summarizes and responds to the comments received. A number of public comments -- a summary of the public comments is presented for each of the three main issues identified, and specific comments and their responses follow the summaries and are organized into issuespecific subcategories. As I said before, at the end of the document is an -- is an appendix which keys the comments to the party which provided them.

The item in your package is a decision document prepared by us for the Trustee Council to approve or modify the 1992 work plan as a result of their review of the public comments.

The restoration team makes a recommendation to the

Trustee Council on the final approval of the 1992 work plan, and based on the fact it was -- there was very little public comment regarding the specific projects contained in the 1992 work plan, we recommend that you approve the 1992 work plan without modification or deletion of any projects.

We have gone two steps further with -- with these comments. One is to defer -- or to refer the suggestions for new projects to the 1993 work plan working group for consideration for the 1993 work plan, and to refer the land acquisition comments to the habitat protection working group for their further -- further consideration as they develop the process.

We have no further recommendations to make. We provided this information to you hopefully at an early date so you'll have a chance to review it, and comment on anything specifically in it that the Trustee Council should wish to.

Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Are there any questions for Mr. Morris from the Council?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, it might be beneficial to -- to just refresh everyone's memory on the -- the time spans of -- the work plan runs through -- had been running from March to March, and we're switching to a fiscal year. There's two fiscal years, a federal -- federal fiscal year and a state fiscal year, and, of course, our budgets are

associated with that. Would you want to -- to confirm, I guess the -- the chronological time period that the 1992 work plan literally covers first of all?

MR. MORRIS: I can -- I can do it in a -- in a The 1992 work plan includes studies that were brief summary. budgeted to continue through to March 1st of 1993. The --in developing the 1993 work plan which will go out for public review hopefully about October of this year, it will include elements of the 1992 work plan that -- that would continue to March, plus it would -- would include anything new that might begin anywhere from potentially October, but there's a public review period involved in there before we go to the final budget approval, through the following -- to the following October of '93, so that there's -- there will be new projects proposed that can be considered this summer, plus the remainder of the projects that -- are on-going right now.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I'm now really confused. Would you mind trying to simplify that .....

MR. MORRIS: Okay. I thought I did.

MR. COLE: .... once more?

MR. MORRIS: I'll go back one step. The 1992

projects .....

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. COLE: Work plan.

MR. MORRIS: .... were -- work plan projects 1 were from -- approved from March of 1992 to March 1st of 1993. 2 That's how their budgets were developed. We've gone onto the 3 fiscal year and are developing a 1993 work plan. 4 And what is the fiscal year these 5 MR. COLE: days? 6 It's from October 1 to September MR. MORRIS: 7 October 1, 1992, to September 30th, 1993. That's fiscal 8 30th. year 1993. And perhaps I'd -- I'd refer to Jerome Montague 9 who's developing the 1993 plan to maybe further clarify how --10 how the overlap fits. 11 12 MR. McVEE: Yes. DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chair? 13 14 MR. MCVEE: Jerome? The -- as Byron said, the -- the 15 DR. MONTAGUE: '92 work plan covers the 12-month period, March 1st, '92, to 16 17 February 28th, '93. The '93 work plan covers October 1st, '92, to September 30th, '93. 18 I -- I think one point of confusion might have 19 that in September we will be petitioning the Court for the 20 remaining five months of '92 plus the 12 months of '93. The 21 five months of '92 will not be part of the '93 work plan. 22 23 MR. COLE: See why I'm confused? MR. MORRIS: 24 Okay. Okay. MR. McVEE: We're going to -- we're going to 25

get to more detail on the '93 schedule here pretty soon I quess.

Basically what we have before us today to approve is the project plan, the -- the work plan for '92 which would carry us through September of this year, 1992. And that would be the project component. The -- the general administration component is -- is still undergoing public review at this time, I believe. I don't remember what the closing date for that public review is. It's in the near future. So this is the project component, the project work that's on-going for the remaining of -- of this fiscal year, through September.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: I would move the team's

recommendation.

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: Is there a second?

MR. SANDOR: Second.

MR. COLE: Restate the recommendation?

MR. McVEE: The recommendation is that the -that the R.T. recommendation was to approve the '92 work plan,
and -- and that the comments that were -- were received on the
'93 work plan would be provided to the -- to the work group
that's working on that as well as comments provided on land
acquisition that would be forwarded to the habitat protection/
land acquisition work group. Is that correctly stated,

Mr. Morris? 1 MR. MORRIS: Yes, it was. 2 So this is the project component of 3 MR. McVEE: 4 the '92 work plan. MR. ROSIER: Well, I 5 Yes, Mr. Cole? Or Mr. Rosier? 6 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, if I might, I need a MR. ROSIER: 7 little clarification myself here. I thought I heard two 8 different things here now. I thought that Mr. Montague 9 10 indicated that we were talking about a '92 work plan that ran from March through February 28th of '93, and I thought that I 11 heard you say that we're approving only the work plan through 12 September of '92. Am I confused in terms of what we're doing 13 14 here? 15 MR. McVEE: What was the R.T. recommendation, Mr. Morris? 16 MR. MORRIS: That -- well, it's a budget 17 The recommendation is propose the work plan through matter. 18 the period through February of '93. 19 MR. McVEE: Okay. Then -- okay. The Chair 20 21 stands corrected. MR. ROSIER: 22 Okay. Thank you, Carl. 23 MR. McVEE: MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman? 24 MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole? 25

I think I -- I'm now additionally MR. COLE: 1 concerned -- or confused I quess is the better term. Is the 2 motion to approve the 1992 work plan as developed? Is that the 3 motion? 4 MR. McVEE: Yes. 5 And that there are no changes or MR. COLE: 6 recommendations that we should consider in amending that work 7 plan based upon public comment? Just so I understand what 8 9 we're voting on? That's correct. MR. MORRIS: 10 MR. COLE: And -- and then may I ask you a 11 question, Mr. Chairman? 12 Yes, Mr. Cole. MR. McVEE: 13 I know we have a lot of comment here MR. COLE: 14 on the '92 work plan which I've -- it has been summarized, 15 commented upon. 16 17 MR. MORRIS: The 1992 work plan. '92 work plan. And are -- are MR. COLE: Yes. 18 you saying that the Restoration Team's recommendations are that 19 there were no changes or amendments or modifications which have 20 been suggested that we should even talk about here today before 21 we vote on this motion? That's what I'm trying to get clear. 22 23 MR. MORRIS: Yeah. Okay. The projects described in the green book that went out for public review, 24

there -- there are no specific comments on those projects that

-- that would suggest that -- that we should modify the existing projects. Okay. There were ....

MR. COLE: Or -- or even consider discussing?

Because I'm not arguing with you. I'm just -- I want to make sure precisely what the Restoration Team's recommendations are.

MR. MORRIS: No, not in any specific way.

MR. COLE: Okay.

MR. MORRIS: They're -- they're more general comments such as "we should do less of this or more of that," but nothing specifically regarding those projects.

The -- the bulk of the comments we received was other things -- additional things -- studies that we should be doing, projects that we should be doing. We -- be- -- because the '93 work plan is -- plan is in the process of being developed as -- as we sit, we -- we felt it best that these suggestions be forwarded to the '93 working group for their consideration as new projects that could begin as early as October of this year.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Here's the thing that's troubling
me: I mean, we have this proposed '92 work plan. We send it
out for public comments, which -- and we 'ceive -- we receive,
I don't know, what, 100, 200 comments, and when we get all done
with this exercise which has been very expensive I think and

### 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

carefully done, and there's not one project that even merits review by the Trustee Council? That's a little surprising to me, but if -- if that's really the way it is, I mean, I'm prepared to accept it, but it does surprise, and it might even shock me, you know, so -- that's my only observation.

Let me just say this: And so therefore I wonder whether the Restoration Team has given the weight to these published comments that perhaps at least I would like to have seen them have given? It's a little tough.

MR. McVEE: Is there any response from the R.T.? Yes, Mr. Rice?

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, as we went through the response to comments, many of the comments were of a fairly general nature, and we -- we reviewed the '92 work plan. What I think we're trying to suggest is that based on the comments, the projects that are going -- that we've proposed for going forward, and -- and most of them are actually in the field now, continue as they were proposed, without change. What we weren't able to resolve were those questions that deal with additional projects or additional activities that should go forward with this -- this year, and we weren't able to come to grips with this based on where we're at with the fiscal year, or where we're at with the -- with the field season now, and basically move it to the Trustee Council to give us some direction as to whether we should add some additional projects

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

into the work plan.

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. COLE: One final comment.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: See, that's where we were --

remember, when we were back in March discussing this, we were sort of trapped.

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. COLE: I think we discussed that, and it's hard to get out from under the '92 work plan based upon public comment giving -- it's -- it's a little out of synch this year I guess, but that's my last comment. Thanks.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: At the risk of confusing this further, the Oct- -- the 1993 work plan which commences in October, obviously is in the mid year of '9- -- the '92 work plan, but is it -- is it not the intent of the Council and the Restoration Team and the planners that these comments that we've received on the '92 work plan actually be a basis for the development of the '93 work plan which commences in October? Is that -- is that the pay-off of this tremendous amount of public comment that we got, and -- and is that where this is to be used?

MR. MORRIS: There's -- there's -- I think that's -- that's basically correct. There's one other step that's involved in the '93 that wasn't involved in the '92, and

that was requests to the public for ideas on projects that should be conducted in '93, so we an additional set of comments on work that the public feels should be done.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: But there's no intent to modify any of the work plans or activities through March 1 of 1993 of the studies that are now in place? Or is there?

MR. MORRIS: No, there's not.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Montague?

DR. MONTAGUE: Based on the public comment we haven't suggested any changes to the '92 work plan, but based upon new findings, there are two projects that changes are recommended for, and if I could bring those to your attention?

One of the projects, fish/shellfish 27, the project that was determining the cause and mechanism for the low production of sockeye salmon in the Kenai River System is requesting the purchase of an optical scanner and -- and some personnel costs to operate it for \$47,000.00. And what this is for is that as you all may remember, the -- the '91 smolt production was very low, and the '92 smolt production, although it's a little prelimin- -- preliminary, seems even lower than last year, and the primary hypothesis as to what is happening is that Skilak Lake is the main production area for -- for young sockeyes in the Kenai system, and apparently the

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

over-escapement so reduced the zooplankton that the fish feed upon, that now the tidal (ph) plankton that the zooplankton fed upon is hugely abundant. In fact, so abundant that the zooplankton can feed near the surface where it's light for only a very few hours of the day, and that's the only place where the sockeyes have a chance to eat them, and then the zooplankton drop below the lighted zone and cannot be fed upon, and that -- that's the reason why they need this optical scanner.

And the second project that -- was R-60C, it was the project to determine why the egg mortality in pink salmon is so much higher even two and three years after the spill. And early on during -- in the draft plan, we had used 150,000 as the figure for which this project could be conducted with, but it was -- the project hadn't been developed, and after working with the peer reviewers and the chief scientist and other experts in the field, the project has been recommended as -- as 253,000 and not 150,000.

So those -- those are two project changes we're recommending.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, what -- what's the cost of each of those? The -- what's the change that you recommend?

DR. MONTAGUE: Okay. The change for fish/

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

shellfish 27 is an additional 47,000, and the change for R-60C is an additional 103,000. And the -- if there's any further technical questions, I think the chief scientist could address those.

One last comment, since we had just gone to the Court, if the Counsel approves this recommendation, we wouldn't recommend going to the Court again for this change. It's simply reprogramming expenses from other projects to take -- carry this from now until the end of September, and then ask for the difference in the last five months of the budget.

MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding, and you can correct me if I'm wrong. This was not received in public comment. This was received by the agency people doing the work. Is that correct?

DR. MONTAGUE: Yes, I thought I said that, but I probably didn't articulate it well.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, getting back to the process again, and I can see where a lot of the people who devoted time and effort and study into reviewing the '92 work plan and made comments might well feel like, to put it in the vernacular, they've sort of been had, you know. They do this, these make these recommendations and then, you know, nothing really goes beyond the Restoration Team to the Trustee Counsel,

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

and, you know, it's a little troubling that we want public participation and advice and counsel and then people do that, then they, you know, can well feel that we -- we didn't consider them, and it's a little troubling. Then we ask them to go back and do the same thing for the '93 work plan, and they'll say, "well, you know, I mean, what the hell, I mean, I didn't get any place when I did it in '92. I mean, I'm wasting Those people are not solicitous (ph) or our views," and -- and that's troubling, and I -- I would like to assure the people who took the time to make these comments that -that I'm sure I and the other members of the Council read these things, and indeed reflect upon them and consider them as we make the decisions as the days and weeks and months pass. have not been ignored, certainly. I'm -- I'm confident of that, but I think they should know that.

MR. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Morris?

MR. MORRIS: Well, I -- I really don't think it's as bad at this point as Mr. Cole is describing, and I'll try and explain why. This process happened very quickly. between the 8th of June and now we were able to put the comments together and provide a recommendation to you on the existing package. We tried to get it to the Council in sufficient time that -- that they could review it, and if there were comments from the public that they felt needed acting

#### 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

upon, they could certainly charge the Restoration Team to then take action on them.

If we were to take action on these comments in terms of developing in them -- them into proposals for funding, we'd be essentially the process that we chose to do with them by deferring them to the -- the '93 work group. It's -- it's the same type of effort. It took weeks of review, peer review, to develop the package -- months actually to develop the original package to begin with, and we would anticipate that any new ideas would require an equal amount of time, and -- and the process is essentially -- it is being done with these new suggestions right now.

It's -- we didn't have the --the time or the opportunity to carry them any further than to make sure you were aware of the -- the public's suggestions for new comments (sic) and .....

MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I -- I want to say I think the Restoration Team did an outstanding job in putting it together in a limited time. I'm not critical of them. I'm somewhat, if anything, critical of the Trustee Council's process, you know, but maybe it's inevitable that this year that that would happen.

MR. McVEE: I guess it seems to me like that -that, and -- and this is inherent in the motion we have before
us at the present time that if we carry forward, you know,

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

those comments that are -- that are particularly pertinent to the development of the '93 program, and also those comments that are pertinent to the habitat protection and land acquisition programs, that if we -- if we go back and look at these comments, they're as part of the record as we proceed with the -- this restoration, that we -- we have a valuable tool here in the -- in the public comments that was submitted.

I guess I might just mention at this point, we have a motion I guess on the -- on the floor, but I'd mention at this point that -- that there was a correction on a response, maybe a little bit of confusion, just straighten that out. It's on page 23 of the response we're talking about the subsistence studies, that there is a subsistence proposal as I understand it for '93, and -- and also that we were moving forward, the federal government was moving forward with the subsistence study required under the Chenega Bay settlement. That is -- is scheduled not under the -- under the '92 budget, or the oil spill budget, it is -- is scheduled for work in '92. It may go over into -- past the first of October, but there -- this wording appears to be referring to one subsistence study, and I think there's two now. A new proposal that was submitted for '93.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: Could I ask a question as to how we're proposing to respond to the people that were commenting

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

on the '92 plan? Will there be a response to the commenters as a part of the public record? And maybe that will answer some of Mr. Cole's questions.

But -- also one other point is the majority of the work in our '92 work plan is injury assessment or damage assessment work, the majority of the comments that I reviewed were on the need for additional restoration activities or moving ahead with restoration activities, so -- so the preponderance of questions were to do more things in the restoration end of it and not very much on what we put the most effort on, that's wrapping up the injury assessment work this year.

so -- so I can understand why there wouldn't be that much, but -- comment on -- our response to the comments on the injury work, but I do believe the public deserves some kind of a response in a timely manner as to how we're going to handle their comments or how we dealt with them or dissent with them.

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons.

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah. If I may respond to that, the specific response to the '92 comments are -- are found in -- in the package before you, and under the specific section of injury assessment. The specific letters are -- are found across the hall here in -- in the library. If --if people would like to cross reference the -- the comment, the number

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

and -- with the response in the document.

I -- I would like to -- to add a little emphasis here that maybe there's a misunderstanding, that the 1993 draft plan is due to the Trustee Council on August 31st, and I think that Dr. Morris mentioned this, that we incorporated all these new projects and proposals into that, and that's about as quick as we can get -- get those up and going, and when we come out the '93, the '93 plan will run, like we mentioned before, October 1st to September 30th, and be a '93 plan, but there will be a portion in the budget, there will be a five-month portion for the '92 to -- to carry this -- this through and done.

So that's -- that's the plan. But the response to comments are found in the document in front of you.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: That raises this other. Are we making any acknowledgement to these people who furnish comments? Are we giving them a copy of this written response here?

DR. GIBBONS: Those are found out in the front, and they're also being faxed to the teleconferencing sites, yes.

MR. McVEE: Well, I think the question

was ....

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

MS. RUTHERFORD: But are we sending them to .....

DR. GIBBONS: No. No, are we sending them 1 specifically to them? We ..... 2 3 MR. COLE: Yeah. ..... we hadn't planned on it, DR. GIBBONS: 4 but if the Trustee Council would like us to do that, we -- we 5 6 can surely do that. MR. COLE: Maybe we could discuss that a little 7 I would like to present for discussion the thought that 8 bit. we at least send out to each person who commented or furnished us with views a copy of this response that's prepared. At --10 at least in the specific area in which a comment was made, that 11 12 we give them the response of the Restoration Team. 13 DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chair? MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons? 14 DR. GIBBONS: I -- if I may add, I think 15 perhaps the whole package might -- might be good, too. It's 16 -- it's not that thick of a package and it might be informative 17 to them. 18 So that -- that will be sent out MR. McVEE: 19 then is what ....? 20 Plus -- plus we propose to -- to 21 MR. MORRIS: provide it to each of the libraries and -- and facilities that 22 keeps all of these documents we -- we produce for other public 23 access. 24 We still have the motion on 25 MR. McVEE: Okay.

the floor. We have I guess a recommendation from Mr. Montague, 1 Fish and Game on -- on two budget increase items. 2 MR. COLLINSWORTH: I have a question. 3 MR. McVEE: Yes? 4 The -- Mr. Montague's 5 MR. COLLINSWORTH: identified two projects. Now, were those projects a part of 6 7 the Restoration Team's recommendations -- recommendation on the '92 work plan or is this something outside of the 8 recommendation of the work -- or of the Team, and did the Team 9 10 consider these projects? MR. McVEE: Mr. Montague? 11 12 DR. MONTAGUE: It was brought up with the 13 Restoration Team, and it was decided to just bring it up here 14 at the Council meeting. DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chair? 15 MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Gibbons? 16 DR. GIBBONS: I don't recall that. I -- I was 17 18 going to make a point that I -- I had been approached by Dr. Spies this morning on -- on these two items, that to my 19 understanding the Restoration Team has not discussed this. 20 MR. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman? Yes, there's 21 confusion. The rec- -- there was no recommendation from the 22 Restoration Team on these -- on these two projects. 23 recommendation was on the work plan as a whole. I -- I think 24 Mr. -- Dr. Montague was -- it was Fish and Game's

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

recommendation, their agency, to -- to modify these projects is what he intended to mean.

MR. ROSIER: Yeah, I .....

MR. McVEE: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, could we hear from Dr. Spies on this? His name keeps getting involved in the discussion here on this. I'd kind of like to hear from Dr. Spies here if -- with the Chair's concurrence?

MR. McVEE: That will be fine. Dr. Spies?

DR. SPIES: Yeah, the -- the two projects that are being referred to as R-60C, which is the study of eggs and fry of pink salmon in Prince William Sound, and as you're aware there's been an increase in the mortality of eggs since the spill on both oiled and unoiled stream since -- and there was -- I had recommended an increase in the budget during the -during the mid year planning to cover some experiments, and we've been discussing these experiments with Fish and Game off and on through the spring. We've finally come to a plan of what needs to be done, and it comes to -- I think there was 150,000 recommended or 60C and the -- the scope of the experiments is another 100,000 beyond that, and it has my recommendation personally, but, of course, we want to go through the Restoration Team. I had -- just had a brief chance to talk to Dave Gibbons this morning about this matter, so the Trustee Council may wish to perhaps consider it later, but

# 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

there is this -- this timeliness about that particular project in that the experiments that need to be done to try to get to the bottom of what's causing these egg mortality increases in Prince William Sound should be carried out this summer. It's a combination of a laboratory exposure experiment and some instream and between stream crosses to try to get at the source of this mortality. It's one of the few projects where I'd recommend that we actually go out in the field, so I -- I think it's important that we somehow tackle this problem as soon as possible.

The second -- so that's a total request of 253 over the original of 150.

The -- the second project is a request I had from Dana Schmidt, Alaska Department of Fish and Game relative to the sockeye salmon smolt question in the -- in the Kenai River drainage. They -- they expect to see by this time of the year about something like eight to 10 million fish that -- smolts that have escaped from that system. Last year there was about three million by this time, which -- which represented a pretty severe potential problem with that -- with those stocks. This year there is I think -- it's about a tenth of that now, so it's a pretty serious developing problem, and it was a request for a piece of instrument and some laboratory technician time to -- this is a tobalplankton (ph) recorder for Skilak Lake to look at the -- to try to get at the bottom of what's going on

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

with those very poor survival of smolt in the last couple of years in that system. And the total request is for \$47,000.00. 2 MR. COLE: I move, Mr. Chairman, that the 3 Trustee Council authorize these project expenditures 4 immediately. 5 That's an amendment to the motion. MR. SANDOR: 6 I second it. 7 MR. McVEE: Amendment to the -- to the motion, Я to the original motion? Very well. 9 Further discussion or questions for Dr. Spies? 10 one question I might have is will the optical scanner, is that 11 something that can be acquired fast enough or quick enough so 12 that it will -- it will be of utility for this -- this field 13 14 work this year? I've talked to Joe Sullivan about DR. SPIES: 15 this at Fish and Game, and I think it can me. It's -- I think 16 the -- it's a \$35,000.00 piece of instrumentation. 17 MR. COLE: Can we rent one rather than buy? 18 DR. SPIES: I don't know. 19 20 MR. COLE: Shouldn't we look into that? Rental -- rental possibility? Any 21 MR. McVEE: other questions for Dr. Spies? Than you very much. 22 Is there further discussion on the motion, which now 23 will include the -- well, we'll -- I quess we'll vote on -- or 24 25 take action on the amendment first that will increase the --

the budget for those two projects. Further discussion on that amendment? Is there any objection?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Excuse me. Yeah.

MR. WOLFE: I -- I guess we've -- we've relied on the Restoration Team to give us their recommendations on all the projects that we've approved to date. We've also relied on Dr. Spies' recommendation. We have Dr. Spies, we do not have any recommendation from the restoration team. I guess my preference would be that we -- we have some way to -- to obtain that consensus from the Restoration Team for this project also, or these two projects before we vote.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Dr. Montague?

DR. MONTAGUE: May I address that, and also

address Dr. Gibbons?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As far as the discussion with the Restoration Team, it was an agenda item, and it was brought up that we had project changes based upon chief scientist and peer review comment, but the projects themselves were not discussed, and the guidance I had was that all we were dealing with now was '92 public comments and if you have these kind of comments, bring them up at the Council, so there wasn't any effort on my part to not bring it up to the Restoration Team.

MR. McVEE: Yes. Mr. Cole?

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, look, if we -- I mean, this is one of these emergency type situations I think Mr. Rosier would agree I hope where the necessity given the -- the season, where we must act quickly. If we refer this back to the Restoration Team, you know, then they have to act and -- and I'm sure they'll act expeditiously, but then we have to have another meeting of this group. I mean, you know, let's just get it done and get on with it if -- if it's essential as it appears to be. Vital.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would -- I would agree. I think that these are two really key areas that -- that we really need to field a program this year on.

The pink salmon issue in Prince William Sound is -- is one that we've all received the information on on the high mortalities associated with those systems that -- that were oiled on this. We're faced with a management scenario there in the Sound this year in which we've got again a very low return of a natural run fish which is the wild stocks associated with the -- with a number of those oiled systems, and a very high hatchery return coming back. The wild stocks under -- under state policy most recently annunciated by the Legislature has a priority in terms of the management program for the Prince William Sound, so really need to have an understanding of what

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

we're doing in terms of -- of basically letting those wild stocks in fact drive that management program within Prince William Sound, and I really feel that it's essential in both cases here.

I think you've heard me talk about the Kenai and the -the problems that we were looking at in -- in '94, and -- and
now it looks like probably '95 and -- and beyond in terms of
--of the rebuilding of those stocks. So I -- I consider these
to be really prime, very priority type projects here and -- and
I would certainly hope to -- to have the support of the Counsel
in moving ahead on these.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: I guess maybe Dr. Montague or Dr. Spies could elaborate on what new findings we've -- we've came up with this summer, this field season already that we didn't know al- -- in the past that required that we modify these projects or add these two new project. I -- I just didn't hear that, so .....

MR. McVEE: Dr. Montague?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, on the sockeye problem, what I brought up was the finding that -- the hypothesis that the investigator was able to come up with based on this season's findings, and that's that the zooplankton were only feeding in the lighted area of water for about one-third

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the day, and -- and then out of -- down in the darkness outside of sockeye feeding for two-thirds of the day. And the investigator would like to test this hypothesis as to whether that is indeed the cause of the fact that the sockeyes aren't recovering.

And then in the case of the -- the pink salmon project, the money that was set aside for that was based simply on developing an experiment that would test or -- or try to investigate why the egg mortality is so high this long after the spill, and the exact mechanism of that project and the procedures and methods of that project weren't determined when we came up with that budget and when -- when it was determined with the combination of the peer reviewers and the chief scientist and the investigator, this is what they were all able to agree upon as the best project to do that.

MR. McVEE: Further discussion?

Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: The results of the Prince William Sound pink egg survival study, what is the -- what is the intended use of the -- of the results of the study?

MR. McVEE: Dr. Montaque?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, first of all to identify that indeed this is an oil spill problem and not -- not some other reason for it. We cannot think of any other possible reason that it could be, but to have mortality higher two -- you know, two years after the spill than one year after

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

the spill is alarming, and -- and that's the -- the main purpose would be to see if it linked to the spill, and also -- for instance, if one of the hypothesis is correct, that there's been genetic damage, then that could require extra effort on the part of the Department for management of these.

MR. McVEE: Any further discussion?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: If -- if we're going to move ahead with these projects, then I would suggest that we have some work plans developed at some point here that reflect what's being proposed and get some documentation down for the record. At this point we appear to have none, so .....

MR. McVEE: That's true. Mr. Montague, can one be developed?

DR. MONTAGUE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we can have those ready in two weeks.

MR. McVEE: Ready to consider the amendment?

The amendment would add to the budget for shellfish -
shellfish number 27, \$47,000.00 and add to the '92 budget for

R-60C an additional \$103,000.00. Does anyone object to the

amendment? The amendment is carried.

The motion then is to -- the R.T. recommendation to approve the '92 work plan, March '92 through February '93, with the -- with the comments, public comments that were made going

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

forward to the -- the appropriate work groups for consideration in their -- their activities. Any objection to the motion?

Motion carried.

I guess just a couple comments that -- that, you know, timely public involvement had been very crucial to -- to our operation. It is required by the Court. I guess that it's important that we -- that we really emphasize the con- -- continue -- and continue the flow of information to the public that -- that to a large extent, you know, good recommendations and ideas will depend upon the information that we provide to the public to -- for them to consider as they make their recommendations.

Is there anything else on the '92 work plan? This is the project component.

I guess as a question, when does the public comment period close on the -- on the general administration component of the '92 work plan?

DR. GIBBONS: That's later on on the -- the agenda. I'll talk ....

MR. McVEE: Okay.

DR. GIBBONS: .... about it, item number

eight, ....

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. McVEE: Number eight.

DR. GIBBONS: .... the teleconference on the

25 final budget.

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Okay. Okay. Then keeping with the 1 amendment that -- the change we've made to the agenda items, we 2 would be taking up next the financial operating procedures. 3 4 Do we want to break before we go into ..... MS. RUTHERFORD: Yeah. 5 MR. McVEE: .... into that item? 6 DR. GIBBONS: We need five minutes. 7 MR. McVEE: Okay. A five-minute break. 8 9 (Off record) (On record) 10 MR. McVEE: If we'll all sit to continue with 11 the agenda for the Trustee Council meeting? The next item was 12 -- which we moved forward was the financial operating 13 We wanted to discuss those before we talked about 14 procedures. the development of the '93 work plan since some of those 15 procedures are significant in terms of -- of that -- that '93 16 process. 17 So I guess we have -- have Dave Gentry who is chairing 18 that financial committee with us today. Are you prepared to 19 20 start this discussion, Mr. Gentry? MR. GENTRY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Is this -- is 21 the microphone on? 22 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record again, my name 23 is David Gentry. I'm with the State Office of Management and 24

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

Budget.

At the last Trustee Council meeting on May 20th, these financial operating procedures were reviewed. There were a number of -- of issues that were raised and the Trustee Council asked the Finance Committee to make changes as directed by the Trustee Council at that time.

What I'd like to do is start off with my presentation here by going through those changes, naming them and -- and pointing out where we made those changes again so that -- that you can -- can verify that your -- your wishes were fulfilled there, and identify a couple of other changes that were made, which I believe are -- are not substantial, but I want to bring to your attention.

First, on page one, -- well, the issue was that the financial operating procedures should not supercede existing agency procedures, and that change was inserted in the second paragraph on page one, the sentence in that paragraph beginning "in addition to these procedures, activities carried out" and so on, "will be conducted in accordance with existing agency operating procedures." And we intend that to be a strong statement, and that -- and that that I believe was the -- the wish of -- of the Trustee Council's last meeting.

The second issue explaining the basis for the development of the general administration rates, and this is on page three. You may recall a discussion about the 15% and 7% and so on. On page three, the first and second full

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

paragraphs, this is after sub- -- sub-item two, again we tried to identify what -- what was included within general administrative expenses and -- and very generally the derivation of those percentage ranges.

The third issue, please stop me if -- if you'd like more time in -- in reading these -- these through. The third item, the issue related to flexibility agencies had in moving money between projects up to a certain limit, can be found on page four, at the bottom of the page, sub-item (a), and we have the -- the limits of 25,000 or up to 10% of the funding for a project, whichever is less. And page four at the very bottom of the page, sub-item (a). Originally it was written that such changes would be submitted to the administrative director before an agency could -- could effectively spend altered (ph) funds within this cap, and at the last Trustee Council meeting, the -- the Trustee Council directed that agencies had that discretion without going to the administrative director. the language in that section reflects that policy decision.

The fourth policy item issue can be found on page six. It relates to reporting to the Trustee Council not only on expenditure information that may have occurred in the past, but accomplishment information, whether goals and objectives were in fact achieved. On page six the second full paragraph from the bottom, the paragraph being "The Administrative Director, with the assistance of the Restoration Team and the Finance

#### 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

Committee, will submit an annual accomplishment and expenditure report."

want more time. The fifth issue related to audits, on page seven you'll see that there's a one-paragraph section dealing with audits. There was a discussion as to insuring that independents audits were carried out. The language was changed to not only emphasize normal audit procedures that are in place within the federal government and state government, but also that audits by private organizations can be carried out if the need is -- is determined to bee there. Between those two facts, those two options of normal audit procedures or an external auditor, we believe that an independent -- independent audit will be accomplished.

The next issue, also on page seven, management of equipment. As you may recall there was lengthy discussion as to ownership and ability to move between agencies equipment purchased with money from settlement lawsuit associated with the Exxon Valdez spill. The direction given by the Trustee Council at the last meeting was we can't work out in the near term the -- the detailed legal basis for this (ph) procedures, we wanted, and speaking from the Trustee Council, "We wanted a statement of principal, short and sweet, and an indication that the legal arrangements would be worked -- worked out later." Legal principals.

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Mr. Gentry, what does that first sentence mean in that paragraph? I -- as I read it, if everything -- anything that cost more than \$500.00 will be used for purposes directed by the Trustee Council. It looks as though if it cost less than \$500.00, it doesn't have to be used for purposes directed by the Trustee Council. That's what it says.

MR. GENTRY: With the exception of -- of the sensitive items, which would include things like firearms, that's the clearest example -- and cameras, that -- that come to mind.

There's always a level of detail where -- where the accounting becomes onerous as to be not worth it, so this is -- this is -- this cut-off is normal for both state and -- and federal agencies.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Gentry, .....

MR. COLE: I just have trouble. It says
"Generally all equipment purchased at a cost of \$500.00 or
more, other than sensitive items, will be used for purposes
directed by the Trustee Council." I mean, that to me means
that if it's less than \$500.00, it doesn't have to be used for
purposes directed by the Trustee Council. Is that what you
mean?

MR. GENTRY: Our intent was this, whether we're stating it or not, our intent is this, that we don't want to

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

account for and keep track of things like supplies,
consumables, small items which even if they're not consumed are
so difficult and -- or expensive to keep track of that it's not
worth it. And .....

MR. COLE: Well, .....

MR. GENTRY: And for -- for what it's worth, and I -- I don't mean this to be an overriding principal here, for what it's worth, this is normal in -- in terms of standard operating procedures for state agencies and federal agencies.

MR. McVEE: Yes. Mr. Gentry, is the -- is that sentence, is it more an issue of accounting for equipment versus use of equipment? And maybe the language could be modified to reflect that it's an issue -- a question of accounting for items, \$500.00 or more.

MR. GENTRY: If -- it it's clear that -- that something was bought with Trustee Council money, the general principal that -- that we had -- we intend is that that equipment would be pur- -- would be used for purposes of the Trustee Council. If something was less than \$500.00, there was not a tag put on it. Everyone, however, knew that it was purchased with Trustee Council money. There would be the imperative on that agency to use it for Trustee Council purposes.

So picking up on your point, Mr. McVee, yes, it's -- it is an issue of accounting versus the -- the general principal

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

of -- of does the Trustee Council control this .....

MR. McVEE: Uh-huh.

MR. GENTRY: .... this equipment and these

assets.

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: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: But is it not true that any -- any property purchased for Trustee Council use must be used -- used explicitly for -- for the purposes authorized by the Trustee Council regardless of value? And that simply this \$500.00 limitation and sensitive limitation, the accountability process, whether it's tagged, but it's not suggestive of -- and maybe this requires an addition of a paragraph, but certainly no items less than \$500.00 would purchased -- purchased out of Trustee funds unless it's to the Trustee Council activity or -- or approved project, is that not true?

MR. GENTRY: Mr. ....

MR. McVEE: Yes?

MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, I, I think speaking for the finance committee, would not have a problem including an additional sentence indicating that again the spirit of -- of this is that all purchases, all assets not already consumed, purchased with Trustee Council money would be used for Trustee Council purposes.

MR. COLE: That sentence has to come out, that's the problem, not put in more sentences. That sentence

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

has to be revised, because it implies that if anything is purchased for less than \$500.00 in Trustee funds, you can use it for any purpose you want. That's not what we mean. MR. GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, that's not what I I meant everything, that the ..... meant either. MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman? MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Collinsworth? MR. COLLINSWORTH: We've spent a lot of time on this, and I don't think there's any disagreement. In the first paragraph, take off "generally" and just say "All equipment purchased by <a>Exxon Valdez</a> settlement funds shall be used for purposes directed by the Trustee Council," take your -- the portion that deals with the sensitive items and the \$500.00 or more, put it down in the second paragraph, where it says "The exec- -- the Administrative Director shall report," and then put your phrase in there about sensitive equipment and \$500.00 and that should take care of it. It looks like a good suggestion to MR. McVEE: me.

MR. GENTRY: And -- and I -- that's fine. Yes, I -- I believe that finance committee would have no -- no difficulty with that whatsoever.

MR. McVEE: Okay.

MR. GENTRY: The -- the last issue begins at the bottom of page seven, the finance committee charter. The

## 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

Trustee Council directed that the finance committee define itself, and the language extending on page eight is intended to do that.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: This is a question with respect to this charter and the finance committee operations. It appears just in review of this whole section that the -- it appears to be establishing another permanent group that's going to be reporting directly to the Trustee Council.

It was my understanding that -- was that we were to utilize specialists like yourself, or professionals like yourself from different departments on an ad hoc basis sort of in an advisory capacity. Are we institutionalizing another bureaucratic group that -- that -- you know, we talked about before that we should steer against?

MR. GENTRY: Well, let me -- Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Gentry.

MR. GENTRY: Let me respond by saying how I view the finance committee working. On an on-going basis there will be issues relating to costs and procedures in preparing budgets that you will receive every year that members of the finance committee expertise in. These -- some of these are laid out on -- on page eight. These individual, members of the finance committee, would be people whose jobs lie elsewhere. They would be seconded if you will on an ad hoc basis, on a

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

temporary basis, to carry out these duties. The time devoted by these members of the finance committee would be small, would be not much time at all on an annual basis. So I view the finance committee, yes, as a standing committee, but whose members meet relatively infrequently for short meetings for a narrow purpose for which they have expertise.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Rosier? Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think I'd like to see that articulated, as being more visible in that -- in that regard. I may be paranoid, but I see another flower blooming, or beginning to bud.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I'd like to follow up if you don't mind my colleague's comments about institutionalizing another group. I -- I start with the language in the last sentence on the bottom of page three, which reads, "The standards and format for justifying a project are the responsibility of the Restoration Team working in conjunction with the finance committee." It's not my idea that the finance committee should be working with the Restoration Team in connection with the formulation of standards justifying a project. That's number one I'd like to leave in suspense for a moment.

Then skipping to this -- on page four, to the second full paragraph which reads as follows: "The finance committee

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

in conjunction with the Restoration Team will review projects proposed for funding." That strikes me as an elevation of the finance committee functions beyond certainly what I had in mind. I don't know about my colleagues, but I leave item two in suspense.

The next paragraph -- well, you could throw in that second sentence there on the second paragraph, "The finance committee will submit comments to the Restoration Team and the Trustee Council."

But then item three is the first sentence in the third full paragraph on page four, "In a public meeting, the Trustee Council will consider projects proposed for funding by the Restoration Team, and reviewed by the finance committee." I wasn't of the view that the finance committee would be reviewing proposed projects for funding, so that's item number three.

Again, troubling is the last sentence in that paragraph, "Budgets approved by the Trustee Council will be subject to appropriate state and federal notification, review and approval procedures." I -- I would want to make sure who -- who has to approve beyond the Trustee Council these projects. That's troubling, at least as I read the decree entered by Judge Holland.

Then down on page five, the bottom paragraph which follows along the "transfer of Exxon settlement funds from the

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

Court Registry," this sentence is troubling: "Upon completion of public notification and public review and comment on the annual budget, federal agencies will forward the approved budget to the Federal Office of Management and Budget. notification of Federal Executive Branch approval," Trustee Council will request the release of funds from Judge Holland. I mean, are we subject in the views of our fellow federal agencies here that our projects and our budget must approved by the Executive Branch of the Federal Government? I mean, I -- I think, you know, we're looking at some very fundamental issues So I think we should reach an understanding as to here. whether we're just a cog in some federal bureaucratic process or whether we are an independent trustees charged by law and the order of the federal court with the restoration of Prince William Sound caused by the Exxon Valdez oil spill.

And by -- whose -- whose language is this and what's the idea behind it I guess is the guestion?

MR. McVEE: I need to comment upon the, I guess the last paragraph you referred to, Mr. Cole, and in that the -- the federal component of the budget, we will be required, we are required on the federal side, and that is still continuing somewhat as a discussion among the federal members, but that to -- to submit that to the Office of Management and Budget.

Office of Management and Budget says that they want to retain some oversight I guess or control as this may be over 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

federal budget component.

Their interests have been expressed as -- as concern about the -- the number of employees, the full-time equivalents that would be added to the federal -- federal staffs as a result of this program, and -- and one other thing I can't remember now, but -- so that I think what we -- what has been -- what the financial management team, the financial committee has tried to build into this language is some recognition of that requirement.

The federal Executive Branch approval would be for the federal component of the budget as I understand it would be -- would be the action.

I guess, you know, I'm concerned -- equally concerned that this, you know, could cause some delay in moving a joint budget forward. Hopefully that would not be the case, that we would have sufficient lead time as we're -- as we're dealing with -- with budget, so that at the appropriate point in time that -- that we could send it forward to OMB and meet schedules for the -- for the filing with the Court to -- to release the funds, but we've got a fairly strong mandate to -- to do that, and we just -- I think the working out of the process and some language so we can do it in a timely manner, not delay.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, it's not the time that -- that troubles me. It's this language says "Upon completion of the budget, federal agencies will approve -- will forward

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

the approved budget." That's the entire budget, okay? The entire budget. That's the money used for administration, that's the money that goes to the state projects, to the federal OMB, and the "Upon notification of Federal Executive Branch approval," then, you know, we can go ahead. personally, I'm unwilling to surrender that -- I guess the better word is abdicate our responsibilities under the federal court decree to the Federal Executive Branch. I didn't see anything in the federal decree that says that the federal OMB shall have the final responsibility over the budget, the projects which the Trustee Counsel has concluded after public review, after scientific advice and -- and a lot of work, it goes back to Washington, D.C., and they make the decision of what needs to be done, with what our budget ought to be. And I can't -- I just can't accept that. I'm sorry.

MR. McVEE: I think the -- I guess my feeling is that the -- you know, that some change in language in this paragraph indicating they're talking about the federal component of the budget, and -- maybe we'd clarify that -- that concern.

Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, I, of course, share Attorney General Cole's grave concern about this issue. I wonder if the genesis for the so-called OMB federal over-sight or involvement might be accommodated in the way that the state deals with

# 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

this. Mr. Gentry is our state OMB representative in the early
stages of this process, and our office, or the state Office of
Management and Budget, OMB, you know, has an opportunity to
to see what's happening, but no final budget of the Trustee
Council is referred to the State OMB for approval or is the
is possible that that the concerns of the federal OMB
might be accommodated by simply communicating with some liaison
with the OMB at the very early process in the same sense that
Mr. Gentry's involved, and and that communication takes
place then at the time when we the Trustee Council, the
Restoration Team and Trustee Council approves the final budget,
that it is final without approval and without reference to the
federal and state OMB. If if you add yet another process in
this, that go through this review and approval process after
the final review of the Trustee Council, it is not the Trustee
Council action. Perhaps the concerns of federal OMB or whoever
could be accommodated in the way in which the state is handling
its OMB communications. Would that has that been explored?
MR. McVEE: I'm not sure that's specifically,
you know, has been explored, although I know that OMB has been
fairly adamant in the in the discussions with that
they've had with with our budget offices about their
involvement. I think by by giving them, you know, advance
copies of this type thing, we could we could speed up
that process.

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

Another element that's involved in this, of course, and maybe it's one -- it is one that makes OMB particular -- federal OMB office particular sense of this is the federal requirement that the federal budget has to go -- has to go to Congress, not for approval, but there's notification to Congress within a 30-day period, so that -- that enters into the picture, and I'm sure is one thing that sensitizes the -- you know, the -- federal OMB, because we have to deal on the federal side with Congress as it relates to the federal budget, so there's a waiting period in there for us before we can spend money.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, I think that is understandable I think to me, and I think I speak generally on behalf I hope of my federal state trustees. We understand that the federal Office of Management and Budget needs to be notified, and be kept abreast of these expenditures, as indeed we provided by statute with respect to funds going to state agencies.

But the issue is whether federal agencies has the right to disapprove projects which the Trustee Council has concluded are vital to the restoration of the damaged resources in the oil spill affected area, and that is a decision committed by law to our judgment, and I think that we must insist on it. And if the federal OMB does not want some of these projects deemed essential by the Trustee Council to be performed by

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

federal agencies, that's fine. But -- we can then perhaps have the right to assign the performance of those projects to state agencies. But we simply must not surrender our Trustee fiduciary responsibilities in that fashion, and I think that's where we need to re-examine or perhaps initially examine what the federal OMB has in mind in that regard.

MR. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. MCVEE: Yes, Mr. Morris?

MR. MORRIS: Can we partially mitigate for Mr. Cole's concern by altering the procedure in terms of the steps and then have the "upon public review and notification and comment" that the Trust- -- and approval by the Trustee Council, that the solicitation through Department of Law and Justice to the Court for release of the funds be made at that time, and have the funds released into the NRDA and our fund and then the federal agencies to the extent that there's an obligation to work through OMB do that -- do it at that time, and it may certainly speed up the process a bit in terms of putting the funds into the account and then may help to isolate the federal requirement over onto the federal side and we -- we would not be engaged in the expenditure of any funds, simply the -- the movement of the funds from one account into our expenditure account that is managed through the Department of Interior.

MR. McVEE: Yes, I -- I think that's -- that

# 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

has been brought up and as I understood it, and I don't know what NOAA or Agriculture, what their feedback has been, but that was not, at least from Interior comment, was not acceptable with -- with OMB to enter it at that stage.

I guess, you know, the other comment is that -- is that the State representatives of the Trustee Council enjoy also the fact that they are the Trustees, the designated Trustees, while we on the federal side do not, you know -- do -- do not enjoy that full privilege. We represent our respective trustees.

And I know in the case of Interior that -- that the federal trustee has kind of similar interests I guess I might say as to whether OMB -- that -- that he wants to see at least the Interior budget before it's -- it's finally approved.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, I guess it's my understanding that there has been a delegation made in -- in Agriculture and Commerce to allow the Trustee Council members to -- to make those decisions.

Do we have anything in writing from OMB that -- how -- how do we know that OMB's position on this is that we -- we must follow this process as opposed to an alternative one?

MR. McVEE: I guess we don't have anything in writing that I'm aware of, but there have been a series of meetings. I think the first one was -- was last -- last December last time, and I know that both NOAA and the Forest Service representatives were -- were present at that -- that

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

meeting where OMB expressed their interest in -- as respects to the budget. And I know there have been some follow-up meetings, and it sounds to me like there's probably need for some more at this stage.

Well, I -- I would agree. Ι MR. COLLINSWORTH: think often the -- the response that you get from a federal agency or from OMB or from a state agency is partially dependent on how you pose the question, and if the question was posed to OMB in a certain way, they would obviously say, sure, that they wanted to participate in the process. I don't know if they were gueried about other alternatives that would be acceptable, so I think we do need to -- to find out if the alternative I proposed earlier would be acceptable. know whether that would help to address your concern, Mr. Cole, or not. Or whether you would find that kind of a process acceptable from the state perspective.

MR. COLE: I'll take that as a question. I think we really need to communicate with the federal OMB, and receive something from them in writing as to what their position is in this area. I mean, for example, suppose, you know, we based upon the decisions we took today that we need to spend another \$103,000.00 on escapement that we're talking about, the study, and the federal OMB says, "Well, we won't approve that." What are we supposed to do? Okay? You know, I -- I just don't think it will work the way even Congress had in

## 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

mind, but certainly Judge Holland had in mind when he signed the decree, but if that's to be the case, those decisions that those of state (ph) have ceased (ph) and not OMB.

MR. WOLFE: Probably -- Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Wolfe.

MR. McVEE: Probably the biggest fact that we're faced with on the federal side, Mr. Cole, is that we do have in the statute that we must go through and get the approval of Congress before we can take money out of our suspense account that we put the fund in when we remove them -- or get them from the Court Registry. And this process as proposed here may be premature to when we have to go to OMB, but before we go to Congress, we always have to go through OMB, and so by statute we must go through OMB, and how we do it, as you point out, is -- is the approach that we need to work out. We need more time to work that out to make it less onerous from your view anyway.

MR. COLE: Excuse me, it's not just less onerous. You know, it -- it goes to the heart of who makes the decisions with respect to the expenditure of these funds. Who makes those decisions, whether it's OMB, it's the federal government, Congress, or this Trustee Council. And I think it's essential, it's -- and it's required by federal court order, which is binding upon the United States of America, which is one of the parties, that -- that it's this Trustee

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Council that makes those decisions and is charged with the legal responsibility for the expenditure of those funds consistent with the decree to restore the resources. That's the issue, not time or anything else.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor, did you ....?

MR. SANDOR: Well, I was going to ask the question, there's an actual statute that says any court ordered action that results in awarding of monies by statute it be That it in approved by the Office of Management and Budget? fact be approved? Mr. Cole -- and I might -- you know, I'm --Mr. Cole, I'd -- I'd really be interested in the statute that would actually require that. Certainly federally appropriated funds, and I feel that whole process is well understood, but I do -- am a little bit surprised that there is -- if the statute actually extends that far, that -- that court orders and judicially awarded monies and et cetera from this process then I think that just adds finally has to go through that hurdle. -- adds to the argument that we need something in writing that actually proves that -- that would in effect scope that out.

But I think there's something more that perhaps is fundamentally involved, and that is the reference to what is delegated by the Trustees themselves in view of both the state and federal governments, and the process where a person can be delegated to act on -- on the basis of trust- -- you know, as a Trustee, whether or not the Trustee is sitting here or not, so

# 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

that maybe you'll have to clarify as well.

But in- -- insofar as this issue on the table, with respect to -- to that, that, you know, is not acceptable from the state perspective and we need -- additionally we need modification I think in -- in the charter of this -- this finance committee. So as presently written, this -- it would not be possible to approve this financial operating procedures without those two (ph).

Can this be deferred for another meeting? Until our next meeting? The -- the nod is affirmative?

MR. GENTRY: Yes, it is.

MR. SANDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would move that we -- that we table this -- this financial operating procedures and that we seek answers to these issues that have been raised, mainly what authority has been delegated, and -- and specifically this involvement of federal OMB, concerns of how they -- alternative ways and to seek from the proper offices the -- you know, our concerns about these, and the appropriate citations. Anyway, I move the tabling of this -- this issue until the next time the Council meets.

MR. ROSIER: Second.

MR. McVEE: Motion made to table action on the federal -- or financial operating procedures until the next meeting. As I recall, that there's no discussion on motions to table, so .....

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Are they subject to motions to 1 2 amend? I -- I think they can be set apart. 3 MR. McVEE: I don't recall that part of my ..... 4 I don't either, but here's one 5 MR. COLE: Is -- did you have in mind Mr. Sandor that we ask the 6 -- those involved in the preparation of this to review the 7 extent of the authority, I mean, in the areas we've talked 8 about here this morning? Not just to defer it, but to advise 9 us in connection with the expressions you made? 10 Yes, Mr. Cole. My hope would be MR. SANDOR: 11 that at the next Trustee Council we'll have a clean package and 12 Trustee chart- -- or the finance committee charter will 13 clarified, the federal OMB would say, "hey, all we want to know 14 is what's happening occasionally, and your other processes (ph) 15 have been delegated completely to Alaskans management of this 16 activity in Alaska. And that we want to be -- certainly do not 17 want to meddle in Alaskan affairs." That would be my prayer. 18 I think you put it quite well. MR. COLE: 19 MR. McVEE: Understand, Mr. Cole's comment, 20 too, was to look at the role of the financial management 21 22 committee. MR. COLE: Yes. Yes. 23 MR. McVEE: Their whole function. Is there any 24 opposition to the motion? The motion passed. The financial 25

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

operating procedures tabled.

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes?

DR. GIBBONS: I -- I've got one topic to bring up in relation to the financial operating procedures. At the last Trustee Council meeting, the Trustee -- the Trustee Council approved an administrative budget pending review by the public. And I held that administrative budget until the middle of June waiting for a financial operating procedures to go out with it, so the public could see how the administrative budget was developed. Like I said, I held it until the middle of June. I've sent it out to 14 locat- -- the teleconferencing sites, libraries and other interested areas across the state with -- with a note saying "the financial operating procedures will soon arrive for -- for your use in analyzing how the administrative budget was developed."

I guess my comment is are we going to accept the comments on the financial -- financial oper- -- I mean, administrative director's and those types of budgets without the financial operating procedures going out so they can use -- see how they -- they were developed? It's a concern of mine.

MR. McVEE: I guess my feeling is that -Dr. Gibbons, that -- that since this has been tabled, that, you
know, that we should accept comments on that administrative
budget and respond to them, and that we should go ahead and

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

deal with or finalize that component of the budget as quickly as possible. While that may be less than fully satisfactory, the public will not have seen the financial operating procedures, I don't think we should hold up that budget component while we're continuing to work on -- on financial operating procedures. Any other comment?

MR. SANDOR: I agree.

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah. The -- the basis for how they were determined have not -- will -- will not change, but I just wanted to make that clarification.

Another point I'd like to make is I think the Restoration Team should work closely with the financial committee before the next draft comes back to the -- to the Trustee Council.

MR. McVEE: We're ready to proceed with the next agenda item? The next agenda item is proposed process for developing the '93 work plan. I believe Dr. Montague has the lead on that one.

DR. MONTAGUE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd just like to bring your attention to go into that relatively short section of your notebook. The first thing in there is about a page or so of draft assumptions behind the op- -- the way we're going to operate to prepare this '93 plan. And one of the objectives of -- of putting these assumptions here was as one of three points between now and the -- developing the -- the

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

final draft of the '93 plan, that we can get input from the Trustee Council on such things as categories and scope and size of the program.

And because the schedule's really tight to have the '93 work plan completely drafted by the end of August, these three periods today, July 20th and August 25th, when we get input from the Council, will be extremely important in seeing that —that we stay within schedule and have a draft plan that's basically acceptable to the Council by the end of August.

So on the 20th of July, the -- the items that will come up is a teleconference where the Council would be able to discuss all the project ideas that we currently have, and then on the 25th of August would be the time that the Council reviews a predraft of the draft '92 -- or '93 plan.

And in these assumptions, I'd like to just highlight a couple of -- a couple of the ideas presented here. One, we're going under the assumption that we would enter into the federal fiscal year with this work plan and that at least the federal offices of man- -- Office of Management and Budget needed a budget 30 days prior to the beginning of the federal fiscal year. And along with that we decided that to have a budget, we needed a draft plan, so that assumption is what's driving this schedule, that we need a draft plan before we can develop the budget, and that that has to be done 30 days prior to October 1st.

Another point is that we would anticipate that the work

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

plan would cover almost all of the -- or all the major restoration areas, and damage assessment as well.

You know, I -- I won't go over the specifics because I'm sure you've read this, but one point I think it's necessary to bring up, that we may need to ask specific guidance from you all on, is that on the last sentence under restoration habitat protection and acquisition. I'll just read it. "Although there is much -- although there is much public support for acquisition projects, we are proposing a pragmatic approach to fully develop the process in '93, but not acquire any habitats except those facing imminent threat." Okay. Certainly any guidance from the Council that's different than that would have a large effect on the 1993 work plan.

If there's no other questions on the assumptions, you know, this isn't a document that needs approval. It's only for your information, and either now or at any time we would appreciate whether these assumptions seem appropriate to you all.

MR. McVEE: Any comments on the assumptions? Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, I guess two points, or questions of Dr. Montague. With regard to the assumptions, I'm assuming that the process is going to take the public comments that were received in the 1992 -- the comments to the 1992 work plan and the restoration frame work and in affect

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

apply them where appropriate with respect to the 1993 work plan?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, relative to that, indeed '92 project ideas and comments that are applicable have been passed on to the '93 work group. You know, we weren't really prepared today to talk about the -- the nature of the ideas and comments on '93, but for the most part all '92 project ideas that we had from the public were also resubmitted as a new '93 project, so as far as project ideas, they have been covered in that way.

And so far we've -- well, I mean the time period has passed, so we have received about 500 ideas and comments for '93. Approximately 50 of these were comments and 450 were projects which if added all up would amount to several billion dollars. So we do need to pare down.

MR. SANDOR: The second question relates to the restoration or habitat protection and/or acquisition, and the Trustee Council has discussed at substantial length and there has been, as you have pointed out, a great deal of public comment on habitat -- habitat protection and/or acquisition.

And I guess I'm a little concerned about the literal wording of that sentence you -- you read. And -- well, I guess the question is The Nature Conservancy's paper on habitat and the efforts to identify what is critical habitat. Can you elaborate on the status of that so that we know where the

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Restoration Team on -- on identifying, you know, what is 1 critical habitat? 2 DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, I could, but I 3 think Marty Rutherford would probably describe it a little 4 5 better. MS. RUTHERFORD: Do you want to take ....? 6 DR. GIBBONS: Do you want me to? 7 8 Chairman, I'll -- I'll try to -- try to take that one. The -- the habitat protection working group has been --9 10 has been working very hard from the direction of the last 11 public package. We're shooting for mid July. We've got a 12

has been working very hard from the direction of the last
Trustee Council meeting. We're about -- about finalized on a
public package. We're shooting for mid July. We've got a
meeting early next week to hopefully finalize the package to go
to the public. In that package there will be an imminent
threat. There will also be an identification of critical
habitats, the procedures to do that. And -- and also the third
set of threshold criteria based on contingent valuation were
developed. So we have three sets of criteria, we have an
imminent threat process, we have a long-term habitat protection
process, and this is like I said all going -- hopefully going
to the public in mid July for comment.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Just -- just the only other thing I would add is that -- is we -- the habitat protection

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

'93 work plan that are -- that have come in. And I think it's very possible that as part of that meeting we will identify projects that will allow us to develop valuation comparison valuations on habitat so that we can address specific suggestions that are coming in. So that is going to be part I think of what we do regarding the '93 work plan, because at this point in time, we don't have enough information to say that one particular habitat is better than another, and so that is very likely to be a part of our '93 response if you will.

MR. SANDOR: Well, you know, I guess given that situation that the process is underway and at least this member of the Trustee Council would really prefer a rewording of that -- this -- this last -- that last sentence of that paragraph titled restoration habitat protection and/or acquisition to read something like perhaps we can take the two sentences and "The Trustee Council recognizes there is much public support for habitat acquisition projects, period. We are proposing a scientific approach to fully develop the process in 1993 and -- and will move to acquire or protect the imminent -- any crucial or any critical habitat in 1993."

I'm -- what I'm wanting to suggest is that we should turn the -- part of those -- of that sentence to -- to go on to say the Trustee Council recognizes the -- the importance of acquisition and protection -- or actually I should say rather

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

than we are proposing, that we are -- the Restoration Team is involved in -- in -- Restoration Team (ph) is going to be developing a scientific approach to identify threatened and critical habitat and that we will if critical habitat is identified, harlequin duck -- as to harlequin duck nesting sites, or whatever else, and that we will move to acquire those in the fiscal year 1983. Let's -- let's switch that around. Or at least that's my suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Do any of the Council members have any problem with Mr. Sandor's suggestion? Concur with that? Okay. Marty, you've got some new language there.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. McVEE: I guess it's -- you know, that -that we need to -- we need to get the work group's process out,
you know, as soon as possible to get the public comment back on
that process. That's critical to accomplishing I think what
Mr. Sandor is -- is recommending or suggesting with his
language change, and -- so we can -- can proceed with that
process.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair, if all goes well, we should have it out by the middle to end of next week.

MR. McVEE: I guess the other element, you know, in the '93 program is that we will not have a restoration plan until late next spring or early next summer so that we're still functioning without the advantage of that

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

long-term guidance for the program. It's almost in an interim context that we're continuing to function, so in my mind that's significant in the way we design the -- the '93 program.

Yes, Mr. Rosier?

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. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm not sure whether this is the appropriate place to interject this thought, but it seems to me that one of the areas that we have talked about as a Council has been the creation of an endowment, and this has been something that's underlied a number of discussions here, but we've never really brought that particular issue to the forefront, and it seems to me that in '93, I don't know whether we should call it a project or what, but it would seem to me that we should be moving ahead with at least consideration of that -- of that particular issue as part of the '93 budgeting process on this. It seems to me that we need to be making some decisions, one, I guess whether we're going to have an endowment, but, two, when we begin to identify the expenditures that we may want to -want to make for the '93 work plan on this, certainly our commitments to an endowment program would be an integral part of that decision. It would seem -- this is one of the few items that we have not had a working group on, and it seems to me it's something that we need to begin to give a little more specific attention to.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: Well, I concur with Carl Rosier on that point, but there was a -- the Restoration Team was directed to look into this -- this matter of an endowment.

Where does that stand, Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: I know in the 1993 work plan we've -- we've broken out a whole section on endowments, and we've got some suggestions from the public and we've also taken the one submitted by yourself, Mr. -- Mr. Sandor, and also by Mr. Rosier, and put those in there as -- as a mechanism for -- for the '93 plan, so they will be discussed in the '93 plan.

We haven't done much on those before as -- as directed by the Trustee Council. We just -- we haven't -- haven't done much.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: I think the Trustee Council, at least the state Trustees, received a letter from Senator Arliss Sturgulewski urging establishment of an endowment, and I think some paper associated with that. Is that also before the -- this same group, Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes, it is. Senator Sturgulewski did -- did submit it in two areas in the framework and also in the 1993.

One other point I'd like to add is in -- in the

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

restoration framework, as a restoration option there's an endowment in there as one option for -- for restoration, so we're -- we're doing some work in that activ- -- in -- in that area, but we're -- we're trying to get those together now.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, finally as -- as Carl Rosier suggested, can we add a sixth item in there on it?

I guess that's what you're suggesting, Carl?

MR. ROSIER: Yes, that's correct.

MR. SANDOR: On discussion of that.

MR. McVEE: Is that acceptable to the other Council members? Organizationally I guess at this point in time that -- that the evaluation of the concept of putting together a package relative to endowment should be with the R.T. Yes, Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Could -- could I ask for you folks to give us any indication as do you want to consider an endowment as part of the work plan, or do you want to consider it as sort of separate from the work plan? Do you want to con--- I mean, 'cause basically then it would be considered almost like a project, which is how we've approached all the budgeting. I -- I guess that's something I'd throw out. You really don't have to respond now. Maybe you want to think about it and get back to us later, but it is something that is some--- that is -- a few of us have discussed as to whether or not it should be considered as part of a work plan.

#### 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

25

guess an endowment as I see it would -- would be more than just a one-year project. It would -- could be -- probably would be a continuing effort, but that -- and -- and maybe organizationally is that, you know, we need to put some type of an ad-hoc group together I guess. We look for guidance -- or I would look for guidance from the R.T. as to determine how, you know, that could be done, to look at the whole area of endowment upon the -- the submissions that we have before us.

-- on it, and maybe this results for discussion here by the

of the '93 program or -- or submitted with the '93 program.

Council members, but is that, you know, is it should be part

MR. McVEE:

Yes, Mr. Sandor?

I guess -- I guess my feeling was

MR. SANDOR: Yeah. And then I believe that this is part of a foundation on which the work plan, you know, is constructed and developed, and -- in other words, talking in terms of short term, I regard ten years as short-term, and then for long-term, and so we -- particularly on easements, purchase of an easement for habitat protection where certain owners do not want to, you know, dispose of their land and -- and want future owners to, you know, have a voice in what happens to that land, or reconsider the circumstances. So that gives more flexibility. So I see it as -- just as a part of the foundation.

MR. BRODERSON: Mr. Chairman?

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mark?

MR. BRODERSON: I'd -- I'd like to reiterate what Mr. Sandor is saying there. I -- I think to have endowment put in as part of the '93 work plan really does -- excuse me -- does not give it the due that it deserves, that -- that we really need to look upon this as developing part of the process here. It needs to be pulled out of the '93 work plan, looked at for the long term, how do we accomplish this? This is really a method of -- of how do we do our financing as opposed to what do we do. It -- it deserves much more consideration than it would get as just a project within the '93 work plan.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Montague?

DR. MONTAGUE: To further clarify, at the moment we have six categories for the '92 work plan, one of which is technical support, and that is where endowments are at this stage, and technical support being the -- that will be the mechanism by which future projects are funded. And so we -- so it, I don't know if subsumed is the right word, but it's simply part of the work plan at the moment. And not to bog it down in specifics, but not that you've brought it up, the -- the two, I guess, nagging questions relative to the -- the ideas for endowments that have come in, is that the director -- direction of how the money's used in most of the projects is not the

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Trustee Council. Sometimes it's one or two members of the Council, but generally it's outside the Council. And certainly we need guidance from you all relative to that.

Two, many of the objectives are to do -- to fund projects that aren't very clearly related to the <a href="Exxon Valdez">Exxon Valdez</a> oil spill.

MR. McVEE: Can -- can we move on? I guess that -- I guess I would feel like that we have provided guidance at this point to the R.T. and indicated our interest in having them pursue the -- the concept, the idea of -- of the endowments -- of an endowment based upon the proposals that have been submitted, and that at -- at some time in the future then we would act probably in -- in my mind, in conjunction with the '93 work plan, whether it's part of that or some separate entity, I -- I guess I don't -- I don't know at this time, but at least we trust the R.T. to come back with analysis of that whole area of concern, of interest.

Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have some sense from the -- from the R.T. group as to the time frame that they feel that they need to develop at least options for us on this. I'd like to get this thing a little bit more specific in terms of, you know, the time frames that we're talking about rather than just sometime in the future. I for one would like to see, you know, what -- what's the time frame

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

that we're -- we can reasonably have something in hand that we can -- we can relate to the '93 budgets that we're going to be considering on this, and -- and how we're in fact going to move ahead on that? Could we get some sense from the R.T. group on that?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Dr. Montague?

DR. MONTAGUE: As long as it is in the '93 work plan, your endowment projects would be in the draft by the 25th of August. If it's not in the '93 work plan, I can't address it.

MR. McVEE: It seems to me that there's certainly some advantage of having this handled in conjunction with the '93 work plan, because then, you know, in terms of public review, the public will see this as part of the total package.

Any other comments?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, Mr. Chairman, .....

MR. McVEE: Yeah, Mr. Collinsworth?

whether it's part of the work plan or a separate project, as long as it -- it gets some focused attention, and -- and a variety of options are prepared, or options are prepared. As Dr. Montague pointed out, suggestions for this kind of fund have varied considerably in terms of the intended use, and

### 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

there are a lot of different ideas on -- on how that money would be used out of the fund. And I'm very interested in that.

I'm not -- I'm not wildly enthusiastic about some of the proposals that I have seen. I think that if there are monies that remain available to us to capitalize a fund down the road a few years, that's perhaps the appropriate time to do it, and perhaps not as -- as in the near term.

I mean, I -- I think one of the things that we do need to get moving on, and we've heard it loud and clear from our public for -- for the last couple of years is a very strong interest in the Trustee Council acquiring land use discretionary authorities, and while it didn't say ownership of lands, but at least the -- the authority to determine how lands would be used, and the -- these acquisitions of this land management authority would serve as part of the restoration, as -- as compensation, and providing a like-value services, and I think that we have not moved as rapidly as we should in -- in dealing with the -- the land use issues.

If we're going to take '93 to -- to work it out and then finally get started in '94 or '95, we're getting pretty far down the line in terms of the years between the actual -- the -- the oil spill and the -- and the damages and the injury that was suffered, and when we start to move forward with a restoration plan.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

So acquisition of equivalent value services is certainly provided for and contemplated under the law, and -- and I think many of our constituents would like to see the -- the Trustees acquire land use management by lease or by ownership or by other kinds of contractual arrangements so that we can start to look at important habitats for restoration purposes as well as -- as the aesthetics of protecting viewsheds and other natural -- the natural ecology of Prince William Sound and I think we -- we may well lose opportunities to do that unless we -- we move.

I know that the attitude on the part of this Trustee Council has vacillated partially as a result of membership, and partially as a result of just changing attitudes and philosophy, but while there seemed to be once a lot of support for the concept of land management acquisition, there seems to be less now or -- and that -- that may vary again, but we certainly do need to work out our procedures for making a determination on how we will make judgments with regard to alternative projects to acquire land use management, and we should do it as quickly in '93 or in the '93 work plan as possible.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I take direct issue with your statement that we vacillated. I've been here at every meeting.

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, I -- I said .....

MR. COLE: Excuse me. Well, hold on. Hold on. Please don't interrupt me. I mean I've been here at every meeting, you know, starting in December, in early December, and essentially except in emergencies when I have to step out for a few moments, I've been here every minute, you know, I don't think there's any -- been any vacillation among this group whatsoever with respect to the acquisition of land and habitat.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, I .....

MR. COLE: Hold on, I'm not finished. Thanks. I didn't interrupt you.

And -- but when you say that we've vacillated, I mean, I -- I want to make the record clear that I don't think we've vacillated, number one.

Number two is I think we've proceeded expeditiously, but not carelessly, and we're dealing as Trustees with vast sums of money. We have to make very critical decisions in the acquisition of habitat, what acqui- -- habitat is acquired, what damage has been done to the various resources, and make rational decisions, not based upon someone who says, "Well, you know, if you don't buy this today, we're going to log it, so you've got to go buy it."

And -- and I speak strongly in defense of what this

Trustee Council has done, and I think we should pursue a steady

course, and I hope we do. The same course we've been on.

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, may I respond? Just briefly. I don't wish to get into a debate.

I do recall some earlier discussions of the new state members on this Trustee Council that seemed to be rather in support of acquisition of -- of lands, it seemed to me it was the Governor who had indicated some strong interest.

But what I intended to say, and I conditioned my remarks by saying as the membership has changed, because the membership on this Council has changed with the exception of -- I guess of one person, Mr. Pennoyer, all of the members have changed since the oil spill and the Trustee Council was initially started. And there was consideration of the -- the Trustee Council that was operated starting in 1989 may not be operating under the same format as this group, but it was a trustee council and it did operate, and some of the attitudes there with regard to land acquisition were different I think than the present Council, and those things evolve.

MR. COLE: Let me respond to that. I mean, this is important, and I don't mean to quibble, but this Trustee Council membership has not changed. Whatever ad hoc body was operating following the spill is one thing, and -- and they were focusing on damage assessment and -- and the preparation for civil litigation, and once the settlement was realized and approved and by judicial degree this group was form- -- formulated, the management -- the membership has not

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

changed. And -- and I don't think any views, the Governor's views have not changed. My views have not changed, and I don't think the views of any -- any member of this Council has changed since in early December following Judge Holland's approval of the settlement have -- has changed whatsoever.

So -- I realize we've been subject to -- to some criticism, should have moved faster, but I think we've proceeded very prudently. So, anyway, thank you.

MR. McVEE: Yeah, let's -- let's move on then.

Jerome?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chair, if there's no further comments on the assumptions, I'll move on to the schedule. The -- the schedule through July 1st has already been approved back in April, so it's the remainder of the year that is up for your all's approval now. And I won't go through it item by item, but I would like to point out a couple of things.

First of all, there's two page fours, and one, I believe the first one, has us requesting the Court the full 12 months of money along with the -- the draft budget, draft -- or the budget based on the draft plan, the first of September and receiving monies the first of October. And the second -- the second page requests the money in December and receives it in January. And certainly we do need some direction on that.

And the -- the issue in front of you is that not until 1994 will a final work plan be done by the end of August. So

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

this year, with -- with the first page four, we would be requesting money from the Court based upon the draft work plan. If we use the second page, it would be based upon the final work plan. But using the second page would require two -- two budgets and two submissions to the Court.

MR. McVEE: Dr. Montague, is -- the first alternative then would be a request to the court prior to the time that we had received public comment on the '93 budget?

DR. MONTAGUE: That is correct. And going the -- the second route would be receiving three months early on, you know, again without public comment and then the rest in -- in December.

MR. McVEE: Or we -- or we have another option there. We get -- we will have received comment on the full five-month budget so to speak, the -- the remainder of the oil year, the old oil year budget that we could ask the Court for -- for since that has been through the entire process, we could ask the Court for -- for those funds.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, I just assumed that that being not part of the '93 program, that that was just going to be dealt with anyway and wasn't up for discussion relative to '93. I presume that we -- no matter what we choose, we're going to go with September to get the remainder of '92 program.

And then I would like to go over the time period

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

between now and the end of August, as that -- it is exceptionally tight, and also to try to give you some feel of how we're handling the 1993 ideas.

And as you may remember, in order to not have people present a lot of -- or use a lot of time making detailed proposals, we requested simply one-page ideas for '93. And as I had mentioned, we received about 450 of these, and we've just recently put them into the six categories which you'll -- you'll see later on here, and also provide what we've termed the -- the critical factors.

And if you'll turn to page six where you see the critical factors, these are -- presumably if they received a no in any one of these categories, they wouldn't be considered further, and these are linkage to the <a href="Exxon Valdez">Exxon Valdez</a> spill, technical feasibility and legality. And we had about 50 of these ideas that have been discarded based upon these critical factors.

And just so there's no uncertainty, on the linkage to <a href="Exxon Valdez">Exxon Valdez</a> oil spill, there were several ideas for projects that would made the state or make the governments better able to respond to future spills, but they had no relation <a href="Exxon Valdez">Exxon</a> <a href="Valdez">Valdez</a> and these have been removed, so, you know, if you're not in agreement with that, we'd like to -- like to know about it.

Okay. And then now that these ideas have been -- and also about 50 and presumably some more were essentially the

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

same project submitted several times, so these have been combined, and we anticipate probably about 300 ideas counting all the combinations. And these will be sent out to the six agencies and to habitat working group for the habitat related projects to develop what we're terming the brief project descriptions, the format of which is near the end of your -- of the packet here.

And based upon those three-page descriptions with a two-page detailed budget, there will a meeting the 22nd through the 27th of July to rank all of the projects, and your -- and that is still looking at the critical factors. After that is five pages of project evaluation factors for the five categories of damage assessment, restoration manipulation and enhancement, management actions, monitoring and technical support. Now, habitat does not have evaluation factors presented here, because they're being referred to the habitat group with their own procedures.

And during this meeting on the 22nd to the 27th, there will be six ranking committees based upon these six categories, and they will be applying these factors with their best professional judgment and ranking them in terms of high, medium or low, and filling in the comment line as to why they got such and such rank.

And then after that, on the 28th and 29th, the
Restoration Team will take these six -- six lists of ideas that

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

have their ranking internally to their own category and re-rank them across the six categories.

And then the 1993 work plan work group will put together a working draft of the plan and will have one more chance to look at it, and then it will be, not finalized, but become the draft plan that's presented to the Council on the 18th of August and would be discussed during a Council meeting on the 25th of August.

The only step I haven't mentioned yet is that in the next few days we will put together a table showing how many projects we've received in each category and their cost and -- and a few other things. And on the 20th of July we would -- have scheduled a teleconference and would be interested at that point based upon what, you know, what you see in the table in terms of the ideas in front of you, what type of a '93 program you might wish so that between the 20th of August and -- or the 20th of July and 18th of August we can put together a draft plan that's pretty close to what you all might want, because the last time to change the plan before we present our budgets to the OMB's would be between the 25th and the 31st of August.

And I think that about covers the whole packet except that we do need -- there's a couple of pages in here where we need Trustee Council approval, and one of them is on this schedule, and I'll just point out the other area where we need approval. The second place we need is on the project selection

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

process, and I believe that's -- that's the only other place we need to have some specific Council approval.

With that I'm open for questions.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Any questions? I guess I have one comment on this -- the same issue of the involvement of the Federal Office of Management and Budget. You know, that will have to be resolved, and I guess we've -- we've tabled that, so as it is reflected in this schedule, it may -- may change based upon that -- resolution of that issue.

I guess I -- I have some great problems with -- with going for, you know, budgets in the future without full -- completing the full public comment and review process. I thought this year was -- was an emergency, we had an exigency that we had to take care of, and that hopefully we'd not have to face that in the future. So it seems to me like the schedule should be built so that we can get full comment and review.

Maybe one other comment, from the August 25th Trustee Council approve draft '93, and -- and maybe the time is -- the time -- the length of time in there was because of the involvement of Offices of Management and Budget, but if -- if that involvement occurred some other time, it would seem like then the release of that public com- -- release of that information for public comment on the first of October is a -- is a fairly -- you know, is a long span of time to -- to do

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

just the final -- prepare the final information for public comment.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps Dave could respond to that. I -- I think, you know, it's usually on the order of about three weeks between, you know, sending it to the printers and actually having it ready to mail out, so you're right, we could save a week in there, but I don't think we could save much more.

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct. We've been allowing two weeks, but then you allow a little bit of mail-out time, too.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Comments on the schedule?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chair, just so that I'm

clear, irregardless (sic) of what's decided with the Federal

Office of Management and Budget, is it or is it not the

Council's intention that we begin the '93 program on the

federal fiscal year? So that's not an item for discussion, may

we assume that?

MR. McVEE: Yeah, from -- from at least

Interior, I'll let the other federal members speak from their

perspective, but is that we should proceed, you know, with a

schedule, and we've -- we've got to figure out or find out how

Office of Management and Budget will fit into that schedule.

There's no use rehashing I guess that prior discussion, but we

need to proceed with the schedule. I think the '93 schedule,

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

you know, has to be -- has to be as streamlined as possible in order to get through the -- the necessary steps, and .....

DR. MONTAGUE: Okay. So, Mr. Chair, so that the only part of the schedule then that's really uncertain is when funds are requested from the Court and received from the Court, and that we should go on with this schedule with those things left blank?

MR. McVEE: I guess that would be my feeling, or at least indicate that that's tentative based upon -- on the prior discussion, yeah.

Comments? Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: I agree with that conclusion.

It occurs to me, reflecting on and agreeing with the Chair's remarks about the absence of a public -- an opportunity for public review, should we not in these target dates identify -- we say, you know, different groups are going to review this and review that. Why don't we institutionalize having this public advisory group, you know, formally review these things? In other words, where you say you're going to go before this and this, that we incorporate using some of those target dates for formal, you know, review like that might be helpful. Is that a problem?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chair, it's not a problem after August 25th which I believe, or sometime around the end of August is their first meeting.

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: Oh, that's their first meeting, August of ....?

DR. MONTAGUE: I -- I believe so. So indeed on page 13 it would be easy to insert the public advisory group's role after that period.

MR. McVEE: Is -- I guess it's -- it occurs to me the public advisory group is somewhat -- somewhat contingent upon how fast we act upon this package of nominations, and -- and proceed with the formal appointment process. But I think that was what I recall on an earlier schedule is the latter part of August would be their first meeting.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: I'm -- I'm still wrestling with how we're going to continue to operate in a '92 work plan and then have a '93 work plan if we're going to go to fis- -- federal fiscal years. I wonder if that's going to create a lot of confusion for us as well as for our public at this point, if we have two sets of work plans to deal with in one fiscal year? It would be for me. I would ask that maybe there's some way we could integrate the balance of the '92 into a '93 program of work or something like that? But if we aren't careful, we're going to have a lot of confusion here.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, yeah, our -- our

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ideas on that would -- would be to on the budget for the 1993 work plan, to have the remaining five months of the 1992 work plan included in that, but have the '93 work plan stand alone in there, you know, 'cause the '92 has been reviewed by the public already. And so just have that budget numbers in there, and -- and work it that way.

One -- one thing I -- I might suggest that might -- might help with -- with the schedule here is that perhaps the Trustee Council approve this in concept. It seems like we need to -- to add the public advisory group in this, and those types of activities, but that the Trustee Council approve this -- the time -- the timeline in concept for meeting some -- some deadlines, and -- and we have an OMB change and some of those things.

MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons, if -- if we proceed in -- as you have suggested, and that makes some -- some sense to me in that -- that the -- the final '93 program include that component of the '92 I guess which you might say which carried forward for the -- for the five months, but it seems like if it's handled in that way -- that way, then what we could do is proceed as soon as we have completed the public comment period on the administrative portion of the '92 program and -- and then following -- and --and the five-month overlaps, we could proceed to -- to request the balance of those funds from the Court, and there -- and then handle the -- the '93 program as

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

an entity, you know, with -- with time for public review and involvement of the P.A.G. and -- and all of that, that we have bought ourselves some time, and we've got some funds to cover the -- the continuing carry-over, you might say, into that -- into that five-month program.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, that is -- the point -- point there, I just want to make sure I understand and maybe some of the other people, so what you're proposing is that there would not be any new 1993 projects until January 1st as opposed to October 1st, so we just ask -- in September we ask for the remaining five months of '92, and don't ask for anything for '93 until we have the final work plan in January?

MR. McVEE: That's -- that's the suggestion, until we've completed public review process and whatever else is necessary to have everything done in a -- in a timely context. And it -- I guess I'm wondering if that is any kind of a major problem since we're -- we're talking about, you know, the fall/ early winter months. We aren't talking about field activities. So I wonder if that's -- that's any -- will be any great problem. It -- it isn't I guess, dependent upon how we design the '93 program. If we design it so that's going to be the effective date for receipt of funds, then it would seem likely it would not be a problem.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, in many cases I think that indeed is true. I think there probably are cases

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

that would have begun on October 1st, some -- some analysis projects and potentially land acquisition isn't -- doesn't have any seasonal constraint to it, but, you know, a nine-month '93 work plan is certainly an option. We just need to -- people are developing their budgets here, or will be beginning the 5th of July so -- or 6th of July, so we need to resolve it and get them guidance.

MR. McVEE: Comment from the other -- other council members?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: I guess I -- I wasn't following exactly what you were saying about a nine-month work plan. If we have a work plan for '93, it should be a work plan for '93, whatever period of time that covers, and that to me is October 1 through September 30th. So I'm -- I'm -- did I hear you say something about a nine-month plan?

MR. McVEE: No, Jerome said that.

MR. WOLFE: I thought maybe I .....

MR. McVEE: Okay. But, no, I -- I think it is a full -- a full 12-month program, but there would not be funds available for implementation of the projects until after money would be received from Court under this schedule in January. Whether that could be, you know, could be accelerated, I don't know. I think it would be pretty difficult, but -- but it

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

would be no -- we'd not be able to initiate a '93 program or 1 2 '93 project until after the funds were received. Of course, you would still be operating on -- on the remainder, the carry-3 over of the '92 five-month funds, the continuation of those 5 projects. MR. WOLFE: 6 Okay. 7 MR. McVEE: Further comments on -- on schedule? Yes? 8 Mr. Chairman, I quess in -- in 9 MR. WOLFE: concept, in response to Dr. Gibbons, what I hear us saying here 10 11 is at least through the August, late August time frame, that we 12 agree at least with that portion of -- of the work plan at this 13 point in time, with this schedule for the work plan. what -- what I'm hearing, with the addition of some reference 14 15 to or involvement with the public advisory group? Is that a motion? 16 MR. McVEE: 17 Maybe I should have made that in MR. WOLFE: the form of a motion, but we're lacking one of our members 18 19 here. MR. McVEE: Okay. Let's -- let's discuss for a 20 little longer. 21 22 Jerome, you had a ....? 23 DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chair, I think that it 24 wasn't just the schedule through August, it's the entire 25 schedule. The only part I think that there isn't agreement on

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

is when we begin the projects and when we'd request money from the Court. Mr. Chair, the -- the way we're currently planning on informing the -- those that are going to be writing their budgets is that if it's a continuation of a '92 project, that it only cover the period March '93 through September '93, and if it's a new project, you know, to begin whenever it needs to begin, but no earlier certainly than October 1st, so there probably would not be a lot of projects with October 1st start up, but there would be some.

MR. McVEE: One option we have I guess, you know, here looking at the schedule is to -- is to -- to follow Dr. Gibbons' suggestion, you know, approve it in concept so that it would be something that the staff would have to work on with -- with refinement, which would include involvement of the P.A.G., resolving this -- our -- our issue concerning Office of Management and Budget, and I guess -- and I don't see why we can't -- we couldn't resolve today the issue of when the actual, you know, when we're -- when we're going to actually you might say initiate '93 projects. Are we going to work under the emergency exigency type of approach or -- for -- for '93, or whether we want to -- we want to wait until we have the money in the account on the formal public review process until, you know, we actually initiate '93 projects. New projects I -- I guess I would say. There will be those '92 projects.

The other option that we have I think is that, you

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

know, is like maybe we dealt with, although maybe not quite the same thing, we dealt with the -- the two requests today for -- for amendments to projects based upon changes and -- and the need for -- for more equipment, information.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes?

MR. WOLFE: I would hope that the way that we dealt with the two projects today wouldn't be the norm that we'd deal with those kinds of projects in the future, that we'd have more -- more information prior to making the decision and have the involvement of the Restoration Team.

MR. McVEE: Good point. Yes.

I guess maybe one point while we -- before we're ready for a motion, is that -- is that, Jerome, on -- on the -- although we're dealing with the schedule at this point in time, and I think after that we want to go onto the project evaluation factors that -- under project evaluation factors, critical factors, consistent that we -- consistency with applicable federal or state law, I assume that would be a review by our respective legal counsels that would -- that would do that review? It seems like that would be appropriate.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, we -- that wasn't what we have done, but we will give those projects to the appropriate legal people to look over what we've done.

MR. McVEE: Are we ready for a motion on the

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

schedule then? It seemed like .....

MR. WOLFE: I started one.

MR. McVEE: All right. Do you want to try

again, Mr. Wolfe?

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. WOLFE: Well, I can try again, and I would make a motion that we accept in concept the -- the full schedule that the Restoration Team has proposed, with the exception that we add in involvement of the public advisory group as soon as they are formed and -- and available to participate, and that we clarify -- will have to clarify the involvement scheduled for OMB and when we go to the Court Registry.

MR. SANDOR: Second.

MR. McVEE: Okay. The motion. Further discussion? Any opposition to the motion? Hearing none, the motion passed.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes?

DR. MONTAGUE: Simply as a housekeeping matter, and indeed we can delay when we decide upon, you know, when we request money from the Court, but we do need to -- there will be approximately 250 people potentially preparing budgets and I'd hate to tell them it begins one time, and they -- and then have -- find out later it begins another time. So I kind of need to give guidance to those that are going to be writing

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

their budgets, whether it begins October 1st or January 1st or encourage that they have it begin January 1st and raise any October 1st funds as a special issue. Some kind of guidance in that regard?

MR. McVEE: Well, let's have further discussion I think that's a fair request. Mr. Cole may have on that. missed part of this conversation concerning request of '93, fiscal year '93 funds from the Court. Two options are, you know, an emergency, you might say, request, I would call it emergency request that would be in -- in late September, for --'93 projects, and that would be prior to the time there'd been pub- -- when we have done public review on the '93 program and The other alternative is to make that request to the projects. Court in December or for -- or January for funds in January which would mean the initiation of '93 projects, funds available for initiation of '93 projects would not be available until January. And that were the -- were the option Is there further discussion we could that we -- was chosen. have on that or guidance we could give the R.T.?

I guess as far the Interior position, we should not go to the Court again until, you know, with the program until we have had public review, complete public review of all components.

MR. SANDOR: And when would that be?

MR. McVEE: Under this schedule that would be

#### 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

receive money -- receipt of the funds would be in January. 1 The request, I don't know, would be ..... 2 DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, the request is 3 December 1st. 4 5 MR. McVEE: December 1st, yeah. And then if the Court were to react like it did recently, which was a very 6 short turn around, it was approximately a week as I recall, it 7 8 could before mid or around mid December. It seems like to me that that's a MR. SANDOR: 9 10 reasonable position, Mr. Chairman, that we wait for that public comment. And we're saying, what, Oct- -- in other words, we're 11 12 saying October 1 and January 1, is that the alternatives? 13 January 1 we have -- we have the public comments? 14 MR. McVEE: We'll have had full public comment 15 on the '93 program. MR. SANDOR: Well, I can share your position 16 17 to, yes (ph), January 1. 18 MR. McVEE: Yes. MR. SANDOR: Well, I would concur with that. 19 20 MR. WOLFE: I guess -- Mr. Chairman? 21 MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe? 22 MR. WOLFE: I think our position that we can instruct the folks to prepare project proposals that they 23 should be based on the -- on not receiving funds or start 24 funding the projects until January or whenever we get the funds 25

from Court also.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

If there is a special need for some project that's unforeseen at this point in time, that -- that they would bring that to the Restoration Team and the Administrative Director for consideration and elevating it to the Trustee Council.

That -- that would be my suggestion.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yeah, I would certainly agree with that -- that amount of flexibility in -- in the procedure here on this. It's hard to tell exactly what's -- what's going to be before us, but I can certainly see the potential for need -- potential need for perhaps something in that first -- first quarter of fiscal '9-- '93.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, the 1992 work plan we approved and the budgets associated with it run to March 1, 1993, right?

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. SANDOR: So that's -- we're talking about maybe new proposals, or as today, these additions that we approved.

MR. McVEE: Yes, that's correct. Yes,

24 Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, basically we're trying

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

to -- we're trying to get off of the old oil spill year and get onto the federal fiscal year, and I think that we should treat the '92 projects as we would a state or a -- or a federal budget, that this is multiple year money, it's continuation funding, so that as we start in FY '93, we're still continuing to use FY '92 funds, and that the projects, the FY '93 budget will take into account the continuing funding of the '92 work plan projects, just as carry-over money, and then -- but -- but any augmentation or changes in those projects or new projects would be FY '93 funds, but the projects wouldn't start until approximately January 1, so .....

MR. McVEE: That's the way I understand it, that those are what we're talking about.

DR. MONTAGUE: Thank you for your guidance.

MR. McVEE: Is there -- is there further discussion on the other component, the other pieces within the -- in the book here, project evaluation factors and selection factors?

I guess on those factors, Dr. Montague, have those -have the R.T. -- have they been discussed in depth with the
R.T., the evaluation and selection factors?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, the packet was presented to the R.T. and approved.

MR. McVEE: Well, then the -- the other -- the other piece of it is the format for project descriptions.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, I -- it might be 1 2 useful to -- to highlight something about this, ..... 3 MR. McVEE: Please go ahead. .... that these three-page tax 4 DR. MONTAGUE: 5 (ph) descriptions and the page or two pages of budget is what we anticipate making up the 1993 work plan, so the work plan 6 should be smaller. I mean, you know, '92 work plan had some 7 projects 35 pages in the work plan, but this is to be a lot 8 more concise summary in '93. 9 MR. McVEE: Is this -- Mr. Montague, you -- you 10 did explain I quess that there was some conflict in dates I 11 noticed between the schedule and the '93 project selection 12 process, there were some differing dates there on ..... 13 DR. MONTAGUE: I'm sorry if there are, but the 14 -- the two-page schedule at the beginning is the one that will 15 be the one that ..... 16 Is the one that drives the process. 17 MR. McVEE: 18 Okay. Is there any further comments or discussion on '93 19 program? Mr. Rosier? 20 A question. In regards to the --MR. ROSIER: 21 to the '93 program, I understand based on the preliminaries 22 that we're looking at, we're looking at a fairly sizeable 23 program, something in the magnitude of I guess it's estimated 24 to exceed the -- the -- twice the amount of the -- the 25

settlement funds here on this.

You may recall we had quite a time with this in terms of finalizing some budgets here this year, that there were differing -- differing views amongst the Trustee Council as to the level of budgeting. Do we intend to give any -- I think it would be beneficial if we gave some -- some guidance to the R.T. in terms of -- of some level of funding that they -- they ought to be perhaps looking at here for this -- for this next round.

MR. McVEE: Do you have -- do you have something in mind, some approach in mind that -- I guess the reason I ask the question, Mr. Rosier, is that we have -- we've had -- asked the public for comment and we have not sorted that -- that entire package yet at this time. I don't know whether we can provide R.T. some -- the R.T. some guidance at this point prior to the time they sort that package. Maybe after they come forward with the preliminary sort that would give us some analysis of what -- what has been submitted, maybe that would a time where we could -- we could accomplish that.

I think that's -- that's appropriate, because along these lines, I guess I've had a little bit of concern since it took several meetings and I guess maybe one more before we finalize the '92 program. We're still looking at the -- the administrative support, and yet in our schedule, we're scheduled to deal with the '93 in one meeting, and I'm just --

I'm worried a little bit if we'll accomplish that. And ..... 1 MR. ROSIER: That's kind of my concern, 2 3 too, ..... MR. McVEE: Yeah. 4 Mr. Chairman. 5 MR. ROSIER: And if we can -- and I think, Carl, MR. McVEE: 6 yeah, your suggestion I think was getting at something that --7 8 that would help resolve that or help speed it. 9 Yes, Mr. Sandor? MR. SANDOR: Well, that's a good question, 10 however, I made an assumption that we would have learned from 11 this process and that we -- one of the principal delays in the 12 '92 was the -- the review by the scientist, Dr. Spies and that 13 all will have been done before we go to that meeting? That --14 or is that assumption false? 15 16 MR. McVEE: Dr. Montague? DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, the chief 17 scientist and the peer reviewers will be involved during that 18 July 22nd to 27th ranking process. 19 MR. SANDOR: Is that going to allow enough time 20 for scrutiny? It took more time than that it seemed to me to 21 -- to adjust the proposal in the '92 program proposals from 22 what was finally developed. 23 24 DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, the schedule indeed is extremely tight, and more time would be desirable, 25

but we see no way to be able to do that and still, you know, meet our 30-days before October 1 deadline.

MR. SANDOR: That's a cloud on the horizon. If that be the case, -- I don't know, maybe it would be appropriate to -- I hate putting Dr. Spies on the spot, but how much time does it take to -- you know, that seems like that's a small amount of time to review, and we're dealing with so many more projects. We won't have the -- you won't have a lot of the feedback from the '92 projects. Maybe -- maybe that's an impossible task for the scientific evaluation. How many days?

DR. MONTAGUE: One week.

MR. SANDOR: My gosh.

MR. ROSIER: Gee.

MR. SANDOR: Is that realistic, Dr. Spies?

MR. McVEE: Dr. Spies?

DR. SPIES: I just learned of this process on Friday, and I'm still trying formulate my thoughts about it. I -- I do have some concerns of that -- that is a very short time. I have yet to contact any peer reviewers I have that can come up here for that week, and I've -- I've got some other concerns as well.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes?

DR. MONTAGUE: I would like to point out that

## 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

there is a lot more time, more involvement scheduled for review of specific detailed project descriptions. As I mentioned, these brief project descriptions of which there are three pages now, after October 1 we anticipate two things potentially happening. One, a request for proposals is prepared, of which the peer review group would be involved in developing that request for proposals, and would also be on the selection committee to chose amongst several proposals. And in those cases where the project is being done by the agency, the detailed project description would be reviewed by the chief scientist and the peer reviewers, but that -- those are refinements, not decisions on whether a project goes ahead or not. One of the concerns that I have is DR. SPIES: that we -- I made recommendations to the Trustee Council last 15 16 year, and the sense of those was ..... Excuse me, Dr. Spies? 17 COURT REPORTER: ..... let's just do the things that DR. SPIES: we need to do to monitor critical populations. This year ..... MR. McVEE: Our Recorder isn't picking you up, DR. SPIES: Okay. ..... Dr. Spies. MR. McVEE: And -- and that -- that we need DR. SPIES: 25 to ....

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 MR. McVEE: It doesn't take long.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. SPIES: I feel so naked when I stand in front of this microphone.

But I think we need to develop a rational process for monitoring those populations that are still -- apparently still affected by the spill, have not recovered, and we really haven't done too much this year so far to get down that road, to identify a rational monitoring process that goes beyond several years and we can talk -- the -- the question always comes up, which species should we be monitoring every year, and can we skip a year and so on and so forth, and that process, those decisions have not been made yet, and I get a little bit worried that it's not progressing, so those are just some of my concerns. I realize that we're all facing a lot of work in a very short period of time.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. Dr. Spies, do you have any recommendations to us about the process we should adopt for the 1993 work plan or whatever you want to call it?

DR. SPIES: I -- as I said, I'm still formulating my thoughts, but I would like to be able to -- to get some more time for review and -- and I haven't been through all the steps yet, I'm just kind of reacting to them right now.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

1	MR. COLE: I think that it's very important
2	that Dr. Spies and his peer review group, if that's what you'd
3	probably call it, be active you might say active
4	participants in the formulation of this plan, because I for one
5	would like to see an element of independent counsel and
6	advice, and I thought that Dr. Spies and group's comments were
7	very helpful in our formulation of the 1992 work plan, so I
8	think we should get them in the process ear as soon as
9	possible.
10	MR. McVEE: Well, one of the things, then Carl,
11	one of the things I understand is the R.T. is going to be
12	meeting tomorrow and that I guess the other question was that
13	if Dr. Spies was going to have some time to input into that
14	meeting? I don't know if you
15	DR. SPIES: Yeah, we'd already made plans
16	with
17	MR. McVEE: had plans to do that?
18	DR. SPIES: I'd talked to Dave about this point
19	and we we'd agreed to to meet together tomorrow.
20	MR. McVEE: It seems like that would be useful.
21	Yes, Mr. Rosier?
22	MR. ROSIER: I'm trying to understand the
23	the process here a little bit, but I I tend to agree with
24	Attorney General Cole in terms of outside review, especially in
25	view of the fact that the that this year you're taking on

the additional -- the additional work associated with, quote, public type proposals on this. In the past we've had the agency people there that could interact with you. It seems to me that -- that in terms of -- of the process, somehow or other we really need to have some public involvement there, somebody -- the -- the P.I.'s of -- for potential public proposals that would interact with the scientific group or something here it would seem to me, and I'm not sure that our process accommodates that kind of involvement at the present time.

DR. SPIES: Yeah. I would -- I'd like to see that we don't develop a perception that the -- the agencies are .....

MR. ROSIER: Absolutely.

DR. SPIES: ..... are designing the programs into budgets to -- to fit what they can do and -- and the restoration program, that we have wide participation from anybody that's qualified to do this sort of work and -- and .....

MR. ROSIER: Absolutely.

DR. SPIES: ..... I don't know exactly how that can be done, but I would like to see it addressed.

MR. McVEE: Well, that's -- that's part of the problem, you know, that we kind of alluded to earlier, is that without the over-all restoration plan, that we're -- we're in this mode that -- where -- where we're -- we intend to look at

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

specifics and maybe not look at the over-all issues as -- as broadly as we should. It seems to me like that's what Dr. Spies' involvement that -- and his suggestion, the comments on monitoring are -- are very appropriate.

MR. SANDOR: Can we formally agree, certainly

I'd like the record to reflect exactly what has just been said.

Is there any objection to that?

MR. COLE: That -- all this is on the record.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I mean -- I'd -- I'd like a complete agreement on that. I don't want to have, you know, arrive at the time this and take -- you know, only got seven days, and that's not enough time, and I think that's why Carl brought that up, ....

MR. ROSIER: That's correct.

MR. SANDOR: .... Mr. Cole, how can we assure that? I just think we've got to take the additional time to be .....

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes?

MR. COLE: I would just say let's go back and see where, you know, sort of where we -- we have a segment of the Alaska population who thinks that -- or may think that this is just agencies of the state and federal government with their own agenda driving the selection of these projects, and that may or may not be a legitimate perception, but, you know, I'm

## 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

called upon to justify my votes and decisions often against all sorts of criticisms I might add, but I -- I feel very comfortable in saying, look, we have Dr. Spies and this independent organization and peer reviewers to whom we can turn and help us make the final call and seek independent advice, and I think that's essential in this process, that -- that they, you know, have an involvement from the early stages up to the final decision making, and I think it's Trustees, and I'm looking at sort of the legal aspects, that -- that we ought well to be able to turn to independent advice to avoid perceptions of conflict of interest which are making the -- the decisions for us. And that's why I think it's very important. Plus they give us good, sound advice.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, could I offer a suggestion that may help out?

First of all, getting back to assumption number one that -- that a draft plan was necessary to prepare a budget and a budget was necessary by September 1st, you know, again assuming that that is the case, then currently, the current schedule only has the chief scientist and peer reviewers involved during the 22nd through the 27th of July. The Restoration Team is going to have two more meetings after that before the draft is developed, and I think we could formalize the chief scientist and peer reviewers' role during those two Restoration Team meetings. So that would offer a fair

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

increase.

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

And a second point, since most projects are -- won't begin until January 1st, that the -- there's a fair amount of time for the chief scientist and the peer reviewers to change the draft into the final work plan upon December 1st.

MR. McVEE: Yes, I -- I think those are good suggestions. I don't hear -- I don't hear any disagreement among the Trustee Council, and my suggestion would be that based upon the discussion, unless you want to provide more formal direction to the R.T., is that -- is that the R.T. is meeting -- at its meeting tomorrow with Dr. Spies work this out That will give both the R.T., you know, within the schedule. time to think this through as well as Dr. Spies an opportunity to look at -- at this in a little more depth and what kind of a commitment that he's making, and then -- and provide us with -with an updated schedule if that seems realistic. I think your quidance has been pretty clear without -- without formal action, as someone did (indiscernible). All right.

Any other discussion on the -- the '93 work plan? If there is not any further discussion on that -- that item, we will recess until 1:15. And back here at 1:15 then.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. McVEE: We'll reconvene the meeting of the Trustee Council and proceed on with the agenda items. It's

shown as agenda item five, status of the habitat protection working group. Dave, you're going to lead that discussion?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes. It's -- it's a brief discussion. It was just more of an informational item to let you know that we've -- we've -- like I said earlier, we finalized the -- we've got a draft final version of the habitat protection process. The habitat working group is going to meet on the seventh to consider that -- the eighth, excuse me, to consider that, and then as quickly as possible after that to go for a 30-day public comment period on the habitat protection process. But that's -- basically I wanted to -- to let you know that we're moving on that and the package is near completion.

MR. McVEE: Okay. There's no action that we need to take at this time then, Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: No, not that I know of. It was clear at the last Trustee Council meeting that the Trustee Council said to add a third threshold criteria dealing with contingent valuation, and then go forward for public comment on it, so we're -- we're in a process of proceeding as quickly as we can on that.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Dr. Gibbons, we had some work advice from The Nature Conservancy. What role are they playing, and what advice are they -- is that organization

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

giving you -- has -- have been giving?

DR. GIBBONS: We've worked with The Nature

Conservancy some, primarily lately on the threshold of imminent

threat process, but that's -- we've worked with them, got -
gotten their ideas and tried to include them where we -- where

we thought that it was -- it was appropriate.

MR. SANDOR: Thank you.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Well, maybe I've been remiss, I probably have, but -- but do we have any documentation on the work so far of this subcommittee?

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah, at the last Trustee Council meeting there was a package provided that had flow charts and detailed explanations of the steps that the process goes through, and two threshold criteria. I think it was your suggestion, Mr. Cole, to develop a third one. We've done that and then it was -- the direction I understand from the Trustee Council was to then go forward to the public and get public comment on that, but it would be basically the package that was presented at the last Trustee Council plus a third threshold criteria and organized into something that the public can understand, rather than a series of flow charts and -- and explanations.

MR. COLE: Well, my thought which I've been

mulling over as I think about these things is that I would like this group to consider the -- the formulation or the -- of a group which, while I've been criticized for it in the past and probably will be in the future some more, of what I call the grand plan for the acquisition of habitat in Prince William Sound. And my thought is that we should get someone on board quickly who has the experience in the form of land planning, land valuation and development, together with a multidisciplined group to look at the entire -- not just the Sound, but the entire spill-affected area, from a long-range point of view, and to start now developing that project, and so that maybe by January we can have the broad outlines of what that group would propose for us, although my friend, Mr. Collinsworth, thinks and maybe properly so that we have been slow, I don't think we've been slow as I said. think we should get onto this and -- and -- immediately and not wait for some public comment and things like that, because then -- then, you know, one might say, well, it's too late to do this in '93, you know, and it's not part of the '93 plan, so we'd better start thinking about it in '94, and we could sort of, in my view, this idea of establishing priorities for the acquisition of habitat, we could start formulating plans to talk with contiguous land owners and maybe putting together joint agreements. You know, it doesn't do us any good to buy plot A which is about to be logged if we at the same time don't

## 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

reach an agreement with the adjoining contiguous land owner and say, well, 'cause you're not going to move -- log the area next to it to next year, and -- 'cause then I can see a whole series of -- of, you know, well, we'll just have to keep buying lands like dominoes, or it's all going to be logged, so we need to start thinking about it, and like the Forest Service -- where's Mr. Barton? Oh, he's not here today. You know, there's no use buying this land here and then the Forest Service say, "well, you know, we want to do a little clear cutting over there, 'cause it's getting --" Mr. Sandor, he's -- he and I talked about clear cutting before, so I don't want to start a full (ph) loons (ph).

But, you know, I mean, we have to do this, and we just can't do it by saying, "Well, let's get this tract, and then we'd better hurry over here. They're going to log this tract" and so forth, and we'll just be jerked around for the next ten years. So we have to, you know, get this, what I call a crystallized, long-range plan that -- anyway, that's enough.

MR. McVEE: Any comment from --? Yes, Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair, I think those are

valuable comments and I think they reinforce some things that

the habitat protections working group has been discussing. In

fact on the eighth, next -- a week from Wednesday, we're going

to be talking about precisely that, and hopefully have some

recommendations to you folks on how we can best get a handle on

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

baseline information so that we -- it won't be '94 before we can take any habitat protection action. If you will allow that time, we should hopefully shortly thereafter have available for you sort of an approach if you will.

MR. COLE: May I follow up on that first,
Mr. Sandor, before ....?

You -- but -- but you see, as we do this, I think we need people who have experience and -- and are, you know, with skills and abilities in this area, not -- because I don't think the Restoration Team necessarily, you know, they've a lot of valuable skills and everything, but I mean we need somebody to tell us how you organize and put together this whole thing, because I keep -- that I visualize somehow out there, but I have a little trouble articulating.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, my recollection was that The Nature Conservancy did a paper or a book on this very issue to the Trustee Council, I guess through the Forest Service which had some type of study arranged that -- and that provided a basis or a background, or, you know, a foundation for further work. It seems to me with that background plus the fact that The Nature Conservancy, you know, around the United States has done similar studies of -- of opportunities for habitat acquisition, protection of some sensitive areas, has a tremendous amount of expertise, you know, that could do that,

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

and -- and I guess I had thought we in fact even authorized a more formal arrangement of some type to -- to in effect, you know, get this process moving, in fact even using The Nature Conservancy under contract or -- or something. Is -- is my memory completely collapsing?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chair?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: If I -- if I may respond to that, The Nature Conservancy did us an options document that provided that various options for -- for habitat protection through conservation easements, through direct acquisition, and that -- that provides a basis for giving us bunch of options. They'd worked on us (sic) through the imminent threat process.

What I heard Mr. Cole saying was something perhaps a little different than that, and that is provide the bigger picture of how these options and the other things fit together in a plan, so if we got a parcel of -- of land in -- Kodiak, and a parcel in Prince William Sound, how do they -- how do they fit towards the restoration? May- -- maybe I'm wrong, but that's what I was -- I was reading into those -- those comments.

MS. RUTHERFORD: And I think how they compare in value.

MR. McVEE: As I understand, one of the next things that will happen will be, you know, by the -- the

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

habitat protection/land acquisition, whether that work group or some other reformed work group would be to -- to identify the habitats that are critical, that are essential to -- to facilitate the recovery of some of the damaged -- damaged species and services.

DR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, our -- our concept of the habitat protection working group was to initially have a group made up of some Restoration Team members and some other members, some -- we have some expertise from the various agencies on this group, to provide the process, and then bring in the technical experts, the -- the appraisers, the -- the land planners, those types of folks and to -- to do the detail work. That was -- that was our thoughts on -- on the working group, but ....

MR. McVEE: I guess what I'm hearing here is that, you know, from -- from Council members is that maybe we need to get on with reforming that work group, whether as part of the old, you know, -- the old work group that's finalizing the documents going out or whether it's an entirely new one, I don't know, but .....

Yes, Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair, I think that's exactly right. Maybe I didn't say it clearly enough. What we -- what we -- we recognize is we have to figure out a way to get a handle on the -- the grand plan, and on the 8th that's

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

one of the things we're going to discuss is how we do that, and hopefully we'll come back to you with a couple of options, maybe even only one, a recommended approach, and I -- it is my opinion that The Nature Conservancy could well play a role in that, trying to get a handle on the implementations.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, as I recall when -- in our discussion of 1993 work plan, we have agreed to reword that section that -- that the Trustee Council recognizes there is public support for habitat acquisition projects. Trustee Council is analyzing opportunities to acquire the critical habitat through fee title or easements or other processes, and that process of actually acquiring these critical habitats will be undertaken in 1993, and I guess I'm understanding that -- that you're confirming that. Have you or do you need or can we reaffirm the authority that you have to go -- that is, the Restoration Team, to -- to go to external groups such as The Nature Conservancy or other organi- -- other individuals to get what we're talking about?

MS. RUTHERFORD: I don't think we feel that we need reaffirmation of the authority. I think that if one of our options involves money, we would feel like we would have to come back to you for that authority.

MR. SANDOR: Well, you can't get anything for -- except a free lunch for -- we need (indiscernible,

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

laughter), but -- but I guess -- I guess I'm a little bit 1 skeptical that we have the ability just within the agencies, 2 and that I -- I would feel that we ought to look at the 3 opportunity to get a group like The Nature Conservancy or 4 someone from outside government to -- that has experience in 5 this area to provide some guidance, and I guess that would 6 require funding, is this what you're saying? 7 8 MS. RUTHERFORD: Yes. And up until -- up until 9 now we have not felt like we were in a position to try to suggest any options to you for -- for this next step. We are 10 -- we now feel like we're about there, but we -- we need to get 11 12 a handle on what we think the money is that would be involved before we can suggest that to you. Maybe by your next meeting 13 which is I think hopefully scheduled August 3rd by 14 teleconference, maybe we can have something to you at that 15 16 point. MR. SANDOR: That will be great. You know, the 17 18 days are shorter, and ..... MR. COLE: They sure are. 19 MR. SANDOR: .... but the -- and -- and 1993 20 is not far behind, ..... 21 MR. COLE: Summer's almost over. 22 MR. SANDOR: .... so, yeah, let's do that. 23 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman? 24 MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole? 25

1 | 2 | lit | 3 | Der | 4 | Der | 5 | the | 6 | so | 7 | nee | 8 | the | 9 | the | 10 | have | 11 | some | some | some | 11 | some | so

19

MR. COLE: I'd -- I'd like to follow up a

little bit in this area, but maybe -- maybe some people in the

Department of Natural Resources, maybe some people in the

Department of the Interior or Agriculture, you know, work with

these lands and forests throughout the country, in planning and

6 so forth. Maybe that ability's there to -- to find what we

7  $\parallel$  need, to give us some help, and I think the -- you know, as

they say, probably we should reach out and see what's really

9 there. We could even go to Washington, D.C. and see if they

10 have some people back there who have some -- who could give us

11 some help. But for example, I thought, you know, we -- we get

12 | these proposals to buy this tract and so forth, and I've sort

13 of thought, well, listen, we could go to these people and say,

14 "Well, we'll make you a deal, we'll divide this checkerboard

15 into 160-acre tracts, and we'll buy every other tract, and you

16 keep yours, and then we will have, you know, a series of -- of

17 covenants running with the land, or agreements of that nature,

18 and so then we'll preserve this whole area, and you want to

preserve it, you know, et cetera, et cetera, we'll make you a

20 nice deal, you know, we'll preserve half, you preserve your

21 half." I mean, I -- I'd like to see that sort of creativity,

22 you know, at least thought about, and things like that. I

23 mean, we -- we should, you know, think -- there are people out

24 there who must do this for a living who could really give us

25 some guidance and help and tell us how to do these things as we

struggle with this. Maybe you .....

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. COLLINSWORTH: Well, I was going to say, I hope there's not a lot of people that do this for a living.

(Laughter)

MR. COLLINSWORTH: At least for a living anyway.

No, I -- I agree with -- with Mr. Cole. I -- you know, but if -- this -- this is not -- this can -- can be as complex and bureaucratic as we want to make it. You know, there are some -- some physical resources that exist and some biological resources that exist in Prince William Sound, and those are -lend themselves to -- to be inventoried, and mapped, and classified. And I don't know whether we have done it yet or not, but certainly the skills reside within both state and federal agencies who do that kind of work. The Forest Service is quite skilled at -- at looking at large land bodies and classifying the land bodies, identifying the land uses or the land types, vegetary -- vegetative types, resource use types, human use types, viewsheds, and other thing things, and it seems basically what we need to do is to get into, you know, and -- and map Sound, inventory the Sound. I mean, maybe it's already been done, but you -- you inventory and map the Sound, and then you identify those kinds of -- of resources, the -the habitats that are supportive of fish and wildlife, the -the land that is supportive of various kinds of recreational

activities, the land that's supportive of various kinds of economic enterprise, the lands that -- that are perhaps lend to the -- kind of the aesthetics and the ecology of the Sound, the -- the viewshed so to speak. And once you do these mappings and develop these overlays, then -- then you -- then you can start looking at what your options are for -- perhaps for acquisition.

At the same time that you map it, you also map the ownership, whether it's private or public or, you know, various kinds of corporate ownerships, and then -- then you -- then once you have that information before you, you can start talking about the relative value of viewsheds, or raparians (ph) zones or deer habitat or bear habitat, tideland sanctuaries or marsh lands for various kinds of birds, and -- and then you can -- once you make those kind of evaluations can move forward in the -- in kind of the land acquisition mode or -- or at least land use acquisition.

And -- and then you -- then you see if you can find, you know, willing sellers and willing buyers, or willing land managers to be able to agree to put the land to certain kinds of uses over a period of time. I don't think it has to be -- I don't think it has to be hugely bureaucratic to -- to get the job done.

By the way, I always -- don't always agree with the Forest Service on what they do with the information after

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

they've got it, but they do a very good job of collecting it. 1 2 MR. SANDOR: You and (indiscernible, laughter) MR. McVEE: Other comments? Yes, Mr. Rosier? 3 MR. ROSIER: Just -- just a short comment to 4 enter on this. I notice that my colleague from NOAA has -- has 5 consistently referred to Prince William Sound when he's been 6 7 referring to land damage or land sales here, and I would hope 8 that we do have something that extended beyond Prince William 9 Sound in terms of the options that we're dealing here on this. I think there's an oil spill area that we've tried to deal with 10 on that, so I think it's important that we keep that concept in 11 12 mind. 13 MR. COLE: You have in mind Afognak or something like that? 14 15 MR. ROSIER: A possibility. 16 MR. BRODERSON: Cape Suckling? MR. ROSIER: No. 17 18 MR. COLE: Well, so anyway, -- Mr. Chairman? 19 MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole? 20 MR. COLE: Well, if a motion is order -- in an order, I will make, as my good friend Mike Stepovich used to 21 22 say, a motion along those lines, and that we should get on with this now and not wait until we have all of the damage 23 assessment materials, because if we wait until we get all the 24 25 damage assessment and the studies done, and then start this,

then we're going to be lagging six months to a year behind. think we should get this mapping and taking the inventory Mr. Collinsworth suggested, and get this group going and do that so we can plug it all together soon.

MR. SANDOR: Second that motion along those lines.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman, I -- I'm not altogether clear on -- on all the projects that we approved or didn't approve this year, but we had a lot of proposals to do some habitat relationship studies so that we could move ahead with this project, or this effort, and as I recall, we -- we eliminated most of those projects and so to -- to accomplish what Attorney General Cole proposes would, if I recall right, would require a significant increase in the amount of habitat data that we're gathering out there this summer. Maybe Dr. Gibbons can correct me or Marty can correct me on that.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair, yes, we did -- we did turn them down, they're not in the -- they're not in -- they're not in the current work plan.

I would beg the Trustee Council's not passing a motion until August 3rd, like we -- allow us this -- this last little bit of time to give you some options on different approaches and what the -- what you give up for each of them, what you gain for each of them, and hopefully by the 3rd we'll have

#### R & R COURT\_REPORTERS

something that you'll -- that you can react to, and it -- not just "along those lines".

MR. WOLFE: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: Another point is I think Attorney
General Cole made a point earlier is we had a brief verbal
status, but nothing substantive that we could look at and re-- and see where we are and where we're going with this whole
habitat protection issue, and I think maybe at our next Trustee
Council meeting it would be appropriate to have some kind of a
paper that maybe laid out that third alternative approach as
well as kind of where we're at at this point in time.

MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I -- I have the sense that we should get on with it, and that there's no reason for delay. I mean, -- 'cause I think eventually that's where we're going to wind up being anyway, and -- and, you know, we should get on with it now, and I think as Mr. Collinsworth said, that probably this should have been done two or three years ago, but, you know, it's timely now, and, sure, we turned some down, but those were sort of discrete type studies or projects, and we're now talking about not discrete studies of particular areas of habitat, but a broad plan, you know, an over-all plan.

And I -- and, Mr. Rosier, I thought I said, you know, at least in my self-defense, the oil spill affected areas, I

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

didn't limit it to Prince William Sound, you know, but, anyway, I have in mind that it should be all of the spill affected area, take this inventory like Commissioner Collinsworth said.

MR. McVEE: Okay. I guess maybe let me try to paraphrase this -- what I understand the motion is, that -- in its broadest context, is that we instruct the R.T. to proceed with the -- with implementing a habitat land acquisition plan, you know, the early phases of this might be the -- starting to collect all the data in -- in one place of damaged -- of the damaged species -- the habitats that are utilized by damaged species or services, and -- and also land status, so that we start the process of developing the -- the over-all program.

We -- we will have, and -- and I think that the -- the work group has done a remarkable job on the -- the process and procedures, so it seems like this, you know, is the next phase. That's what the public will be reviewing, so it seems like the -- the next phase is to start to do those things which will allow us to implement those procedures, and as I understand it, that's what Mr. Cole has asked the R.T. to do basically.

MR. COLE: Well, when -- when I really have some fuzzy thinking, I just say "along those lines," but I really think that Commissioner Collinsworth expression of what he thought should be done provides very good guidance, if his remarks could be transcribed and -- and presented to the

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

Restoration Team, I think they would have a good starting point or guidance of what the motion contemplates.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Very good. Yes, Mr. Rice?

MR. RICE: Mr. Rice, just a point of clarification, it's been pointed out that we did have some suite of projects that were -- at least went through some review. Some of those were directed or -- or could -- were directed towards giving us a lot of the information that -- that Mr. Collinsworth had pointed out that we need. I think what we'd envision was waiting until the '93 budget in order to resurface some of those and -- and put them into more focused a package.

However, we could at Trustee -- Trustee Council direction go back and -- and work on those as part of the package that Marty is pulling together and come back to the Trustee Council with some projects that would be out of phase with '93. There's no -- no reason why a lot of that work can't be started before this coming October if funds are available.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, there may be -- there may be a need to finance and fiscally support some new projects, but it is my sense that just a whole lot of this information already exists probably to enough detail to allow us -- probably in enough detail to allow us to plan at the

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

level that we're talking about. All of the streams in Prince William Sound are in the anadromous stream catalog that have salmon in them.

I'm -- that should -- you know, dollars to donuts that -- that if we -- if you went to the Department of Fish and Game that they could provide you the information about recreational species of fishes, where they -- you know, they're -- where they're fished and where they -- the fish originate if they're fresh water, or -- or locations where they're fished if they're marine species. And they can tell you where the bear habitat is, the deer habitat. I would -- I'll bet the Fish and Wildlife Service can map the -- the areas important for marine birds and ducks and predators, eagles, perigrins and I -- I think a lot of that in- -- I mean, I think essentially all of the information that you would need to do this mapping probably is information that already exists, and to -- I don't think we need to finance and go out and start to -- to do a lot of new The -- I think the information is there habitat studies. and -- and, you know, we don't need to -- to re-invent it.

And we also should keep track of the degree to which -you know, how much detail is -- is necessary. Do you need to
know down to the last acre that a deer in Prince William Sound
had ever put their footy-print in, then you're probably going
to have to spend quite a bit more money, but generally you know
the habitat types and the area that support deer in Prince

## 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

William Sound and in the other areas, just as an example of species. So I don't think you need to get down to -- to, you know, very minute detail, but the data probably already exists. I think it does.

MR. McVEE: Any further -- yes, Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman? Yeah, I -- what -- what I'm hearing is when we come back up to the August 3rd Trustee Council meeting, we're going to have a grand plan outline for you and what I propose to do is to -- to tell you what kind of data is available what -- where holes exist in that data that we feel that we -- we need, so -- and in that grand plan it should have the -- the framework for that, also the information -- the ideas of information that we have and information that we need, so for the August 3rd meeting, that -- that's what I envision coming back to you with.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: I guess maybe I'm getting confused here, because I thought we had agreed, and -- and I thought that Attorney General Cole had just affirmed that we wanted to integrate the land acquisition process into the over-all restoration planning effort that we're working on right at this point in time. I -- to come up with a grand scheme for land acquisition outside of that process at this point seems to frustrate our attempts, our efforts to bring this whole

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

restoration effort together in -- in one -- one document.

Charlie, is that what you intended? Are do you just want to know what we're doing and that we are going ahead in a timely manner?

MR. COLE: Well, I -- I think as Commissioner Collinsworth says that we should start collecting all of this data which exists. There must be aerial photographs out there of all this so we know where everything is, start putting it together, and then as -- once we find out where all this habitat is, where the ducks are, where the bears are and all, et cetera, et cetera, then as we get more data, then we can start putting priorities on we should buy this tract and -- because it has the highest priority, you know, but I -- I think that it's -- it's best that we start integrating all this material now. Isn't that what you had in mind?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Yeah.

MR. COLE: I think (ph) so.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Okay.

MR. McVEE: Isn't -- isn't that also essential when the timing is right in terms of the restoration plan that's the same data to a large extent that will be critical to the restoration so we have to -- we'll -- we'll have to have that same information as part of that process.

Is there further discussion? Any opposition to the motion to provide direction to the R.T. as per

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

Mr. Collinsworth's statement? Okay. Motion passed.

MR. COLE: Can I bring up another subject?

MR. McVEE: Yes, you may, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Are we all satisfied that we do not want to take a look at acquiring some options on some of this threatened land? Have we exhausted that? I'm not just sure where we are. What happened to that thought? Did -- did we regard it as a waste of money or where are we on that?

MR. McVEE: Staff have any comment on that?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chair, as far as I know, where we were on that is that was part of a package that was presented at the last Trustee Council meeting, and that was going out for public comment and like I mentioned earlier, that's -- that's as quick as we -- we can get it out is maybe mid July. That's part of that package, and -- and it was my understanding that the Trustee Council was waiting for -- for public comment on that before they -- they moved ahead, but that -- that was my understanding.

MR. McVEE: That process did have procedures for -- for lands or resources which were under imminent threat?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

MR. COLE: Well, let me just say I don't know of there's anyone else, any other Trustee, but, you know, I'm not sure we can wait for decisions for public comment in exigent circumstances, but if none exist, fine, but if -- if

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

circumstances exist where immediate action one way or the other is required by the board, I mean, I just think we ought to do it, and, you know, -- I mean, I don't think we wait for public comment, you know. The scene of the crime, you know, you can't wait for the judge to get there.

MR. McVEE: Further questions? Yes, Mr.

Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, a follow-up question. Do we then have the authority or -- let me say this, at the next Trustee Council meeting, August 3rd or whenever, certainly the staff, the Restoration Team has I guess adequate direction that they would in fact be able to present an option package, is that true?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair?

MR. McVEE: Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Again, just to clarify, this option package would simply be different ways to get the information to you. I mean, it could be hire a staff person to gather all the available information into a massive, you know, plan. It could be hire TNC to impose (ph) their process that they've been using throughout the United States, or throughout the country -- actually throughout the whole continent, to identify critical habitat. It could be new contract to get some additional information where there -- where we know we don't have something. It could be a whole series of these

things. That's what we mean -- what I meant by make -- make options available to you. Is that what you referring to?

MR. SANDOR: No, I was really going a step further by saying that, you know, is it conceivable that we would have a proposal to -- to take, you know, an option on some critical habitats that have already been identified?

MS. RUTHERFORD: We -- oh, I don't think we had perceived being able to do that by August 3rd. There is, like you -- like Dave had indicated, there is an immediate crit- -- imminent threat process in that package you received at the last meeting. I suppose it is not beyond the realm of possibility that in some way we could ask the public to com- -- let us know where they think there is imminent threat and then we could run that through the process and -- not by August 3rd, and come back to you with action items. But, I mean, right now we are not doing that. We would need your direction to start that.

MR. SANDOR: It would be my hope that, as one member of the Council, that -- that we would be able to be in a position of -- if critical habitat has been identified and -- and -- which I think it has, or at least been alleged, if it can be verified to be such, that we be able to -- to act on it August -- you know, this -- this -- certainly this summer, this fall at the latest. We -- these things have been .....

MS. RUTHERFORD: Right.

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: .... before us now for, you know, seven, eight months. I don't know, is that unreasonable from the standpoint of -- of action?

MR. COLE: I'm not the world's reason- -- most reasonable man, so don't ask me.

MR. SANDOR: Well, let's try it for God's sakes.

MR. COLE: I -- I just think, you know, as

Commissioner Sandor says, you know, the days are getting

shorter. I mean, you know, and this season is over really in

many ways. We wait, you know, until August -- August 3rd or

something, I mean, this season is over. I mean, we're talking

about next year as of August 3rd, because the snow is, you

know, and -- and the storms are out there certainly by, you

know, September 15th. That's gone, and the season's over in,

what is that, a few days. And I just think we have to move

faster, and make more decisions, get on with it. You know,

we're just getting stifled I think in -- you know, in process.

MR. SANDOR: We become bureaucratic.

MR. McVEE: I guess -- guess my question is -is there some way that we can -- the R.T. or the land
acquisition work group could go back through the various
proposals, you know, and sort through them, you know, with
--with the knowledge within the -- within the various agencies
and -- and identify any areas that are under immediate threat,

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

you know, with- -- within a short period of time here before

August or before September or whatever? Is there some way we

could -- we could do that?

I guess looking for a source of information we could utilize to -- to arrive at, you know, arrive at a definition of the -- of the problem?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes?

MR. COLE: I just want to have another -- I mean, the public has told us, not that I necessarily agree with all, you know, the views, but they want habitat acquisition. We've seen that. I mean, we've had public comment on that, ....

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. COLE: .... you know, galore, and I don't think, you know, if we want to accept that public comment, you know, it's right for us to accept it now without seeking more public comment, because we've had a surfeit of public comment on that subject, and, you know, I think we should get about to acting upon it rather than say, "Well, we should wait and have more public comment." I mean, we've had it.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Marty?

MS. RUTHERFORD: I'm going to go out on a limb, because I've not run this past, obviously, the habitat

#### 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

protection or the Restoration Team, but I don't think it's -it is impossible for the restoration team to identify the ideas
that came in as part of the '93 work plan that were for
specific habitat protection, and arrange with the -- the TNC to
do immediate threat analysis, and have available within fairly
short order a package of action for you.

MR. McVEE: I guess (ph) .....

MR. COLE: Who TNC you're referring to?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Oh, I'm sorry, .....

MR. SANDOR: The Nature Conservancy.

MS. RUTHERFORD: .... The Nature Conservancy.

12 They do have, you know, a lot of experience in this. I'm --

13 I'm hesitant to say that the Restoration Team could, you know,

itself pull that off in that -- in -- in short order, but I'm

sure we could get it done, and one option would be The Nature

16 | Conservancy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

19

25

MR. McVEE: Well, that seems like a very

18 positive approach. Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Yes, I think that is. There are

20 | habitats already identified as critical. I don't think there's

21 any question at all that nesting -- harlequin duck, those

22 nesting sites, you know, are surely critical, that those have

23 been identified, and I guess within a four (ph). My gosh, if

24 | they're -- if those are -- those simply ought to be protected.

I don't -- I mean, you know, if they're under some kind of a

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

threat, those and related habitat should be -- should be protected, and -- anyway -- but with the assurance that -- that there's going to be something presented on August 3 or whenever our next Trustee Council meeting is, that's great.

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, .....

MR. McVEE: Yes?

DR. GIBBONS: .... I -- I think we can give you something, but -- but my concern is the level of detail and so I -- I'm less confident than Marty is on this, but until we start dealing with this level of detail, rather than say harlequin ducks nest on Knight Island or something like that, we -- we need some more defined, you know, links between injured resources and -- and their habitat, so I'm -- I'm leaving it open. Hopefully we've got it and we can -- we can give it to you, but I'm -- I'm somewhat concerned of linking some of those.

MR. COLE: Let me address that if you would, Mr. Chairman, please?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: It's -- it's not that we're saying that -- to acquire this particular habitat now, because I agree strongly that we have to have the requisite, you know, legal-slash-virgal (ph) factual link. But I'm -- I'm saying we should be, as Commissioner Collinsworth says, acquiring this information, putting it together so when we find, you know,

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

the link, I mean, we don't have to wait months again to get back and plug that link into where this habitat is. That's what I'm getting at. I don't know if -- Commissioner Rosier, do you agree with ....?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Well, I'm getting two signals here on this, and I, you know, I'm going to kind of come to the defense of the staff a little bit here, because I hear certainly kind of talking a little bit about the -- the need to begin to bring the information together, and I don't disagree with that, but on the other hand I hear, you know, Commissioner Sandor talking about having a process in place to in fact buy or make commitments to buy right away, and -- and certainly I think both things are necessary at least in my view in -- in terms of responding to the -- to the public and the -- the information that they've been supplying us right from the very first meeting here in Anchorage. But which -- you know, I'm not convinced that we can do both. I don't know, maybe we can hear from the staff in this regard between now and August, but as I heard John, he wants to be in a position to move ahead in terms of -- of actually acquiring land or access to land by August on this.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, yeah, to clarify, a number of critical habitats, you know, or the -- the description of

## 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

saying nesting areas of harlequin ducks as a for instance, and so -- and -- and at least four of such sites have been identified, and -- and in one or two instances it's been alleged at least that part of the lands that in fact have been suggested for acquisition include such habitats. If -- if those lands are subject to, you know, to modification or those habitats are threatened, then that shouldn't take a great deal of -- of study to determine whether that's the case of not. We ought to at the very least buy -- or get an option and -- at least to make a commitment and to make a financial commitment to do the necessary work to, you know, define the specific and I guess that's exactly what I thought the boundaries, folks at The Nature Conservancy was suggesting was that. fact they had a proposal, you know, for Chugach land if that was -- that was modified or I quess the background of it changed though. It wasn't, you know, an open issue. should be prepared to make a financial commitment, whatever, as we did this morning on this study. There's no reason why we can't make that kind of a financial commitment. We shouldn't do it blindly, but at least the option could be purchased, you know, if there was still some uncertainty. This -- it has to be done scientifically certainly, and -- a sound -- sound decision, but I'm -- I'm just concerned that this will pass into the fall and into the next, '93.

MR. McVEE: Yeah, winter and it snowballs

# 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

1	into
2	MR. SANDOR: Yeah.
3	MR. COLE: Well, you could buy land in the
4	winter.
5	MR. SANDOR: That's true.
6	MR. McVEE: It may be hard to appraise,
7	that's
8	MR. COLE: Yeah, it might be hard to survey.
9	MR. McVEE: I guess we we don't have any
10	formal action I guess before us at this time, but we've
11	we've given guidance to the to the R.T. on this.
12	Marty, was there any questions you have to
13	MS. RUTHERFORD: No, I
14	MR. McVEE: get clarification on that
15	guidance.
16	MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair, I think it's very
17	clear what you're looking for, and we'll move with all haste as
18	much as we can. I I think we can come up with the options
19	for the base line information and I think we can give you
20	tell you how quickly we could do threat analysis on '93 ideas
21	by August 3rd. That's my opinion.
22	MR. McVEE: Very good. Shall we move on to the
23	next item on the agenda? Item six on the agenda is the status
24	of the symposium. Mr. Morris, you have a report?
25	MR. MORRIS: Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman, you

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

should have a copy of the OSPIS (ph) symposium progress report in your package, or it was -- actually it was handed out this morning. You should have also received a copy by fax last week. This should be a duplicate of -- of that earlier copy.

I'm also passing out some background information materials.

At the April 27th Trustee Council meeting you gave us approval to organize an oil spill symposium and proceedings and approved the amount of \$25,000.00 for this effort. The Trustee Council also instructed the Restoration team to come back with greater detail and organization, cost estimates, and a timeline for the symposium. You also instructed the Restoration Team to include non-natural resource damage assessment sponsored science in the symposium, and to seek a contractor or cosponsor as a partner for organizing the symposium, and Alaska Sea Grant was a specific suggestion that was given at the last council meeting.

The Restoration Team is pleased to report that substantial progress has been made on all these items. We have organized a symposium planning committee made up of representatives from the Trustee agencies that operates voluntarily to organize this symposium. We have met several times and we'll continue to meet in the future. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday.

It's been proposed that we establish an editorial

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

committee which would be a subset of the symposium planning committee to deal with review of submissions of papers for the symposiums, the abstracts that would be developed with the presentations at the symposium, and consequently to deal with the review of the actual manuscripts that would go into the proceedings.

We feel that this task -- this task is composed of -includes two scientists and will include some peer reviewers.
We feel that this task is within the -- the present scope of
both the chief scientist's duties and those of peer review, and
through Dr. Spies I was able to obtain an estimate of the -the cost of these duties for the sypos- -- symposium planning,
and -- and it would be about \$3,600.00 for the chief scientist
and four to \$5,000.00 for peer reviewers' time. We -- we're
not asking for this additional money, we feel it's already in
the present budgets.

MR. COLE: I'm sorry, how much was that?

MR. MORRIS: Three and a half thousand dollars

for the chief scientist's time and four to 5,000 for one to two

peer reviewers.

We have found a potential co-sponsor, organizer for this symposium. Alaska Sea Grant has expressed genuine interest in serving as the co-sponsor of the symposium, and as a co-sponsor they would assume some portion of the costs of organizing the symposium. And in return they would become a

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

member of the financial -- not financial, symposium planning committee, so they may sure that they're in tune with -- with the steps that are being taken for the organization.

I have in your -- in the progress report here a brief description of who Alaska Sea Grant is. I won't go into detail. Basically they're the marine counterpart of land grant colleges. They were authorized by Congress in 1966, and Alaska Sea Grant was -- was initiated in 1970.

The -- the portion of Alaska Sea Grant that will help us organize the symposium is the public information services project which is located in Fairbanks at the School of Fisheries and Ocean Science at the University of Alaska.

We feel that the expertise of Alaska Sea Grant is ideally suited to co- -- co-sponsorship and organization of the symposium. They've had plenty of experience in similar types of endeavors in the past.

They're willing to assume some of the costs. For example, they're salaries would be donated, their labor to -- to the organization would be donated to the symposium.

We intend to open the symposium to all science that was conducted on the spill, not only the natural resources damage assessment studies conducted by us, but to scientific studies conducted during the response phase, and the in- -- and any independent studies that may have been conducted outside the -- the actual federal -- federal/state partnership in -- in the

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

oil spill itself.

We have a budget estimate for the cost of actually achieving the symposium. The total cost is -- is approximately \$34,000.00. In some respects we feel this may be high. We intend to produce an abstract book which would be available at the time of the conference. Depending on the size of the book, and the -- and the print shop that is contracted to produce it, we feel that the estimated cost here is probably on the high end and -- and could reduced substantially.

We have been estimating that the attendance at the symposium would be approximately 1,000 people, and given this, with the modest registration fee for a four-day meeting of \$35.00, we could entirely cover the costs of putting on the symposium. We could reduce these costs further by -- by not claiming first of all Sea Grant's labor as part of the project, we -- we could support the program of the -- of the convention center to reduce costs. This is all possibilities that are still open to us.

And the costs that we have not included include travel, we think this would be very minimum for a very few selected parties, and refreshments, which we are proposing at this point to seek a goodwill donor to provide to the conference.

The symposium is on a tight time frame. We're -- we're planning on organizing further steps in the symposium

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

independent of a process which will be working towards developing the proceedings. They are parallel processes though, and the timing of -- of one will be coordinated with -- with the timing of the other, so that by the time the symposium is held, the manuscripts that will go into the proceedings will also be available.

You have before you a tentative schedule as best we can outline it now, starting with defining the scope of the symposium. By that I mean approximately how many papers do we think we can accept within a four-day meeting at -- at X-number of minutes or portions of an hour per paper, identifying potential speakers, sending out invitations, sending out announcements, getting registration brochures put together and returned all -- all in a time frame that would allow us to have the symposium on the 2nd to 5th of February here in Anchorage at the Egan Convention Center.

If you have any questions on what I presented, I'd be happy to try and answer questions.

MR. McVEE: I've got -- I have one question.

That -- is the propos- -- the proposal is to publish

abstracts, extended abstracts before the symposium?

MR. MORRIS: Yes, so they would be available -probably not to be mailed out, but to be there for people to
pick up when they came to the symposium itself, yes.

MR. McVEE: So that -- I notice that then

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

misreading this, following the symposium -- symposium, will 2 arrange peer review of the papers. 3 The papers that go into the MR. MORRIS: 4 proceedings that will follow the symposium, yes. 5 MR. McVEE: I see. And you would not have the 6 7 peer review until after -- after the symposium? MR. MORRIS: There would -- there would be a 8 much lower level of peer review of the abstracts to make sure 9 that they -- they are technically accurate when they're printed 10 and distributed at the symposium, but it's a lot less effort, 11 because it's a much smaller volume of pages we're dealing with. 12 And Dr. Spies suggests 40 to 50 hours of peer review time would 13 be sufficient for that. 14 Does the -- the budget include 15 MR. McVEE: publication of the proceedings? 16 MR. MORRIS: No. We -- we can at that time. 17 We're still defining the -- the scope of the symposium. Will 18 19 we include in the proceedings only those papers that are presented verbally at the symposium or will we include papers 20 that would be in addition to those that have verbal 21 That's not defined yet. presentations. 22 MR. McVEE: Do Counsel have other questions or 23 comments? 24 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman? 25

there'll be technical review of abstracts -- oh, maybe I'm

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole. 1 MR. COLE: Is any action called for by the 2 Counsel today on this subject? 3 Is -- is there any action that's MR. MCVEE: 4 5 recommended by ....? MR. MORRIS: No, we're not -- unless you --6 we're telling you how we're planning on proceeding, and if you 7 have any action that you would like us rethink or revise, we --8 we'd entertain those suggestions, but we hope we're following 9 your direction and -- and this is just an update on where we are. 10 MR. COLE: What about the 34,000? We've 11 allocated, what, 25? You -- are you looking at more? 12 13 MR. MORRIS: No. No, we -- yes, you've allocated 25. We feel that the -- that it's -- to a large 14 extent we feel the registration fees will -- will cover the 15 cost of the symposium, and hopefully there will be a portion --16 at least a portion, a large portion of the 25,000 yet available 17 proceedings. That's -- that's our intention and plans. 18 19 If -- if you wish to provide more, we could certainly ..... I move we approve the direction that MR. COLE: 20 21 the symposium group is taking. MR. ROSIER: Second. 22 MR. McVEE: Further discussion? I quess my 23 only concern was if we're not publishing proceedings, why are 24

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

we doing peer review that is after the -- after the fact, after

the symposium? If you could explain the rationale there, it might help me.

MR. MORRIS: We are publishing proceedings.

This will be -- The symposium's next February we're planning on. The manuscripts for the proceedings we'll want due by the time of the symposium. The review of these manuscripts to go into the proceedings will follow the symposium. The -- we have -- we -- I could -- we haven't got a complete package and proposal for the proceedings yet, but just -- just for the symposium.

MR. McVEE: Further discussion? The motion is made to accept the report and the schedule. Any opposition? The motion is carried.

The next item on the agenda was item seven, EIS options for the draft restoration plan. Ken Rice, you have a report on this?

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman, at the, I think it was the February Trustee Council meeting, you directed that the restoration plan comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The Restoration Team -- Team has been concerned for some time that the restoration planning work group that's putting together the restoration plan under the -- under the time constraints that -- that we've imposed would not be able to complete an EIS, and we looked several options for completing an EIS. The options that we eliminated were

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

those that required a major time commitment on the part of the restoration planning work group. And you have before you three options that are there for your consideration.

One is to go out with a competitive contract which has some advantages and disadvantages. One of the major disadvantages is it would take us about 120 days to get to an RFP and -- and up to signing the contract, an estimated of between three and \$400,000.00.

The other options that we have, one we had some discussions with Walcoff and Associates who have been under contract with the Justice Department, an they do have expertise They say that they would be able to to be able to do an EIS. do it within the time commitments that we have put forward. We'd originally looked at using some of the money the federal agencies had in some of the existing contracts with the Justice Department for doing the economic studies. understanding that the agencies that control that money don't want to free that up for other purposes. They -- they need it for -- they need to get it back. However, you did approve some money to the environmental compliance working group that would certainly carry us through the end of this fiscal year, if you took this approach, that is to work with the Justice Department and work with Walcoff and Associates to contract the completion of the EIS.

The third approach that we have before us is to use

## 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

local -- hopefully local agency expertise, but it may require detailing some people in from outside of Alaska or -- or from at least outside of Anchorage, up to work on it. And what we envision is a three or four-person team. It could be a multiagency team or it could be people from one agency that would work on analyzing the impacts of the restoration plan and The cost for that is what you see in front of writing the EIS. It's a bit different than what the Walcoff contract I think realistically the difference is not all comes in at. The -- the one that would involve agency people doesn't include cost for -- for bringing anybody in from outside of Anchorage, in other words, any -- any travel or per diem for bringing in any experts if that became a necessity. If we had a multi-agency team housing or -- or at least providing office space, maybe -- may be a problem, not an insurmountable one, but if we had to find or rent space for that team for the ten-month period or whatever it takes to get the EIS done, that's a cost that hasn't been included in there. So as you go into providing us some direction on a course of action to get this EIS done, I wouldn't use the difference between the Walcoff estimate for completion and the -- the figures that we've provided here.

Basically what the Restoration Team is after is some direction on -- on what course of action or what -- which ones of these we should pursue to get -- to get the environmental

### 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

impact statement completed. We were -- we were divided between -- within the Restoration Team as to whether the Walcoff contract was a better option to go than using agency people, and -- and so we come to you with either options two or three, but we -- we don't feel that going for a competitive contract at this time is going to get us a contract or in enough time to be able to get the draft out in -- in time to -- to be -- to meet the time frames for our restoration plan.

Ouestions?

MR. McVEE: One -- one question I guess, is the -- is the Walcoff contract, DOJ contract -- you know, procurement or contracting people, either state or federal, looked at this to know whether it can be expanded or enlarged to include this? You know, is it flexible enough or ....?

MR. RICE: I'm ....

MS. PULITZER: I think we think it wouldn't be outside the scope of the contract. Do you want me ....?

MR. McVEE: Yes. Yes, please.

MS. PULITZER: Yeah, I'm Lisa Pulitzer from -from Justice, and I don't think we think it's outside the scope
of the contract. The contract was most specifically for expert
work surrounding the <a href="Exxon Valdez">Exxon Valdez</a> oil spill, and I think that
it was written in a broad enough way to be not a scope problem.
If, you know, if that vehicle is the vehicle you -- you'd like
to pursue. Okay.

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

Thanks, Lisa. Yes, Mr. Sandor? MR. McVEE: 1 2 MR. SANDOR: What time span is -- is covered by 3 this EIS? Basically I looked at the time span 4 MR. RICE: for completing the draft and final restoration plan which the 5 draft is out, what, in early February, the final is out at the 6 So it would be starting almost immediately and --7 8 and going through the end of May. Covering restoration activities MR. SANDOR: 9 for what period of time? 10 I'm not sure I quite understand your 11 MR. RICE: -- your question, but the restoration plan is basically for the 12 life of the -- of the -- the funds that we'd be receiving, so 13 it would be roughly ten years. 14 Yeah, well, that's the point that 15 MR. SANDOR: I wanted to -- to make that this is a one-time EIS commitment 16 of 300,000 or whatever it is, it's a one-time commitment, 17 that's the intention? 18

MR. RICE: That's correct. If we -- if we do an adequate enough evaluation, then any subsequent projects that are developed as part of annual work plans, may require some site specific analysis, but hopefully would not require an EIS. They could be done tiering (ph) to the restoration plan EIS.

MR. SANDOR: Okay. Thank you.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Are we going to have -- are we really going to have enough information available in the draft restoration plan to do an EIS at this point? I mean, we -- we have to, as you know, in -- a NEPA document requires that there be enough information available in the proposed federal action and the alternatives to allow the decision makers and the public, the public an opportunity to comment specifically and the decision makers to use the information in making their decisions, and if -- if we're just talking about kind of some generic activities in the restoration plan for the -- the tenyear or decade life of the plan, then I'm not sure that there's enough information to initiate an EIS.

And I do think that you're going to have to use step down or tiered EIS's if -- as you get more specificity into specific projects. If you identify, for example, fish ladders, well, a fish ladder is a mitigation or a restoration measure or a compensation measure. A fish ladder in one place is not a fish ladder in another place. It depends on the species, the location, the ecology, and it's a lot of -- they're very -- very different projects so if you just put in fish ladders in a -- in a generalized restoration plan, you're not going to satisfy at least in my opinion the requirements of -- of NEPA when you get to specific projects.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: I guess is there a response to that, and then Mr. Cole?

Yeah, I think you made an excellent MR. RICE: Depending on the level of specificity that the Trustee point. Council wants in the restoration plan will help determine what level of analysis that -- that can be accomplished. restoration plan provides enough direction that -- that at least a general course for the amount of different restoration options that might go forward over the course of the year, then you'll make some cumulative effects analysis based on that as to approximately how many fish passes, for example, might be built. No, you wouldn't be able to analyze the specific site, but you could at least make some projections as to what the changes that would occur within the oil spill area are. you would have to do your more -- more systematic analyses on a case-by-case basis.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I -- just to

-- just following up. I'm -- I'm just concerned that when -
if -- I think NEPA is a very interesting piece of legislation.

It's -- and it's a good -- it's a good piece of work in a lot

of respects, and it does provide I think a systematic way of

evaluating the potential impacts or the effects on the

environment, you know, the biological, physical, natural

environment as well as the human environment by engaging

certain kinds of projects. And -- but you have to have enough

### 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

detail in order to make evaluations, because a key part of NEPA is the comparison of one alternative -- I mean one means of achieving your objective against another means of achieving that same objective, and unless you have the viable alternatives specified well enough, it doesn't really produce a meaningful document, and I don't think we'd want to spend three or \$400,000.00, you know, as -- as we start -- you know, we -- we can certainly start the NEPA process early enough in the planning because that's -- that's one of the accepted concepts is that NEPA goes along with the other planning, but we don't want to get -- you know, we don't want to lead ourselves to believe that when -- when we complete a NEPA document, unless we have enough detail, that that's going to carry us for ten years. So I mean, we've got to have enough detail in the restoration plan to be able to do a NEPA .....

MR. RICE: One -- one of the -- as you pointed out, one of the critical points that we're going to have in the restoration plan is -- is what those alternatives look like, and the restoration team was -- had some time set up tomorrow to sit down with the restoration plan work group and start providing some direction on that. The Trustee Council has a role to play in that as well, so that we develop clear alternatives that are different enough that provide some -- some range in which you can make a clear choice and -- and just be able to display the differences. It's going to be a tough

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

one, and it's going to take some real effort both on the Trustee Counsel and on the -- on the planning work group.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I -- I like Commissioner Collinsworth was concerned about the answer that Commissioner Sandor received to his question as to the period covered by this EIS. It's -- I find it hard to imagine that one EIS will get us through ten years, because I don't think that we can come up with a restoration plan, you know, this year or next which will point us in all the directions and provide all the solutions and the alternatives that are going to -- the choices And I -- I suspect we'll be faced with in the future years. we're almost going to have to have this EIS supplemented or amended every year as we make specific decisions. And I'm also a little troubled about this not being done before, you know, next May, or the end of May, because we should be well along with the '93 plan by that time. We -- don't we have to have this done before then? I mean, I don't .....

MR. RICE: Let me respond just to both of your points. The Council on Environmental Quality requires that if an EIS is more than five years old, you go back and take a look, so you're -- you're right. While we would estimate the effects for ten years, we are going to have to go back and look at it. If it's between three and five years old, if the plan -- if the EIS is between three and five years old, you might

### 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

want to make a judgment call as to whether you need to go back and re-analyze what went into the EIS and what's out there in your environment. But if it's more than five years old, you really do have to by -- by Council on Environmental Quality regulations do that.

In answer to your second question, the -- the time frame that -- that I was looking at follows the schedule that the Trustee Council approved, I think it was at the April 27th Trustee Council meeting where the time frame was spelled out. It was an expanded time frame from what I think you had originally anticipated, but it an attempt to be a little more realistic than -- and grasp what we -- we think we can accomplish.

MR. McVEE: It's my understanding, and maybe it's -- it's easier to describe, you know, the life of an EIS in a given number of years, but relate it to the restoration plan. The restoration plan as I visualize it at least, is a general programmatic statement that evaluates or -- or describes options that are available and provides guidance to the Trustee Council, and that -- that as it gets amended, and I'm sure that it will have to be as we move forward, I don't know whether on an annual basis or whatever, but as need arises, then it would seem like we'd have to address the -- the EIS or the NEPA requirements at that point. And maybe it requires a supplement, maybe it could be handled differently,

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

but as far as I guess the '93 projects, I think we would deal with those since they will be approved, will occur, initiation of -- of them will occur before this EIS, and we'll have to deal with them pretty much like we dealt with the '92, and that is through the -- through environmental assessment process unless there's some major kind of activities proposed, and -- and I don't know what we would find when we get into land, you know, acquisition, but major activities might -- you know, might require an EIS, individual projects. But we seem to have done well this year with working the environmental assessment process for those that required it.

Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, the question on the time span was just to I guess make certain or to try to get some agreement or understanding that whatever contract was made, agreement either with Walcoff through Department of Justice or the agencies that we would be looking at the total period of time and the -- the ten-year period and perhaps the -- I think as both Attorney General Cole and Don Collinsworth points out, it probably isn't realistic to expect that we would have adequate information to cover the whole -- the -- the restoration activities for the whole ten-year period.

On the other hand, the process should be set up so that either through addendums to the plan or environmental assessments that the -- at least the ten-year period is covered

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

and that -- and I understood, Ken, that's what you're saying this -- this was. The worst case scenario would be that this would lay out 300,000 for '93 and then find out they had to lay out another 300,000 in '95 and '97, and that's what I was worried about.

MR. RICE: Yeah. Hopefully we wouldn't have to -- to do it every two years, but what we're looking at is getting an EIS that's compatible with the restoration plan and -- and that we deal with an analysis to the level of detail that's provided in the restoration plan and -- and the detail that's provided in there and, of course, a direction to go in. And it would be a one-shot deal

However, we would have to go back and -- and look every -- every few years at least at the adequacy of that analysis. It may require for a couple of years just a fairly quick look to see if the -- the situation has changed. As time goes on, it may require a more detailed look.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Just a question, do you need a decision today on whether to go to the Walcoff group or the .....

MR. RICE: We need a sensing from the Trustee

Council as to whether they -- they would like us to pursue both

of them and see which one we can bring to resolution the

quickest and the cheapest and -- and to provide us the best

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

product, or whether they have a feeling for one over the other.

2 MR. SANDOR: I move the former.

MR. COLE: Perhaps you would explain what that

is?

1

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: Pursue them both to .....

MR. COLE: Along those lines.

MR. SANDOR: Along those lines. That is to say, Ken, I -- I heard you say that if it was possible, to pursue both options, look to get this long-range period and -- and ways of accommodating and the most cost effective and -- and to get the best product. And so you don't really need a decision today on -- on one or the other?

MR. RICE: Yes and no. It would be -- it would be nice if we -- if we could say, "yeah, we're going to focus in on this." The problem is we don't have all of the information back from the agencies, for example, as to whether enough people are available to do this for us, and -- and we -- we would need to do some additional work with Justice Department and Walcoff to make sure that any funds that needed to be made available to be done within the -- within the monies that we have available to do that. Additional money would have to be -- have to come out of the '93 budget I suspect to cover the cost for a Walcoff contract, and -- and they would have to be comfortable that -- with that. So there's still some unresolved issues out there with both of these options.

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Mr. Wolfe?

MR. WOLFE: I'll follow up on the same thing. What time frame would it take to implement something under Walcoff's contract? Has Justice given you a date or a time frame on that?

MR. RICE: I don't have an answer to that. Perhaps Lisa can help with that?

MS. PULITZER: I think at -- at Ken's request Walcoff prepared a rough proposal which is how you got the cost figure. The process with the contract as it exists now would be that should be modified however the Trustee Council and the Restoration Team feel is appropriate. Then that would go back out to Walcoff and they would make sure that their pricing didn't in any way change. Then if that was all agreed to, then really it would be a matter of acquiring the funding and getting a task order issued by having a contracting officer, you know, sign the requisite forms. So that's a relatively straight forward process that can move fairly quickly, you know, if that's the route that you want to pursue.

MR. McVEE: Well, the Walcoff contract's with DOJ, so would it still continue to be a DOJ contract?

MS. PULITZER: Yeah, unless -- you know, unless there would be a agency that could meet with us and talk about some possibility of doing a hand-off, but it is right now a Justice contract. It hasn't required the level of over-sight

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

that the CACI contract has, so I -- I don't know that there would be a problem with continuing it. I don't know that Justice would come back and say, "We feel there ought to be a handling charge." I don't think that there would be, you know, any -- any great addition of any kind from that.

MR. WOLFE: Yeah. Before Lisa leaves, do the people that Walcoff have on board have experience in writing NEPA documents for this type of a -- well, for any projects?

MS. PULITZER: I -- I believe so. Sharon?

MR. RICE: Yeah. Sharon Saari put in a proposal and she would probably be one of the leads on this. She has about 15 EIS under her belt, which is a heck of a lot more than I have.

MS. PULITZER: Yeah, but I mean she's -- she's here actually if you'd like to, you know, to talk with her.

Anything else?

MR. SANDOR: Well, a question. It boils down to which is going to give us the -- excuse me, the -- the quality product in a -- in a cost-effective way. Was the Restoration Team prepared to answer that question or give some suggestion of which?

MR. RICE: Well, we had a bit of discussion at it last -- late last week, and basically we were kind of split. There are -- there are advantages to going with a contractor. You can hold their feet to the fire. It's -- so we feel that

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

we would be able to get a good product from it. They're out of state, there's some coordination problem with being that far away, not insurmountable with our electronic age, but certainly there are some -- some problems with that.

If we had a team here, we could work a little more closely with them.

Cost-wise, I'm not sure there's a tremendous difference, although it appears that there's a little bit of a difference there. In terms of whether the product would be any better under one or the other, I -- I would hope that there -- there wouldn't be a tremendous difference in that product.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, a third of a million dollars is a lot of money. Why don't we take five minutes or so to have an explanation such as you offered? Somebody is here that ....?

MS. PULITZER: Of -- of what it -- what it is?

Sharon, do you want to come and answer questions or describe

the process?

MS. SAARI: What we've proposed is a generic environmental impact statement similar to a programmatic environmental impact statement which would cover the restoration plan. I agree with Ken that it should be looked at within five years to see if it's still adequate. If one of the proposals for restoration was a significant change that would affect the environment, say you wanted to channelize a

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

river to introduce fish into an island, a major action like that would require either a supplemental EIS or an environmental assessment to look at it.

years of experience in environmental impact statements. I've written a book called "Environmental Impact Statement Data Book". I've worked on EIS's in Alaska, and we have some experts that are left-over experts from our previous life doing NRDA work that we would also transfer and use in this project. We have somebody proposed to do socio-economics who has expertise working with natives and someone on our team that came from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service who also has experience with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and we're prepared to start tomorrow on this, if that's what you want.

MR. McVEE: I have a few questions.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Go ahead.

MR. SANDOR: I was just going to say I -- I would move that we move forward on this, you know, exploring the possibility of, you know, developing a more complete plan on doing this thing, giving the Restoration Team the authority to work out the hand-off option that -- with that experience and background, I -- I think we -- we would have assurance that the product is going to be of a quality type.

MS. SAARI: We have done contract mods and --

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

and done that agency -- inter-agency agreements. We've done 1 that in less than a week. We have a lot of experience in the 2 3 past several years in doing this with this project, so the contractual problems would not be significant. 4 5 MR. McVEE: And you -- you have pretty an inter-disciplinary type group ..... 6 7 MS. SAARI: MR. MCVEE: ..... or basis for it at 8 least .... 9 10 MS. SAARI: Yes. ..... that's available to you now? MR. McVEE: 11 12 MS. SAARI: Yes, sir. And have -- and we've submitted the resumes and -- and Ken has them if you want to 13 14 see them. MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman? 15 MR. McVEE: A question? 16 17 MR. COLLINSWORTH: Before you leave, how do you, in -- in initiating your EIS, identifying very clearly 18 what the -- the federal or what -- what the objective is and 19 20 what the federal proposed action and what the alternatives are, is -- is a key element. 21 22 MS. SAARI: That -- and that key is in the We can't go beyond describing what the restoration plan. 23 alternatives are than what the restoration team will do in 24 25 their restoration plan, so as they've organized their

alternatives, which may fall into management actions, acquisition actions, the various actions that -- that they outline in the restoration plan are the same alternatives that we would use in the environmental impact statement, and it would be just a parallel sister document that goes in -- as Ken said, in the same level of detail. We would not go into more detail than they have.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: So ....

MS. SAARI: We -- we wouldn't .....

MR. COLLINSWORTH: I'm -- what I was .....

MS. SAARI: .... re-invent options.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: .... really testing the water for is to identify how this Trustee Council would participate in -- in making sure that we have concurrence on what the objective -- the objective is or objectives are, and what the feasible approved (ph) alternatives are. And so it would be the -- the -- that we receive in terms of the planning document from the plan team. So when we approve that, then we prescribe what will be analyzed?

MS. SAARI: And we can also provide you with copies as we go along. As we propose to do the work, the first thing we would do is an outline. So when we submitted that to the restoration team, you all would also get the outline. As we revise the outline because of public comments or public input for including more options, you would get a copy of that.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

As we wrote the initial chapters to describe Prince William Sound, for example, before and after the spill, you could get vir- -- you know, as we provide those review chapters and review outlines and things to the Restoration Team, you could get the same copies at the same time, so you don't have to wait until the end, to public review until you would have some review capabilities yourself. But I .....

MR. McVEE: Mr. Rice?

Just to expand on that just a little MR. RICE: bit, there are some -- some really critical junctures where the Trustee Council needs to be involved. Early on as you identify the issues that need to be addressed in the environmental impact statement, if you misidentify, leave some out or -- or gloss over some or -- or whatever, then you can end up with some real headaches down the road, so it's going to be important that the Trustee Council take a look at those and say, yes, this is -- this is what needs to be analyzed, and then as you get into the alternatives, before you get too far with the alternatives, the Trustee Council says, "yes, this is a reasonable range of alternatives, and it will provide us a wide enough differences between those alternatives that we can adequately make a decision, and -- and you'll be able to adequately display the differences in those alternatives." So those are at least just two of the fairly early on critical junctures where you can be involved.

#### 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. McVEE: Mr. Cole, and then -- Mr. Cole? 1 MR. COLE: Are we far enough along in the 2 restoration plan to be able to initiate work on the EIS? 3 Mr. Rice? 4 MR. McVEE: 5 MR. RICE: I think we're pretty close on that. 6 We've got some working drafts of the -- of options that the 7 restoration plan work group is -- is putting together. Restoration Team hasn't had a chance to review those, but 8 they're -- they're making their way through the process. 9 10 those get finalized and the Restoration (sic) starts sitting down in the next week or so to start working on alternatives, 11 12 then, you know, we're -- that starts getting involved is where 13 the EIS team, whether it's Walcoff or an agency team needs to 14 start being able to pull that together, start looking at the 15 public comments that have come in and say here are the issues that need to be analyzed as they relate to the restoration 16 17 plan, so I don't think we're too early to pull somebody in like -- like Sharon ..... 18 MS. SAARI: As we've done 19 20 MR. RICE: ..... into this process. 21 MS. SAARI: .... on programmatic EIS's where they didn't have a clue where the program was going when they 22 started the EIS. And this is at least a lot further than a 23

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

That may be where we are.

MR. COLE:

clue, so

24

MS. SAARI: Oh, you have .....

MR. McVEE: Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Yes. With regard -- one of the key elements of NEPA is early on in the process in developing an EIS is scoping. How -- what vehicle are we going to use for scoping?

MS. SAARI: The Restoration Team wrote in their framework plan, I don't know if you've read that or not, but they assumed that the public review of the restoration framework plan would provide most of what was needed for Now, I have not gone through all of the comments, as scoping. they have just been collected during this month, but I still think that we could have a scoping meeting, inviting the agencies here in Anchorage, and if any of the public wanted to come, to add additional -- additional issues, that we could still have a scoping meeting in addition to what we've done under the framework plan as long as it wasn't, you know, a big all-out public hearing, kind of expensive thing, by just inviting the agencies to address the issues and make that public -- open to the public. That plus the public comments from the framework plan, we should have the issues identified.

MR. McVEE: I think that one advantage in that last winter when we started talking about the restoration plan that we did approach it, you know, approached -- approached it at least considering the -- the comment process would be an

### 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

environmental impact statement, and so there's been quite a 1 little bit of information, public information at least obtained 2 from the scoping process and so on, as well as we have the 3 draft or the restoration document that's -- that's presently 4 out, and that is better than most scoping documents that I have 5 6 seen on the EIS. Any other questions? Thank you very much. 7 Thank you. MS. SAARI: 8 MR. McVEE: It's useful. 9 We have a motion that's on the floor. You know, I 10 can't remember what it was now, but just ..... 11 MR. COLE: Along those lines. 12 Shall we try again? MR. McVEE: 13 MR. COLE: Along the lines of an EIS. 14 MR. McVEE: Along the lines of an EIS. 15 MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I had moved that we 16 -- we proceed forward with the EIS process and that we move to 17 engage Walcoff through the Department of Justice, but that the 18 Restoration Team be certain that these questions that were 19 discussed here today be answered and -- before the thing is 20 finalized, but the -- the motion is to move forward with Walcoff. 21 MR. MCVEE: Is there a second? 22 23 MR. COLE: Would you restate that? MR. SANDOR: Along those lines. 24

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Along those lines.

25

Is there a

second to that motion?

MR. WOLFE: I'll second.

MR. McVEE: Is there further discussion of the motion? Any opposition to the motion? The motion passed.

It's close to a break time here, but we have item eight, if we could finish that, I think in very quick order before we take the break, then we -- we have a logical break before we go into the next item.

DR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chair, that -- that was aimed at trying to set up a teleconference for the approval of a final '92 budget, including the -- the office of administrative director and the Restoration Team. But after hearing the -- what's going to be looked at in the habitat protection arena and those -- those other activities for -- for that date, I'd -- I'd like to propose that the next Trustee Council face-to-face meeting be on August 3rd and we deal with the final administrative budget and the habitat protection grand plan or, you know, the options. Or -- or perhaps a little later than that if the Trustee Council would like.

MS. RUTHERFORD: But not before.

DR. GIBBONS: But not -- yeah, not -- not before. The -- the budget package was -- was shipped out mid June, we're giving the public ade- -- we feel adequate time to comment on the administrative budget portion of it, and then analyze their comments and get back to you.

1	MR. McVEE: August 3rd's on Monday.
2	MR. COLE: I think Commissioner Sandor has a
3	point of order.
4	MR. SANDOR: No. August 3 is Monday?
5	MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor?
6	MR. SANDOR: Well, are you sure you're going to
7	be able to have the
8	MS. RUTHERFORD: A little extra time would not
9	hurt.
10	DR. GIBBONS: That's that's correct. The
11	15th or a month later even.
12	MR. SANDOR: No, I was thinking August 10 or
13	or 11 or something, the following week, but, yeah, third is
14	if that's what the Restoration Team recommends, that's fine.
15	MS. RUTHERFORD: The 10th? The 10th is fine.
16	MR. COLE: No, it's bad for me. Thanks.
17	MR. McVEE: I'm hearing a week later from some
18	of the members here, so yes. Any other comments on that?
19	MR. SANDOR: The 10th is bad for you?
20	MR. COLE: The 10th is bad for me.
21	MR. SANDOR: The 10th is bad, okay.
22	MR. McVEE: The tenth is bad for Mr. Cole.
23	Just that date that week or?
24	MR. COLE: The third is fine. No, I I
25	sometime out in there I know I'm

1	MR. McVEE: Can you look?
2	MR. COLE: supposed to be some place
3	other than here then.
4	MR. McVEE: You don't have to tell us where.
5	MR. COLE: Well, I don't know. I think it's
6	the Conference of Western Attorney Generals some place.
7	MR. McVEE: Oh, okay.
8	MR. COLE: Yes. But I don't know the exact
9	dates.
10	DR. GIBBONS: Mr Mr. Chair, maybe I can
11	poll the Trustee Council at a later date, get their calendars
12	and try to establish a date?
13	MR. McVEE: Sounds good to me. All right.
14	MR. COLE: Well, let me ask this, do we have
15	any decisions that we have to make timely here?
16	MR. McVEE: I think we maybe we should
17	finish up the '92 budget which would be the the
18	administrative component budget so that we can then schedule a
19	request to the Court for the for the remainder of the of
20	the budget on in for into the next next year. It seemed
21	like that maybe is the most critical thing.
22	MR. SANDOR: Do we even need a meeting, a
23	formal meeting to do that? Can
24	MR. COLE: Yeah, can can we do that by
25	telephone or

MR. SANDOR: Yes. 1 MR. COLE: .... teleconference is what we're 2 3 thinking. MR. SANDOR: Yeah. 4 The -- the administrative budget DR. GIBBONS: 5 portion of that, I think we can. But the habitat protection I 6 think we need to -- we're going to -- it sounds like you -- you 7 want some detail and we're going to -- we're going to need to 8 9 get into it. MR. COLE: With belaboring this, it -- it seems 10 to me that we can do -- we don't have to do them both at the 11 We can get the budget done by teleconferencing. 12 same time. If you need more time on the habitat, you know, plan and 13 inventory and those things, we could push that back two weeks 14 15 or something like that. That -- that's fine. DR. GIBBONS: Okay. 16 MR. McVEE: Okay. We'll work on that basis 17 then. Let's recess for ten minutes and then we'll come back to 18 19 this location. (Off record) 20 (On record) 21 MR. McVEE: Trustee Council members are all 22 present. We'd like to continue with consideration of the 23 agenda items for this meeting. 24 The next item on the agenda was Trustee Council 25

executive session. Before we go into that executive session, I felt like it was worthwhile to -- to discuss among ourselves here at public session kind of the process of what we're going to -- going through to select representatives for the public advisory group, and we have a slate of some 31 nominations I believe it is now, and nominations in every category, and nominations from -- from many of the communities all over the -- basically I think all of the communities, so we have opportunity for wide representation in terms of the categories of interest as -- as well as wide representation in terms of the -- of the geographic areas.

What I would propose to do, and have some discussion among the members of the Trustee Council, is that we go into executive session and since we will be discussing, you know, I'd say personnel papers and actions and -- and qualifications, that we go into executive session to do that, and then come back into a public session, hopefully, you know, later on this afternoon and -- and discuss and make the final -- the -- the final cut at the recommendations for the P.A.G.

And I'm somewhat sensitive to, and I think we have to be, to being sensitive to the -- to the Open Meetings Act of the State, and -- and public -- public interest in this -- in this subject, which has been expressed many, many times at -- at our meeting in the past, and I guess at this point, I'd like to have any comments from the Trustee Council members on that

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

kind of an approach to the -- the process of selecting P.A.G. 1 2 members. It sounds good. MR. WOLFE: 3 Sounds good? MR. McVEE: 4 I move something along those 5 MR. COLLINSWORTH: 6 lines. Something along those lines. With 7 MR. McVEE: that I guess then we'll adjourn. Is the upstairs meeting room 8 available to us? And we'll adjourn to executive session. Ι 9 shouldn't say adjourn, recess into executive session. 10 Well, before we do that. 11 MR. COLE: 12 MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole? Let me see if I understand this 13 MR. COLE: correctly. Well, to help me understand it correctly, would you 14 tell me once again what the plan is? 15 The idea I presented was one of --16 MR. MCVEE: of being able to go into executive session and look in detail 17 at the qualifications of the various nominees and coming out of 18 that session with a slate of acceptable candidates which then 19 we can act upon in -- in public session and make the final 20 selection. 21 MR. COLE: And will we do that by category? 22 MR. McVEE: Yes, by category. It's my thought 23 that ..... 24 Could we have public comment on 25 MR. COLE:

that? I mean, I'm -- I'm really in -- you know, I'm having a lot of trouble making up my mind whether that's the right thing to do. Look, I mean, you know, I think we -- well, that's -- comply with the Open Meetings Act, can we do that? Probably. Should we do it? I mean, I just wonder if that's what we ought to do.

MR. McVEE: I'd certainly be open to having comment on it. Mr. Sandor, did you have some comment?

MR. SANDOR: Well, I was mostly wanting to query about the process of -- it is the intention of -- of doing this today if possible, right?

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. SANDOR: Well, there are several ways that one could -- could do this. We could have this executive session, lay out the -- the names that -- but then I had -- had thought that from that executive session actually have -- public comment period is already in place from five to seven, even to utilize that public comment period for, you know, whatever comments plus this and then have the final executive session at seven to eight or whatever ....

MR. COLE: No. No. I mean, maybe tomorrow, maybe next week, but, you know, 12 hours of this at one time is enough. I mean, .....

MR. SANDOR: Okay. But I mean if you really want public comment, you've got a period five to seven, we

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

could fax them the -- to everybody on teleconference the product of the executive meeting, then you'd have comments from everybody.

MR. COLE: Well, I'm -- I'm not objecting to public comment. I mean, that's what I'm asking for. The .....

MR. SANDOR: Well, that's an option.

MR. COLE: .... The problem is -- is I just -- after we get the public comment, I mean, frankly like I say, you -- you know, you and I started at seven on this this morning. That's essentially 12 straight hours, and I think being fair to people, and being fair to the process, I mean, I don't want to do this when I'm so tired and beat up that, you know, I can't really think as clearly as I'd like to.

But I would like to get public comment, and I am concerned about, you know, adjourning to the back room and saying, "Well, now we'll just come up with the list of the good old boys, you know, and then we'll come out and go through, you know, and go through the motions and won't everything be lovely." And you know we'll get intense criticism for that, and -- and -- so that's where I think we should have public comment just hopefully maybe to give us guidance and support for the process we adopt, but, you know, that's what I find troubling.

MR. McVEE: Is there anyone in the audience, just raise hands I guess, who would want to make comment on

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

this process or procedures for selecting or identifying the P.A.G. members?

MR. COLE: May I say, here's the problem, you know, I -- I know what people are going to say, you know, you -- you can see it coming, can't you? They'll say, "look, they weeded out the people who didn't agree with their views, and they didn't put them on, I mean, you know, because they know that you -- you won't be as malleable and agree with just what goes on, with what -- what John Sandor wants to do." And -and so -- and -- and, you know, I -- I think we -- this is a very important decision, because we all know how important this Public Advisory Group is and what strong support there is for So, how we proceed here at this juncture is critical, and I'd like to hear public views on this before, about the process and how we do it. I like Ms. Brody, I mean I don't mind saying look, I mean I know she'll be a thorn in our side, we can throw her off right now. But if we're going to throw her off, we should throw her off right here in public, not in the back room, you know. So, you get what I'm thinking about.

MR. McVEE: Is -- are there any people in the audience who wish to comment on this process and procedure? With your indulgence then, I would like to have them followthrough (ph), we have one hand raised is all I can see.

MS. BRODY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess you all know, I'm Pamela Brody from the Sierra Club. And I'd

# 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

like to say that although, I think this is similar to a personnel matter, it is different. These Public Advisory Group members will be representing the public, and I do believe that it should be open to the public, the process of choosing the people. And even though it might hurt my feelings, I guess I just will have to take it, and so, I would recommend an open process.

MR. COLE: And then, can I ask a question?

MS. BRODY: Um-hum.

MR. COLE: Do you think we -- you know, some of these people we may find unacceptable for reasons, you know, unrelated to their direct service on -- or qualifications to serve as a Public Advisory member. And I mean we're concerned about, in essence, some form of rights to privacy of these candidates. And so we said, you know, what I heard about, you know, Joe Blow, you know, what he was involved in 15 years ago, let me tell you. I mean, you know, that's what's, see, troubling the Trustees; how far can we go to express these views because it's not maybe pleasant to be hurt in public. And we're trying to protect the privacy of these applicants on the one hand, and on the other hand, the attention (ph) is created, we must conduct this business as much as possible in public. And then, you know, not an easy call.

So, that's why I, personally, would like some help.

Maybe we need some experts here in ethics and things like that

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

to counsel. Thank you.

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

MS. BRODY: Just in response to that, there is the problem when discussions go on behind closed doors that people can have information that isn't accurate, too, and that things that are said and are not public, then the person doesn't have any chance to respond.

MR. COLE: In some ways, they're not going to have any -- much of a chance to respond after we make the decision and go on, if he's stricken from the list. And you know, he doesn't -- he or she may not have the same forum we do to respond, and it's a little unfair. So, what I'm saying is when we say that we may have some reservations about doing this in public, we're trying to protect the individual's personal right of privacy and reputation, things like that. So, I mean it's not an easy call.

MS. BRODY: I agree.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Ms. Brody, do you think insofar as having the public discussion and participation that we should do this in this group, in this setting, or include the teleconference, 5:00 to 7:00 or what would ....

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: It's unclear to me what we're trying to solicit here in terms of input that will aid us

in the decision-making process. I mean what are we going to ask in the public hearing, if somebody wants to provide testimony in support of some particular candidate or in opposition of some particular nominee, what the makeup should be? What are we trying to solicit from the public?

MR. COLE: I can answer that. We're trying to solicit from the public, right at this moment, should we go into Executive Session and make some decisions about members who constitute this Advisory Group or shall we just do the whole thing right in public and use our best discretion about protecting people's right of privacy.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Yeah. I heard (indiscernible - interrupted) ....

MR. COLE: That's what I'm seeing guidance on.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: .... taking about the teleconference between 5:00 and 7:00 this evening, and as you know, we have a special purpose, I guess, inquiry of our public here regarding process, but I thought there was some talk about the public comment between 5:00 and 7:00 of what we were soliciting on that.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I guess the reason I raise that question, Don, is the agenda as published, you know, it didn't provide for that kind of a thing. And I'm just trying to deal with the most practical, best way to -- in effect, to assure that all those interests, you know, can have the optimum

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

or maximum benefit of the information that's developed. It was my understanding that the proposal was such that we would, essentially, go through -- essentially, an analysis of all the candidates and weed out these right of privacy things and come back with a listing of multiple names that are being considered in each category, and then publicly select from that listing and could do that here before the public comment period 5:00 to 7:00 or after. And (indiscernible) raise the question, you know, what it is we're going to do, it could be done, you know, a number of different ways.

I, as I said earlier today, was very impressed with the group and all other -- only 31 that actually applied that I found in each category, at least, three very qualified people, any one of whom would be, you know, simply from my perspective would be very find. And so, I don't think there's a shortage of candidates, but I'm just trying to suggest we be responsive to give them maximum, you know, public exposure to what it is we're doing. And so .....

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Collinsworth.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: I am familiar with one other process that solicits a lot of public interest and a lot of participation, and that is the -- how the North Pacific Fishery Management Council operates under the provisions of the Magnisum (ph) Act, and it has a scientific review body, a

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

2.2

scientific and statistical committee as well as an advisory And there's 21 or 22 members of the advisory panel that panel. play an important role in the proceedings of the Council and serve for one-year terms, and go- -- and they have a nominating process that's quite similar to what we've engaged here. the Council goes though an initial selection of the list of folks in Executive Session, and has done that since the first Council -- or the first advisory committee was appointed about in 1970- -- late '77, early '78, and has participation with both state and federal members on the committee. And it seems to have worked satisfactorily protecting -- having the Council take formal approval action in public session, but dealing with some of those fairly delicate personal issues, the right of privacy type issues that Mr. Cole mentioned, that is done in Executive Session. And I think that's a model that we should follow here.

MR. McVEE: I guess since we asked for public comment, I should find out if there is any more -- if there's anyone else that wishes to comment.

MS. RODERMAN: I'm Lisa Roderman (ph), I'm from Cordova. Just -- I think your point about other advisory councils is well-taken, but this is a public advisory council, and it is to represent the public. The advisory council on Fisheries matters, for instance, that you referred to, you know, you might ask other scientists what they think of these

#### 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

scientists and to provide input. You know, in thinking about it, I guess I would have to support Pam's suggestion that since simply because whoever you choose does represent all of us, that all of us should know why you chose those people or did not choose them.

The other alternative might be to keep a record of what you say in there, and then if someone wants to know why they weren't chosen, they have access to that record.

MR. McVEE: Is there other public comment on this issue? No other comment at this time.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the testimony we've just heard, I believe the process that I outlined, at least having an Executive Session and taking a look to see if there are any reasons why we believe that any of these individuals that have been nominated do not satisfy the minimum qualifications or the qualifications that personal -- you know, requirements, if that could be done in Executive Session, then we could complete the process in open forum.

MR. McVEE: Is that the motion?

MR. COLE: Well, I have another idea,

Mr. Chairman.

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: I haven't got a second to the motion, so go ahead, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Well, I was thinking maybe we could

have -- this is just a wild thought -- but one person or so or someone to, essentially, be a witness to the fact there wasn't any skulduggery going on there in the Executive Session, you know, so that somebody could say yes, they really did focus on the issues, and they didn't go in the back room and agree upon the final, you know, selection. We can do that, too, to sort of have -- and swear them to secrecy, so to speak, except on that issue, you know, that they did do the right thing back there. And that way it would be a form of public, you know, involvement in the process, and not entirely in secret or Executive Session, but give the public some assurance that we were, you know, being responsible. If we could find somebody who could agree with that.

Anyway, that's just another thought that occurs to me.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Collinsworth, did you want to
divert (ph) your statement to an admission (ph) or what, do I
have a motion here? Because we need to get something on the
table so we can take an action here.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: I move that we adjourn to Executive Session and review the applications and the qualifications of the individuals. If individuals are identified by -- or if there are nominees that identified by the Council Members as not being suitable for appointment, that we could take care of it at that time. Those that we believe meet the qualifications, bring that group back and proceed in

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

public forum.

Either that or -- well, I could make that as the motion, but since we -- our rules of procedure are somewhat lax, you might want to appoint a nominating committee or a subcommittee, because somebody's going to have to take now and -- you know, we've got to array (ph) these folks into the appropriate category, make sure that the categories are satisfactory; and the Staff has done some of that for us. And then, we're going to have to -- when we have multiple candidates for a given discipline or interest, we're going to have to decide, you know, how we are going to select that among the qualified individuals.

Several of these people I know only by resume and recommendations, I don't know them personally. Maybe other members do and can provide some insights on how to proceed.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: My thought is that whatever the process is, it ought to be open from the standpoint of what is done. I think, perhaps, everybody approaches a little bit differently. I went through the list Saturday and Sunday -- a few Sunday morning, and I identified at least three individuals in each category, any one of which would be, you know, I thought terrific. And I thought, you know, that when we got together, either in Executive Session or open session, that I

was certainly prepared to identify these individuals. I thought there might be a consensus, and it turns out that these people, 31, really have excellent -- you know, there's -- seemingly, we wanted -- we thought -- we might've been disappointed 'case we didn't have a hundred, I'm thankful we didn't have a hundred, because the 31 there, the qualifications are really great.

So, in the Executive Session, I will display these three in each category, in open session I'd display these three categories. It doesn't make any difference to me.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Speaking to Mr. Collinsworth's motion, it seems to me that we, as part of that motion, should have a limitation on those -- the reasons for someone not making the cut. You know, it should be reasons -- by reasons of something other than I just don't particularly like this person or, you know, this person is said to be disruptive, so in the Executive Session we scratch them off the list. And you see, that doesn't satisfy the public process as far as I'm concerned.

I think that in Executive Session for people -- reasons for people not making the cut should be some -- specified here, you see, because other than -- well, whatever, just because somebody doesn't like them. Say, Ms. Brody has commented upon

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

my views here a number of times, so I go to the back room and say well, strike her off the list, you know. I mean you see, that's the way of avoiding the public process, and that's what I am concerned about.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman. I don't want to avoid the public process. I would like to engage some process today, however. You know, I mean .....

MR. COLE: We've struggled through these things and usually get the right answer, eventually.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, I mean if we want to make it a participatory type of situation, let's have -- let's pass out a paper and everybody write down 15 names, and we'll add them up and whoever gets the most votes gets on the panel.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Well, the other way, the way I approached this thing was to -- ....

MR. COLLINSWORTH: I mean pass it out to everybody.

MR. SANDOR: .... to -- in identifying these top three was credentials, both with respect to, you know, from the standpoint of science or knowledge and then from the standpoint of their involvement in the categories, either professional societies or organizations. And there are no shortage of qualified people. I don't think we need to look so much at the negatives as to identify the positives of these

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

people, and that's what I would urge the individuals to do is to identify these positives. And .....

MR. COLE: Well, then you wouldn't go into Executive Session.

MR. SANDOR: We don't have to. I said that I'm -- what I move to present in Executive Session is the same thing that I would permit (ph) here. There's just no shortage of qualified people.

MR. COLE: Well, can we talk about something else? How are we going to select these people when we're no longer in Executive Session, if we ever go to Executive Session? That's another, we haven't faced that terrible problem yet.

MR. SANDOR: Do you mean (ph) by consensus or numerical ranking as he suggests?

MR. McVEE: Maybe could we talk about -- I guess if we're not going to do it, if we're not going to function as a review panel in Executive Session, may we talk about how we would do that (ph) in a public session?

MR. COLE: That's as big a problem.

MR. McVEE: And one of the possibilities that Staff suggested is that -- brought a note to me here, is that we could each identify -- you know, as categories, we could identify on a written ballot the acceptable candidates, and then take that list and discuss it and make the selections. Is

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

there a problem with that approach or should we just start down 1 the list? 2 MR. SANDOR: Well, who -- whatever -- I don't 3 what Staff person suggested that, but could you run that by 4 5 In other words, we each ..... We'd each identify a candidate or 6 MR. McVEE: 7 candidates in a category that are acceptable, and then discuss and make a selection from that list. Does that work? 8 MR. COLE: Do we need to decide this today? 9 MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons told me earlier that we 10 needed to -- if we're going to keep on our schedule to get a 11 12 P.A.G. appointed so it could act on the '93 budget in a timely 13 manner, that we needed to decide this. 14 MR. COLE: I move we continue this until the next meeting and get this straightened out how we're going --15 16 whether we're going to have an Executive Session on these issues, and then, if we no longer have an Executive Session, 17 how we are going to select the members, whether it's by -- you 18 know, the basic rule has been unanimity, does that rule still 19 20 apply or are we going to change the rules or what? I mean I think for the first time we're addressing this 21 hard issue, so I, therefore, move to pass it for ..... 22 MR. COLLINSWORTH: Second. 23 MR. McVEE: There's a motion to table. 24 Also, 25 one comment, I quess, that might be worthwhile to pass on is

1	that, you know, we could handle this, the discussion, in an
2	open session, when we reach any point where privacy matters,
3	confidential issues needed to be discussed, adjourn at that
4	point. We have, I guess, a motion to table till our next
5	meeting; is that essentially what Mr. Cole, what your motion
6	was (ph)?
7	MR. COLE: I just want to say, one might we
8	all might be better prepared, too, at the next meeting.
9	MR. SANDOR: The motion to table,
LO	Mr. Parliamentarian, whoever you are, ordinarily is not
11	really
12	MR. McVEE: It's not open for discussion
13	normally under
L4	MR. SANDOR: Yeah. It's open (ph) to
L <b>5</b>	discussion but
16	MR. McVEE: If you want to discuss
17	(indiscernible - interrupted)
18	MR. SANDOR: But can I
١9	MR. COLE: Go ahead.
20	MR. SANDOR: make a comment about it?
21	MR. COLE: I suspend the rules.
22	MR. SANDOR: I think we're putting this off.
23	Why don't we simply go ahead. My gosh, this Public Advisory
24	Group, we need to get on with it.
25	MR. COLE: What's the downside, then?

MR. SANDOR: Well, the downside is no (ph)
worse that can happen in this thing is just to if we each
one of us, in open session, simply identified two, three, four
people, or whatever number, and say, you know and see what
happens going through the six members, there may well be a
consensus, and then go through each category and pick one, you
know, by vote. And I would suspend the consensus rule and
maybe even go by a majority vote of the Trustee Council in each
category.
MR. COLE: Well, let me bring up something else
since we've suspended the rules. You know, we have two pinch
hitters today here, you know, and
MR. SANDOR: Who?
MR. COLE: and in deference to
Mr. Collinsworth and Mr. Wolfe, and you know, that's one-third
of the group that's not here. And their you know, maybe
they have some views on these that we would want, they would
want to be expressed among the group. I don't know how
Mr. Collinsworth feels about that but
MR. COLLINSWORTH: I'd love to postpone it and
let the boss take care of it.
MR. SANDOR: Well, that's a point I overlooked,
I guess, frankly, and that's the only (indiscernible -
simultaneous speech)

MR. COLE: Or you think it's the only argument

and that it's (ph) worthwhile.

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. COLLINSWORTH: On the other hand, I've -(indiscernible) complete competence to make the selection if
you would (ph) like to go forward.

MR. McVEE: Well, we have a motion to table. Is there any opposition to that motion to table to a future meeting?

There is opposition, is that .....

MR. COLE: Wow.

MR. SANDOR: I think we're really making a mistake not doing anything, and you know, that if only to get together in Executive Session to get our act together. I think it's a disgrace to come here and deal with this subject which is on the agenda and then not do something. And we've got a whole hour before the public comment period. Why don't we go into Executive Session to think about the process and then (indiscernible - interrupted) ....

MR. COLE: No. No. That is -- I would totally object to that.

MR. SANDOR: Well, just to lay out -- or publicly reach a conclusion, but when we go to the four winds and wait till August 3 or August 10, you know, we lose another month .....

MR. COLE: But why do we need -- I'm trying to address this rationally for a change. Why -- if we -- what

would the -- if we don't get the Advisory Council today, how is the process be disadvantaged if we do it next time rather than today?

MR. McVEE: My comment upon that would be that after we make a recommendation, then there's the group -- or make a selection, then there's the appointment process to go through, so it just delays that appointment process. However, you know, I don't think that's going to take a great deal of time but it's -- a delay is a delay, whatever it amounts to. And notification and the scheduling of the first meeting, I think there has to be a 30 day notice on a meeting -- ....

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Fifteen.

MR. McVEE: ..... 15 days notice on a meeting.

MS. SLAETER: (Indiscernible - away from a

microphone) -- Federal Register.

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: Pardon?

MS. SLAETER: The notice is published in the Federal Register of our meetings, dates and which takes another period of time.

MR. McVEE: It takes some time, so it just delays. One suggestion, you know, possibly as far as the process, would be that -- is that we -- each member identify, you know, their candidate or candidates acceptable on a list and we exchange that information. And we maybe have that available for our teleconference and go through the process.

The problem with that is in the public "forum." 1 2 John. 3 MR. SANDOR: Well, I was going to move that we .... 4 5 MR. COLE: There's a motion on the ..... 6 MR. SANDOR: I'm sorry. There's a motion pending isn't 7 MR. COLE: 8 there? 9 MR. McVEE: Well, the motion failed, basically, 10 John .... MR. COLE: Because he objected? 11 12 MR. SANDOR: And I'll never hear the end of it. Well, I was -- I move that we table this final selection with 13 the understanding that for our next meeting, each of the 14 15 Trustees identify at least three people or up to three people in each category, and that list then be developed in advance of 16 17 the meeting and be available to the public. And for action, then, in other words, what would be available at August 3 or 18 whenever the meeting is and, in fact, what the composite list 19 20 of people that is acceptable. MR. COLE: Can we talk about that a little? 21 22 MR. SANDOR: Sure. MR. COLE: Well, would we -- would you have in 23 24 mind that we would get that list to the Executive Director say 25 in two weeks?

MR. SANDOR: Yeah.

MR. COLE: And then, that would just be each member acting independently and not in any -- you know, in league with any other member, we would just each nominate three people. And then, how -- what would we do when we came back on the 3rd?

MR. SANDOR: Then, the Trustees would have a compounded list of everyone, and as a matter of public disclosure, as far as that's concerned, for the public record, the individual Trustees -- you know, that -- those lists could be the backup. But what we want along this path (ph) would be the composite list of the total group (ph).

MR. COLE: Well, that's right. But then do we have unanimous or do we take a vote on these eligiblees? You know, I think we should decide that sort of now, too, since you want to do something today.

MR. SANDOR: Okay. I'd say that we attempt to get consensus, but if we fail, rather than delay the decision to yet another meeting, that we go by majority vote.

MR. McVEE: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. ROSIER: I second it.

MR. McVEE: I guess the only problem with that is in terms of timing that -- you know, with this scenario, that we will -- probably could not schedule a P.A.G. meeting until sometime in September, maybe mid-September; it depends on

how fast things move.

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

The motion is to table action today, and that each

Trustee Council Member will provide a listing of three in each

category or up to three?

MR. SANDOR: Up to three.

MR. McVEE: Up to three in each category from the nomination list, and that we attempt to resolve this -- make those selections by consensus at our next meeting, that that'll (ph) leave the option open for us to perform jury votes (ph).

Discussion on the motion? Staff?

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Montague.

MR. MONTAGUE: I just want to bring up a point.

A few of the categories only had three people in them, and I'm wondering if on these three names if they should be ranked in terms of first, second and third priority or not by ballot (ph).

MR. SANDOR: No. No, not at this time.

MR. COLE: It's up to three, too.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Yeah.

MR. SANDOR: Up to three.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman. As I understood it, it was up to three; it could be one for each category or up to three for each category.

MR. McVEE: Yeah. I tried to put words into 1 2 John's mouth there. No, he doesn't need help. MR. COLE: 3 It didn't work. Is there MR. McVEE: 4 Any objection to that motion? Okay. The motion 5 agreement? 6 passed. MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair. 7 MR. McVEE: Yes, Marty. 8 Could I ask for a point of MS. RUTHERFORD: 9 When we will make public the information, the 10 clarification. lists of the three, do you want the Trustee Council's name for 11 that -- for each list attached to it and made public, too, or 12 do you just want a cumulative list made public without any 13 indication of which Trustee Council suggested those names? 14 MR. McVEE: Opinion ..... 15 MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, my opinion would be 16 that what would be published would be a composite listing, but 17 if anyone wanted to look (ph) at the backup information, that 18 that be accessible to them but not formally published. 19 MS. RUTHERFORD: Thank you. 20 The other item that we had 21 MR. McVEE: scheduled for Trustee Council Executive Session was working 22 group memberships, and this is a matter of Privacy Act concern. 23 And I guess maybe before we retire or recess for the Executive 24 Session on the working groups, is there any other matter at 25

1	this time that we need to bring up?
2	Dave, do you have any does Staff have any comments?
3	MR. SANDOR: No other Mr. Chairman. No
4	other subject, but we have we're going to do two things, are
5	we going to have a teleconference on the budget first and then
6	a meeting, or what was our decision on the next meeting and
7	teleconference or what or in-person or what?
8	DR. GIBBONS: The next meeting, I understand,
9	would have now three items on it; administrative budget, the
10	financial operating procedures and the P.A.G. selection.
11	MR. SANDOR: Okay. So, we're going to do all
12	three at a regular meeting?
13	MR. McVEE: At an August meeting.
14	MR. SANDOR: August. Is the date set?
15	DR. GIBBONS: August 3rd.
16	MR. SANDOR: Okay.
17	MR. COLLINSWORTH: Is that for a teleconference
18	MR. SANDOR: No. That's what I was asking, and
19	I heard
20	MR. COLE: No, because excuse me. I thought
21	we said we could do the budget by teleconference, and then at
22	sometime later than August 3,
23	DR. GIBBONS: Yeah.
24	MR. COLE: maybe the 20 25th or
25	something like that, we can then have this meeting to give the

1	Habitat Team a little more time to make to get a
2	product (ph).
3	DR. GIBBONS: Yes. What that was the
4	decision. The August 25th meeting has got two agenda items on
5	it, it's got the habitat protection and it also has the 1993
6	work plan. And so that if you want to put the P.A.G.
7	selection Public Advisory Group selection off till the 25th
8	I would prefer to deal with it on the 3rd, if we can, to get
9	that process going. But maybe defer the financial operating
10	procedures, but
11	MR. COLE: Well, let me make another since
12	there is some idea of some urgency in the Public Advisory
13	Group, could we have a meeting sometime in late July? I mean,
14	you know, move it forward rather than some of this a little
15	bit, we'd get the budget done in advance, we could get
16	MR. SANDOR: Yeah.
17	MR. COLE: the Public Advisory Group
18	done.
19	MR. WOLFE: And defer the habitat?
20	MR. SANDOR: Yeah.
21	MR. COLE: And then defer yeah, defer the
22	habitat. Yeah.
23	MR. WOLFE: We really do need to move that
24	back (ph).
25	DR. GIBBONS: So excuse me. The suggestion
- 1	

would be to have a face-to-face Trustee Council meeting at the 1 end of July to deal with the Public Advisory Group members, 2 3 then have a teleconference on August 3 to deal with administrative budget ..... 4 5 MR. COLE: No. MR. SANDOR: No. 6 .... and then have another face-DR. GIBBONS: 7 to-face meeting on the 25th to deal with the '93 and habitat 8 9 protection? MR. COLE: No. Do the administrative budget, 10 if we can, at the meeting in July. 11 DR. GIBBONS: Well, I really can't -- at this 12 time, I don't know how many comments we're going to get. 13 were trying to give ourselves about a week to get comments and 14 redo the administrative budget, if possible, or respond to the 15 comments. That was our -- that's my only concern. 16 17 MR. COLE: Let's do the administrative budget, if need be, by telephone. 18 Can we wrap up -- I guess the MR. McVEE: 19 suggestion is can we do the administrative budget by 20 teleconference in early August, go ahead with the -- you know, 21 a meeting in July for completing the P.A.G. 22 MR. COLE: Or any other business for next 23 24 year's program (ph).

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. ROSIER:

25

I'm on business in the last half

of July. 1 MR. McVEE: You're out of touch? 2 MR. ROSIER: Yeah. I'm in the field the last 3 two weeks of July. 4 MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman. 5 MR. McVEE: Yes, Jerome. 6 I think we may have forgotten 7 MR. MONTAGUE: 8 about the July 20th teleconference, or it could be a face-toface meeting, to look at the very early burden of just titles 9 of the '93 work plan. So -- and because of the review process 10 being the 22nd to the 27th, there is no room to delay that. Ι 11 12 would wonder if the Council and Dave would consider that faceto-face meeting on the 20th or thereabouts. 13 MR. COLE: Great. 14 DR. GIBBONS: We could deal with the Public 15 Advisory Group nomination process at that time. 16 17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On the 20th. MR. McVEE: On the 20th. How does that work 18 out on the calendars? 19 Well, could we take a look at where MR. COLE: 20 we are in our various other duties and notify the 21 Administrative Director if the 20th is acceptable or whatever? 22 MR. McVEE: Let's do that. Look at our 23 calendars and see if that's possible. We may have to poll us 24 25 (indiscernible). Any other matters before we recess to

1	Executive Session?
2	MR. COLE: May I be
3	MR. COLLINSWORTH: Yeah. I have a question.
4	Why are we recessing to Executive Session?
5	MR. McVEE: There is a discussion on work group
6	membership.
7	MR. SANDOR: The work group membership.
8	MR. McVEE: Yes, that's on the agenda.
9	MR. SANDOR: We're not going to be talking
10	about P.A.G.s?
11	MR. McVEE: No. No. Just work group
12	membership.
13	MR. COLE: May I be excused from the work group
14	membership meeting? I'll give you my proxy, you and
15	Commissioner Rosier, but you have to exercise it jointly.
16	MR. SANDOR: With a consensus, you mean (ph).
17	MR. COLE: No, unanimity. Then, I'll be back
18	at 5:00, there's some things that
19	MR. McVEE: Let's adjourn. I guess the
20	upstairs conference room is available. We'll be back at
21	5:00 o'clock or shortly before for the teleconference.
22	(Off record)
23	(On record)
24	MR. McVEE: reconvene for the
25	teleconference session of the public to take public

testimony or public comment of this meeting of the Trustee Council. I might just check right now and try to do a roll call of who we might have on-line, and then immediately following that, I will have Dr. Gibbons do a summary of today's activities of the Trustee Council.

Do we have anyone from Chenega? Chenega Bay, is anyone on-line?

CONFERENCE OPERATOR: The only sites on-line are Juneau and Kodiak.

MR. McVEE: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The only sites on-line right now are Juneau and Kodiak.

MR. McVEE: Juneau and Kodiak are on-line.

Let's then proceed to with the -- Dr. Gibbons' summary, then

following that, we'll do a round-robin of all of the sites and

take public comment. Dr. Gibbons.

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah. Okay. I'm going to follow the format of the agenda. And the first action item taken by the Trustee Council was concerning the 1992 Work Plan. The Trustee Council moved to accept the 1992 Work Plan as developed, with the addition of \$47,000.00 to the fish -- Shellfish Project Number 27, the sockeye salmon project, and 103,000 for R60-C, the pink salmon project. Fish & Game will revise the detailed study plans concerning these two projects and have those ready -- will have those prepared by -- in

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

several weeks, I think the term was.

We will -- the Trustee Council also approved forwarding all specific new projects to the 1993 Work Plan for analysis and inclusion in that plan, and the habitat protection proposals to the Habitat Protection Working Group synthesis (ph) and development.

The final 1992 Work Plan, in response to public comments, will be sent to all commentors, and that is final now, the copy's out here and will be sent to the teleconferencing sites also.

The second agenda item, the financial operating procedures. The Trustee Council tabled the financial operating procedures until August 3rd Trustee Council teleconference.

The Financial Committee is to review the standard authorities by agencies and suggest the change that's identified in the procedures by the Trustee Council.

The third item, the 1993 Work Plan. The Trustee Council moved to approve the 1993 schedule in concept, including changes involving the Public Advisory Group, O&B and others for inclusion.

The Trustee Council proposed to request funding from the Court for the 1993 projects in December, with a consideration of others needing emergency funding before that time.

The remaining five months of the 1992 budget will be

requested from the Court to enable obtaining funds prior to the start of the 1993 fiscal year on October 1.

More involvement, as suggested by the Trustee Council, is needed by the chief scientist, peer reviewers and Public Advisory Group in the 1993 proposed schedule. The Restoration Team is to meet with the chief scientist tomorrow to facilitate this increased involvement.

Fourth item, habitat protection. For the August 25th Trustee Council meeting, the Restoration Team is develop an outline for the overall habitat protection plan, including level of detail, options for accomplishment, identification of critical habitats for imminent threat. The Trustee Council wants an integrated package to start moving forward in this area.

Item Number 5, the symposium. The Trustee Council approves of the direction that the Restoration Team has presented in the information document in the package.

Item Number 6, EIS options. The Trustee Council has recommended to proceed with the Walkoff contract, Option Number 2, for the development of a draft EIS restoration plan.

Item Number 7, Public Advisory Group. The Trustee

Council tabled the final selection of the Public Advisory Group

members with the understanding that each Trustee Council member

will independently nominate up to three members in each

category by the next Trustee Council meeting, which would be

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

July 20th. The composite list at the Trustee Council meeting will then be used for the selection of the members.

The last item, the Trust- -- the next Trustee Council meetings: July 20th is the next scheduled Trustee Council meeting, the agenda items will be an overview of the 1993 Work Plan and the Public Advisory Group process and selection.

There is a teleconference -- Trustee Council teleconference scheduled for August 3rd on the administrative budget. And August 25th is another Trustee Council meeting to discuss the draft 1993 Work Plan and the habitat protection long-term process. These dates are suggested dates at this time, I need to check with the lat date with the Trustee Council and on the August 3rd to see if those are firm dates.

MR. McVEE: Thank you, Dave. I guess at this point, we'll start taking comment from the public. And have we still just got two?

## (Side conversations)

MR. McVEE: Okay. Who do we have on-line? Do we have anybody from Chenega Bay on-line? Cordova, anyone from Cordova on-line? Fairbanks? Fairbanks Information Office, are you on-line? Juneau, are you still on-line?

JUNEAU: Juneau is on-line, however there is nobody here, so I'm probably going to be hanging up until we do get some -- if and when we get some participants.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Homer, Teleconference

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

Center? Homer, on-line?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HOMER: Yes, Homer's on-line and Nancy Lord is here but she just wishes to listen.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Kenai, is Kenai on-line?
How about Kodiak, Kodiak Information Office?

KODIAK: Kodiak is on-line, although we just have observers here, no one to testify.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Seward, is Seward on-line?

Tatitlek, is there anyone from Tatitlek on-line? Valdez

Information Office, are you on-line? Valdez? Whittier, is
there anyone at Whittier?

Okay. At this point then, I'd ask if there's anyone from the Anchorage audience who wants to testify at this point?

Yes. John, Arliss, Senator ....

SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: Yeah, (indiscernible - away from microphone).

MR. SIBERT: My name is John Sibert (ph), I'm the Executive Director of the Alaska Science & Technology Foundation, and I wanted to speak just a minute to the proposal that Arliss Sturgulewski had put to this body regarding the establishment of Exxon Valdez Marine Sciences Endowment.

There are two reasons, I think, that something like this is important and would be very useful, whether it was done in FY '93 or at some later point in time. And I think one of them has been brought home to me by the kinds of proposals I

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

see all the time; we get a couple hundred proposals a year in all sorts of areas, including, as you can well imagine, right after the Spill, an awful lot of things on how you're going to clean up that Oil Spill, what you're going to do about it, how we're going to prevent it, all of those sorts of things.

One of the concerns I have from various meetings I've been to is that the focus, in many cases, has been on the -- I guess what one might call the sexier aspects of that Spill in terms of the, you know, sea otters, murrelets, et cetera, and very little, or at least a reduced amount of effort in areas related to the bottom of the food chain, bitoplanktons (ph), zoe plankton (ph), a lot of things that are related to long-term problems that we do not understand with regard to oil spills. If you look at the Amoco Cadiz and the problems that have -- in fact, the studies that are still ongoing there in the marshes along the French coast. They're still learning about the problems from oil -- crude oil and biota, particularly, the bottom end of the food chain, as I said.

And I think these are important, because if you wipe out that or have an affect on that, you're certainly going to affect the top end of the food chain later. So, I think it's important that we have some long-term commitment to these kinds of studies. These are not the kinds of things you're going to see a change in a year or two years but much longer term

And the second point I'd like to make since the Science

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

& Technology Foundation was set up with an endowment, and we use the earnings from that endowment to fund research and development projects, that the system works pretty well. We've been in existence, in terms of actual operations, for about three years. It allows one to take a longer term view, there are less -- let's say less subject to some of the vagaries of the changes in the way the wind's blowing when it comes to dealing with those longer-term research projects. The -- and what it does do is provide some continuity. It allows one to establish a good, sound RFP project -- process which can carry forward year to year. It allows, as I said, the time to thoughtfully evaluate proposals, peer reviewed projects and things of that sort, and do it in a very consistent manner.

So, I would strongly support, if it's possible for this group to do that, the establishment of an endowment for the longer-term evaluation of the affects of the Oil Spill in Prince William Sound. I'll be glad to -- in fact, at any other time or at any time, I would be glad to talk to any members of the Commission about how the Science & Technology Foundation was set up, and how we are dealing with these kinds of issues, if you would so wish.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: You say you have as many as 200 proposals that come before the Alaska Science & Technology Foundation a year?

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SIBERT: Yeah. Last year, it was about 200.

MR. SANDOR: Very briefly, how do you go through those and pick out the priorities and what -- and the way in which that's relevant for us?

We lay out a number of criteria MR. SIBERT: that are critical in order for someone to be funded. At least one member of your Commission, in fact, two -- is Mike Barton still involved with -- Mike is the technical area (ph) review chairman for forest products for our -- for the Science & Technology Foundation and Kurt has reviewed proposals for us before. And that what we do is a two-stage process; there's a pre-proposal which is fairly short. I've looked at a thousand of those in three years. And they -- we evaluate those based upon the criteria that are established, those criteria being -what's appropriate, of course, for the Science & Technology Foundation is a focus on economic development more than on the kinds of knowledge that we're dealing with here, and give some feedback to the potential proposer as to whether or not that proposal is appropriate and what might be done to fix it. then, get the proposals in, each one is peer reviewed by three to five peer reviewers, and finally evaluated by the Board of Directors three times a year.

That's one way to do it. I also serve as a Board of Governors member of the National Coastal Research & Resources

#### 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

Institute, which is a Congressional and Federal committee, to do research related to economic development in coastal areas. And they use a somewhat similar process, but they use a separate board of advisors that does the first screening, and then the Board of Governors makes the final decision. There are mechanisms to do that, I think, that make it not too onerous, though my staff might disagree with that.

MR. McVEE: Yes. John, one question, I guess, is on your peer review process, you have, I guess, a roster of names for various categories of projects that may come to you, and then those are utilized over and over again as peer review?

MR. SIBERT: Right. But we have a lot of them. The peer review list, at the current time, has 570 people on it from all over the country. And we try not to over-use anybody. We use, as I said, technical area review chairman for various areas to help assign peer reviewers, the people who are knowledgeable in the field; as I said, Mike Barton is forestry Sam Dunaway (ph) is mining. So, we have for us and so on. that process built in. It's take a while to build up a good list of peer reviewers, but once you've done that, it helps a They are voluntary peer reviewers and very happy to serve as voluntary peer reviewers, from my observation. interested in what's happening because they have knowledge in the field, and it's one way for them to keep current. Also, peer reviewers can write proposals as well.

### 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

Um-hum. Further questions? MR. McVEE: Yes, 1 Mr. Sandor. 2 Well, just an observation, I think 3 MR. SANDOR: we ought to take John's offer of providing some assistance and 4 5 quidance to us in not only developing the proposal or evaluating proposals for an endowment but for a proposal for a 6 way in which we review projects and screen them. It seems if 7 8 like you've been in business for three years, that you can 9 provide some help to us. My beard turned completely white 10 MR. SIBERT: 11 in that period, you understand. 12 MR. McVEE: You've done well. Any other 13 questions for John here? Thank you very much. MR. SIBERT: Thanks. 14 MR. MCVEE: Senator. I feel kind of awkward 15 sitting at this side of the table from you. 16 17 SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: Yeah. It's about time 18 you got even with me. This is not user friendly, by the way. 19 What you need is a table and for us to be sitting down at ..... 20 MR. McVEE: Yes. 21 SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: .... the level of you. However, this is one opportunity I have to speak down to you, 22 23 so I will. But I do thank you for giving me just a few minutes. I know that you've got a long way to go before you 24 make the decisions for 1993. But as you also know, I've had an 25

opportunity to talk to a number of you, I'm very interested in seeing a science foundation established, and I'd like to just give you a very little bit of background. But I'm very interested in the founding and the action of the Arctic Research Commission.

And he's not on now, but was a wonderful scientist by the name of John Steele from Wood's Hole. And we were out Unalaska one time, I have family there, and it was pouring rain and we were walking in the rain, and John was telling me about this little grain of whatever starting it's way from iceland and taking a thousand years to come all the way around and be part of the upwelling that goes into the incredibly rich Bering Sea. And I think Alaska learned in spades how the tides work as a result of the Exxon Valdez.

In 1988, Paul Fooz (ph), who was then the Mayor of Unalaska, and I appeared before the Arctic Research Commission. And as a result of our appearance before them, they adopted, and it then became a part of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee, which is NFC is the National Science Foundation's interagency group, a study on the research to understand the Arctic Ocean, the Bering and Marginal Seas, the sea ice, the seabed, and on and on. But it -- they're actually focusing now research dollars into the Bering Sea, and both the water itself and oceanography and so on.

I have been a member and advisor for some years now to

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, which has Don and Carl and others will know, is going to be superseded by — or is being superseded by a new agency which will include, now, Russia and Japan, Canada and the United States, and it's just underway. But I've been interested in what I've been hearing over a series of years about research, about what we know and what we don't know. There are some tremendous gaps out there, and those gaps have led, I think, to over-fishing on the Bogoslof, we've seen that closed now in terms of bottom fishing. Nobody, I'm sure, of the scientists in the room can tell us why the crab went away, why we're seeing very small species, there's a very complex interrelationship.

I think you had a situation this morning where certain things are happening, and so you're going to toss some dollars, and you don't really know why those are happening, you think there may or there may not be an interrelationship to the Exxon Valdez. So, it seems to me there's a tremendous need for additional information.

As a result of a meeting that the advisors held in Japan in Tokyo last year, Senators Zharoff, Cotten and myself make a request to our Senate Research Agency to take a look at the various agencies that were doing research. And I believe I have made that available -- I'm sure I've made it available to the Staff. But it talks about all of the different agencies from the regulatory agencies, such as the Pacific Halibut

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

Commission to NOAA to the University of Alaska to et cetera, et cetera; the major players that are out there. Very complex interrelationship. Most of them, as you well know, starved for dollars. But I've seen us in the Legislature, more when the money first came, doing lots and lots of short-term things. And I think that that is one of the dangers that we face as we look toward restoration and restoration projects is knowing enough, getting enough snapshots so that we have a good basis on which to make the decisions that you have coming. And it was with this in mind that I have pursued the idea of establishing a foundation.

I've talked to some of you and there seems to be some concern as to whether it fits directly. I think that it does in spades in terms of you have to know what's happening out there in order to make the kind of judgments as to restoration and to their value.

And so I would just encourage you as Trustees, I realize this is a premature presentation, but I would encourage you to really get involved. Where do you want to go with this? Where do you want to end up? And I'm talking about the whole restoration effort. You've got a lot of money, maybe \$700 million, and what is the goal?

It seems to me that if we can advance our knowledge and -- and understanding of the interrelationship of the -- of our oceans and our seas and our currents, that it does a lot for us

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

in this particular endeavor, but, of course, it's valuable information if -- if anything happens in the future. And I know that makes -- that part of it makes the fartherest reach, but what a wonderful thing if we could not only help in the wise restoration, but have the information we need so that we can continue to manage our resources.

So at this point I -- I hope you take up John's offer. He's done a marvelous job of bringing a peer or scientific review to -- to issues. I didn't call and ask him to be here today, but I'm delighted he is, because we go the -- the same way on a lot of these -- these various areas, and so just with that I'll look forward to working with you and hope you'll seriously consider the proposal.

Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Thank you.

SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Are there any questions for the

Senator?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Thank you, Senator.

Since we did not have anyone identified available for public comment in the other localities, I will again ask if there's anyone else from Anchorage, and then -- yes, come forward?

MAYOR SELBY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

members of the Trustees. I'm Jerome Selby, Mayor of the Kodiak Island Borough. I appreciate your giving us an opportunity today.

I wanted to primarily today call your attention to this particular document which I know each of you have a copy of, because I mailed it to you at the same time we submitted it to the staff, and just talk briefly to that document. I guess we're a little amazed that there's 450 projects, because there's a total of 36 projects in this document.

This document is a ten-year plan, it's not a one-year plan. It's a ten-year plan. The sum of the request over that ten-year time period is something a little less than \$280 million total, including \$95 million into an endowment of the 280 million. We are requesting for 1993 a modest \$5 million to put in the endowment as -- more or less as a seed money. Our request for 1993 for these projects is \$22.9 million, which again we -- we felt was somewhat modest going in.

The way that the projects break out, just for a little information and -- and based on some of the -- the discussion you folks had earlier here today, for acquisition, we've got about \$134 million in there, or roughly 45 to 47% of the total. For the endowment, it runs 95 million, roughly 30-32%, and then for other restoration type projects, we've got approximately 50 million or 20 to 25%.

#### R&R\_COURT REPORTERS

Now, we anticipate that the endowment figure that we have in here is high. I mean, we -- we don't make any bones about that, but what we do anticipate is that that gives us some room for that endowment figure to shrink a little bit if over the ten years, and we anticipate there will be some additional projects that are identified that -- that we don't know of today, we haven't thought of yet, based on other information that will come in. During the time period, we're - we feel confident that there will be some other good projects identified, and that you could take that money then out of the 95 million and still have a hefty endowment fund if you've followed a similar format for the other two subareas of the spill area.

I'd like to speak to just a couple of them in particular that maybe you don't -- one of the acquisitions, of course, is the Afognak acquisition. What we've done with that is that I think you folks are aware that there's studies underway this summer by both Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Fish and Game of Afognak, of the Afognak lands. And so what we did is we simply proposed in there to start a year from now with a \$4 million, if you will earnest money or - depending on if you buy an option or -- or -- it gives you some options there. And then spread the actual acquisition over the remaining time period that funds would become available. And so that's the approach we used on most of the

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

acquisitions.

We have kind of a potpourri of acquisitions. This weir sites, for example, for the Department of Fish and Game, those are all real well defined. Virtually all of them are currently under lease, and we're proposing to begin that acquisition this -- in 1993. So in this case we feel that the acquisition is very clearly defined. What's -- what is needed to be acquired, and we have a ballpark of a figure and are proposing to move ahead with those.

Similarly with the bear refuge in-holdings, we're proposing to move ahead with that in 1993, but allocate some amount of funds, and it's \$5 million per year for the remainder of the time period here, but again that's a fairly well defined in-holding acquisition program.

So we've kind of got a range of -- of acquisitions in there.

There's a couple of projects within the restoration projects that we'd like to particularly draw your attention to, because they kind of don't fit with some of the conversation that we've heard espoused by the -- the Council before. That's the expansion of the Fisheries Industrial Technology Center in Kodiak, and we're requesting seven and a half million dollars for that, three and a half million in 1993, three and a half in 1994, and a half a million in 1995.

We feel that that's a really critical project and one

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

that deserves a lot of attention from you folks, because it basically is what we consider to be a win-win-win situation. We win three times over as -- as a state to fund that particular construction. First of all we win because it allows a lot of the analysis that's going to be done by some of the other studies that are being funded from these projects to be done right here in Alaska as opposed to shipping them to laboratories outside the State of Alaska. And so we consider that a win if we can support the studies in-state at a facility in -- in the State of Alaska.

Now, it's win for the University and the Fish -- the Fish Tech Center itself, because it allows them to move ahead with programming that they need anyway. So in order to do the research that we need to have done, on our fisheries research, on our fisheries in the State of Alaska, we need this capability.

And the third win that we look at is the fact that one of the biggest drawbacks we had during the Exxon Valdez spill is that we had no capability laboratory-wise in the State of Alaska to support and analyze, particularly where we got frustrated was to determine whether subsistence clam and fish were safe to eat or not. And we pursued that throughout the summer of 1989. We ended up spending from the Kodiak Island Borough \$1 million trying to get that answer. Do you know when we got the answer? We got the answer in November of 1989.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Now the folks that were trying to get their subsistence fish in during the summer of 1989 really didn't benefit at all from that. And the reason it took so long is that all of the samples we took starting in April, they came to Anchorage first, but then the Anchorage labs were so plugged that they had to go to -- I think part of it was done in Denver, Colorado, and part of it was done in Texas, and I'm not sure where the third place was, but by the time we got the -- the data back, it was November.

Meanwhile, what folks had to go on was the recommendation from -- I think it was from NOAA, not to pick on anybody in particular, but they were kind of the lead agency on the subsistence, the rule of thumb for the folks in the villages was, if you open a clam and it smells like oil, don't eat it. You know, that's -- that just didn't make it as far as those people were considered -- concerned, particularly the subsistence folks.

And so we desperately need to have the capability to do some of this analysis in the State of Alaska. Hopefully we'll never have another situation like this to deal with, but if we do, we definitely need to have, and we would have that capability sitting here in this facility.

The other one then also -- similar is the archaeological museum for the Kodiak Area Native Association. I understand that you folks weren't too excited about bricks

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

and mortar, but we would encourage you to look at this one very closely as part of the over-all archaeological results of the spill.

Now, what -- what we all know is, is there were a number of excellent sites mapped during the <a href="Exxon Valdez">Exxon Valdez</a> spill. What we know since then is that some of those have already been pretty much cleaned out, because some of those maps got into private hands somehow, who knows how.

What we're concerned about is being able to go out and actually do some digs and preserve some of those artifacts permanently in a good facility here in Alaska. Again, the other option is to dig them and send them -- send them to the Smithsonian I guess back in Washington, D.C. That doesn't do much for the people in Alaska.

In addition, just recently within the last few weeks, the archaeological folks at KANA have discovered what may be one of the most significant finds in the -- in the North American continent, and Jim Carmichael can probably tell you more about this than I can, but my understanding is -- is that on the north side of Afognak Island, in a dig they've discovered an area where because of a change in water tables, the artifacts have been preserved in the absence of oxygen, and so they have some premier materials that they're digging up that have not deteriorated at all for several hundred years, and it's ranked -- it was immediately ranked as maybe being one

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

of the top four archeological sites in North America.

Now, where are we going to take those artifacts?

Again, we could leave them there, in which case they'll

disappear, or we can bring them out and have a place to put

them. And that's why we feel it's real important to have a

place to put them here in Alaska, and close to the people whose

culture they represent. And these also are the people in our

view that really got significantly hindered, damaged by the

spill itself, hence we feel it's -- it makes sense from a

restoration perspective to provide a place to put these and

give these folks some pride in their culture and a place to

keep these things on Kodiak Island.

So again we know the -- you folks have said they don't maybe quite fit as well as they should, but we feel they fit real well, and they fit very strongly within the -- the archaeological preservation aspect of the -- of the framework document.

Now, the Exxon Valdez Restoration Committee in Kodiak is made up of folks from Federal Parks, Federal Fish and Wildlife, State Fish and Game, State DEC, the Kodiak Island Borough, Kodiak Area Native Association. Basically what we did is we took the Shoreline Clean-up Committee, and we've expanded it some since then, but we took the -- these folks are the folks who spent the most part of two years on the shore during the oil spill in the field and know where the impacts are, and

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

as a result of that, these are the projects that those folks have come up with, and we've expanded that -- we've had as high as 25 or 30 people at some of the meetings that we've had putting this document together, and so we'd like to recommend it to you for careful consideration for -- for funding in the Kodiak area.

The -- the one concern I have as far as the briefness of the descriptions is that I'm a little concerned that they're too brief and maybe the full impact or importance of some of the projects may not come across in a page and a half of documents. So I'd sure hope that you and your staff will get back to us if you want more backup, and virtually all of these projects, we've got quite a bit more backup and thought that's gone into them, so that is available.

And as a final thought, I did comment during the -- the review of the framework document itself, and -- and something that we still think is a little bit light, and that we'd like to see the -- the Trustees consider a little more in the future, is we'd still like you to consider the resource, the restoration of the people resource, the impact to the people themselves that were involved in the spill. We saw it on a daily basis throughout 1989, and -- and we'd like you to see -- maybe put something in the framework document itself for some guidelines along -- along that line, so ....

If there's any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Are there any questions? I guess I 1 might ask staff a question. Is this document -- do you have 2 this with the -- with the '93 submissions, Dr. Montague? 3 DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, yes. 4 MAYOR SELBY: Thank you. 5 MR. SANDOR: Well, I ..... 6 MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor? 7 Mr. Mayor, you make reference in -MR. SANDOR: 8 -in here to -- well, one of the options, the five million set 9 aside for an endowment fund, and then you -- you point out in 10 that same paragraph, or the group points out in that same 11 paragraph the spill-wide an endowment might be an option to 12 that, and -- but that's the first question with respect to --13 to the concept of endowment spill-wide, I presume -- or the way 14 15 I interpret this paragraph that you would endorse either. MAYOR SELBY: That ..... 16 ..... Would you talk to that, what MR. SANDOR: 17 your concept is? 18 That's correct, Mr. Sandor, we MAYOR SELBY: 19 don't -- we aren't preconceived. We just -- basically what you 20 21 see here is that we support the -- the development of an endowment program to continue this availability of some funding 22 on a -- on a long-term basis. We're not hung up about whether 23 it should be a spill-wide endowment or if -- if no one else --24

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

if the other two subareas don't support endowments, or you

folks aren't getting that kind of information from them, then we'd be willing to do an endowment and management it with the Kodiak Island Borough, but that's -- we're not stating a strong preference for one or the other. We're just saying that we think there should be an endowment, and we want to work with you folks in -- in the development of the endowment and how it might be structured so that things are -- are covered for the future for some of these critical areas that I think most of us share a concern about, and so that's where we are with it.

We haven't really thought through how the thing ought to get structured. You know, maybe a piece of it broken off for Senator Sturgulewski's idea is -- is a good way to go. You know, maybe there ought to be an endowment with three or four different categories within it or -- or something like that. But -- and I know you folks are starting to wrestle with that and -- and we're not here to try to suggest to you that we've thought through all that and have all the answers for you by any stretch.

MR. SANDOR: I guess the second question, your proposals in effect as I understand them run around 30 million per year for the next nine years, is that about right?

MAYOR SELBY: That's correct. The first year is a little lighter as I've mentioned. It's 22.9, and that's because we knew you folks had some other financial obligations the first year here, particularly in 1993 that had to be taken

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

care of, so we've come in intentionally light in '93. But then '94 through the -- through the rest of the years, we targeted to try to hit right around 30 million.

MR. SANDOR: And that roughly is equivalent to about a third of the monies available?

MAYOR SELBY: Yeah, roughly. We've -- we left what we felt was funding for administration and whatnot and -- and we're not necessarily totally locked in on a regional one-third, one-third, one-third. We feel that we got a little bit more than one-third of the impact quite frankly out of the whole -- whole thing, but we don't want to turn it into a regional strife type of situation, but we thought that made some amount of sense for us to target going in roughly one-third, one -- for each of the subareas just as something for us to work against in terms of putting together a ten-year plan.

MR. SANDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is really an impressive package of proposals, and surely will be helpful for the restoration -- for the '93/94 planning effort.

Priorities aren't always identified in there though?

MAYOR SELBY: We intentionally avoided

priorities in order to keep the whole group working together.

We didn't want to get into an internal cat fight, and so we

didn't -- intentionally avoided trying to prioritize. We did

target that we would not exceed the 30 million, and -- and

fortunately it turned out. Now, you know, I want to give

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

credit to a lot of folks that worked real hard on putting this together. We kind of did the typing and -- and whatnot, but actually staff and several of you sitting here at this table are the ones that did a lot of the work on putting this information together, and had I -- they've done an excellent job. The people have worked real hard. Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Just thinking about this 300 million roughly, 270, whatever, first you have to take out 900 million, 75, 80 million for reimbursement of state expenses, we have at least 60 for -- plus for federal expenses, that's 150. We have administrative expenses and expenses this year of I think 20 at least. And I can easily see 200 million sort of evaporate if you will fairly quickly. And that leaves 700. Take your 300 out of there, that's 400 left, you know, so you might want to do a little homespun math and take a hard look at your because I think it's going to be very hard to give proposals, Kodiak 300 million out of seventy- -- 700 or less that will be I mean, you know, just thinking realistically. available.

And then we get proposals for the acquisition of habitat, you know. I can see two or 300 million there going faster than you can blink an eye. So I tell people generally, you know, we have to take a hard look at these expenditures and where we're going to put the bucks, for what it's worth. That's simple math.

### 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

2.2

23

24

MAYOR SELBY: Yeah, we've -- now the 1 acquisitions in the Kodiak area, of course are included in 2 3 here. So .... They are? How about Afognak? MR. COLE: MAYOR SELBY: That's in here. 5 MR. COLE: You -- Afognak's in your plan. 6 7 MAYOR SELBY: That's in here, yeah. So I -- I know what you're saying, and -- and obviously there has to be a 8 balance that's struck there, and we're willing to work with the 9 Council on -- on coming up with that. We're not saying that 10 we're adamant that it's 300 million to Kodiak Island by any 11 12 stretch of the imagination. 13 MR. COLE: Let me just mention another problem that we can think about in connection with this endowment. 14 mean, suppose we set up the endowment and -- and times change 15 16 and we retire and all those good things, and then another, you know, some -- the Trustee Council changes. Somebody says, 17 "Well, we don't like this endowment," and they terminate it. 18 Are we thinking about that possibility, Commissioner? 19 20 MR. SANDOR: Yes. MR. COLE: I mean, that's -- it's a little 21 troubling, ..... 22 MR. SANDOR: Yeah. 23 ..... you know. We say, well, let's 24 MR. COLE: 25 just take this 100 million or so and put it into an endowment,

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

be very prudent, and then here comes a new group, different composition, which surely will happen, and say "We don't like this endowment," and, poof, they all take it out like the Alaska Legislature did to 411 and 50 million's gone before you bat an eye. And that's the thing that troubles me, John, about this endowment. I think we have to think very hard.

And then as we think about that, well, what right do we have to set up an endowment and, you know, essentially lock in money, you know, from a future Trustee Council -- Trustee members. It's -- it's a little troubling. So you might give some thought to that.

MR. McVEE: Dr. Montague?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, I do have a question for Mayor Selby. You had mentioned the desire to work with us on further development of these ideas. Currently our mode of operation is that the agency that, you know, one of the six lead agencies would turn each of these one-pagers into the brief project description. Our intent was to not have the public work too much on an idea that may never be funded, but I guess the question is would the Borough be interested in -- and/or willing to turn these one-page ideas into the project descriptions or would you prefer that we do it?

MAYOR SELBY: We'd be glad to do it, because

I'm -- we're not going to do it. We're going to go back to

each agency that submitted each of the projects and have them

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

complete it. Like I say, most of them do already have a fair amount of backup on most of these projects already, so it would not be that hard of a problem from our perspective, because we're going to spread the load across probably ten or 12 other agencies. We have some from the Borough itself, obviously, but it would -- it kind of spreads the workload out. We could certainly do that if that's beneficial.

DR. MONTAGUE: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe?

MAYOR SELBY: Mayor Selby, just one other question is you folks have quite a bit of land acquisition proposed as part of your project. Did you use any kind of a screening process? We're -- we're wrestling with how we're going to deal with the land acquisition proposals, and maybe your -- your Borough has come up with some ideas that we could use if you have a screening established.

MAYOR SELBY: Well, the only screening we really provided, Mr. Wolfe was that we had the framework document itself, and suggested to folks that if the project that they were proposing didn't clearly fit in the framework document, don't bother to submit it, you know. I mean, the -- the committee could say no if it's something that actually didn't fit. I was real pleased with the response we got from that, because we didn't have to turn down any. Every project that was submitted is in here. From our perspective, they all

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

do fit in the framework document, and so these are areas that are, you know, high priority, I think primo habitat as far as the acquisition is concerned.

Some of the information that's already coming in from the north Afognak study that's being conducted right now indicates that North Afognak might be even better habitat and more critical habitat than we had thought it was. The marbled murrelet nesting areas apparently are much higher than they thought they were going in there, for example, and there's other bits of information that I'm getting back from the folks doing the study, so we feel that the ones that we've identified and -- and we've not locked in, that's an important point, on exactly what on north Afognak would be included in the actual acquisition.

Basically what we've done is we've notified the owners that we want to start a negotiation process, but until we got the information from those studies this summer, we really weren't in a process -- in a position to -- to move ahead with that. And so that's why that number, while it's a little bit soft, at least it's provided for in our ten-year plan so that once the final determination of what the habitat area is that we really need, we could move ahead with the negotiation and the -- and the funding would be -- would be forthcoming.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Other questions? I guess not.

#### R&R\_COURT REPORTERS

MAYOR SELBY: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Thank you very much, Mayor Selby.

Rick Steiner?

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. STEINER: I almost forgot what I was going to say. That was quite -- quite a discourse there.

I'm Rick Steiner from Cordova, and first of all I think Mr. Selby's ideas deserve some merit. I -- it opens up a whole new can of worms though having regional management in -- in this sort of context I think, so it's something you're going to have to wrestle with a little bit.

Mainly what I wanted to do, I just have a couple of quick comments, but I wanted to thank the Council for some positive movement on the habitat acquisition issue. I know you've been creeping along in that direction, but I'd specifically like to thank Don Collinsworth, Charlie Cole and John Sandor for the leadership they've shown today in pushing this issue along. It means a lot to hundreds of people in the region. Thanks a lot.

I think the critical thing that I think Attorney

General Cole alluded to in this discussion today is interim

protection. It's been talked about for over two years, and we
have none in place, and I don't mean to be critical, it's just

we need to move on it if we're going to do it.

One of the primary examples of why we probably should have had this two years ago is Patton Bay which there's a road

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

right now, about a third of it has been built on Montague

Island I just heard today, and the other 20 miles will be built
in the next month and a half. That — the Patton Bay timber,
which will probably start being cut in late summer, probably I
think would — would have fallen out in any system of criteria
for acquisition of equivalent resources or of habitat for
species injured by the spill. It's very close to where most of
the oil exited the Sound, and that's — that's an opportunity
we have lost, period.

And not to focus on the negative and looking backwards, I think if we look forward, the question is how many more of those are we prepared to lose, which is why I think the urgency in this issue is paramount. So thanks again.

The -- the next question is, how much money's in the bank right now? You've about 18 million or so that has not been appropriated, is that ....?

DR. GIBBONS: Seventeen.

MR. STEINER: Seventeen. It would be nice at your next meeting to keep that -- to keep that money on the table, or at least be very, very aware that it's there, and be prepared, if -- if you're ready institutionally, to provide some of that in -- by way of moratorium, offers, option offers to timber owners, resource owners that are prepared to work with you. There are a number in the region that are.

The endowment idea, very quickly, I do like

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Senator Sturgulewski's idea of a research endowment. A number of people have mentioned that before. I think it might be a way of organizing the research in -- in a fairly logical manner and provide long-term research for this -- for this Restoration Team.

The idea though of taking all the money and putting it into an endowment I think is a little premature at this stage. I think Mr. Collinsworth mentioned it earlier today. Instead of figuring out a financial plan, -- correct me if I'm paraphrasing you incorrectly. Instead of figuring out a financial plan and then tailoring a restoration program to fit that -- that's sort of the -- the tail wagging the dog. What we need to do is figure out what we're going to do and then figure out how to finance it.

So I think at this stage -- and plus there's only been a couple of people really that have ever even mentioned putting the entire pot of money that comes in over ten years in an endowment. There's been a lot of testimony against it. So I think we need to be careful about that.

The next thing I'd like to mention very quickly in context of what Mayor Selby said was it's important in this whole process to keep our eyes on the prize, and that's borrowing from the civil rights movement. There's going to be a lot of proposals before you. You've already seen a lot. A Seward storm sewer, separate -- oil and grease separators and

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

facilities here and there to do various different things, but as Charlie Cole has mentioned, we're bound by the court settlement. This is a natural resource damage settlement. And as the Justice Department stated in pleading before Judge Holland, this is largely an environmental crime, and it should be treated as an environmental crime, natural resource-wise. So, please, let's all keep our eyes on -- on the prize, which I think in this case is -- is the full recovery of the damaged environment.

Next, I've got a question for the three federal

Trustees, and that is what plans have been made for the -- or

the Trustee Council members, excuse me, for the federal

\$50 million? Has -- has there been -- I'm sure that -- sure

there's been discussion as to what to do with that money, and

I'm just kind of curious for those of us here, what those plans

are?

MR. McVEE: I can respond to that. There have been no commitment for the \$50 million that -- restitution funds, what you're referring to, that -- So currently there's no plan basically for the expenditure of that money. We've talked some about -- among ourselves about an agreement as to -- as to how a process could be set up to expend it, but we have not reached conclusions on that, so we're still in discussion mode.

MR. STEINER: Okay. Yeah. What -- what we had

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

heard, what I had been told by one of the federal agency people is that they've -- that the three federal trustee agencies had essentially agreed to divide the pot 17 million each, and that projects that are in the field this summer, that they expect -- that you expect to repay out of that federal 50 million without having gone through the process of public review, so I just wanted to correct that. Thanks.

MR. McVEE: Yeah. That -- that's not quite correct.

MR. STEINER: Okay.

MR. McVEE: We haven't gone through that .....

MR. STEINER: Good. I'm glad to hear that.

mentioned to me that was partic- -- was probably the most disturbing of all is that they've already decided that acquisition is not -- is not within their ball game here, period. End of report. And that, besides seeming extremely arrogant to me, goes against the entire public process that I think this Trustees Council wants to engender. I could name the agency, but I don't think it's worth putting them on the spot right now. By and large it might be all the federal agencies, but I think with the leadership we've seen this afternoon, I hope that policy will be thought through very carefully and people will be a little more open minded.

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Two more things very quickly. The -- these documents that are being passed out in the Oil Spill Public Information Center Library here are a little bit disturbing to a number of people. They are Exxon publications and that in and of itself is fine, if we want to be doing that, but they should be clearly labeled as paid for by the Exxon Corporation I think. They espouse "sea otters are fine in Prince William Sound," "bald eagles are fine in Prince William Sound," "Prince William Sound is blue". These were all paid for by Exxon. And the other one, I wanted to get another copy of it, but its title is, "It's time to drill Alaska's Refuge".

Now, my question is now regardless of which side of the Arctic Refuge issue you're on, is that something we want to be passing out in the Oil Spill Public Information Center Library? So I would ask -- I mean, we might as well be publish- -- or passing out National Inquirer and Hustler Magazine if we're going to be passing out things like this.

So I'd ask that if we are going to continue doing this, that we have equal space for "No drilling in the Arctic Refuge," things like that. That's all.

One last quick thing, and that is I'll reiterate my, or a number of people's invitation for the Trustees Council as a body to visit the region. There is simply no replacing it.

Getting on the ground and wearing hip boots and getting in the water and seeing the place, talking to the timber owners,

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

talking to the fishermen, and I hope you don't interpret the lack of participation today -- at today's meeting as a lack of interest, because salmon don't wait for meetings.

So that's all I have. If there's any questions?

MR. McVEE: Any questions?

MR. STEINER: Thanks.

MR. McVEE: Thank you. Thank you.

MS. ROTTERMAN: I'm Lisa Rotterman. I spoke with you a little bit earlier. I'm an independent research scientist and I'm also a citizen of Cordova, and I speak to you today in both capacities representing myself as an independent research scientist and as a citizen.

Just -- first to give you a little bit of background about me so that you can interpret some of my remarks accordingly, I've been studying sea otters in Prince William Sound since 1984 on a continuous basis, and I was also one of the principal investigators on damage assessment studies of sea otters. I was a principal investigator on the weanling study which I think you've all heard quite a bit about in terms of the increased mortality that was observed among sea otter weanlings, and also on the sea otter blood chemistry and hematology studies.

There's three points that I'd like to discuss today,
three issues I'd like to bring up, and I'll keep referring to
my notes so I can stick to the topic, and also not forget some

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

things.

The first issue, which is unrelated to the other two is the issue of habitat acquisition. I'd just like to go on record publicly since I had not done so before, that I support acquisition of timber rights within Prince William Sound. I think scientifically it seems obvious to most of us that have been working on damage assessment and restoration that there's not a heck of a lot you can do to help restore Prince William Sound except to prevent further damage, and with the scheduled clear-cutting of most of the timber rights — timber in Prince William Sound, that's certainly damage that will occur if something isn't done.

I also as did Rick, I'd like to thank the Trustee Council today for their positive movement towards temporary protection of timber rights, and I particularly liked the comments about, you know, how much detail do we need to have temporary, to identify habitats that require temporary protection. And, you know, I don't think we want to wait until everything is mapped and computerized and everything. That you'll probably want to justify permanent acquisition of timber rights.

But something I would suggest that you consider is having The Nature Conservancy convene a one-day workshop to which are invited members of the fishing industry and the scientific community and some of the other interest groups, or

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

just the scientific community if you'd rather keep this totally on a scientific basis, individuals who have been doing studies in Prince William for, set some arbitrary limit, say two years. And I think that you would find that, you know, put people's noses to the grind stone, make them identify the critical habitats for their species on a map and justify why they're doing so and identify the types of data that they have that might be useful in the future to justify those temporary acquisitions, possibly as permanent.

The other two issues that I'd like to bring up are related, and they have to do with opening up the process of funding of scientific projects and then also the related issues of problems with scientific ethics and conflict of interest that have been discussed just a little bit before. And they're related to opening up the process.

I -- I would urge the Trustees to consider establishment of an independent research fund, the funds of which -- or an endowment fund somewhere -- I would say seven to 12 million is -- a year is certainly enough. And with the dispension of the funds being by an independent, a totally independent scientific body, so that the issue of conflict of interest is totally avoided. You could even think about something like giving the money to NSF to establish a Prince William Sound damage assessment and restoration fund just like there is specific money in -- in NSF for Arctic research.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

There could be specific money within NSF for oil spill research and restoration funds.

If you do this, then one thing you will avoid is -well, you'll -- you'll get several benefits. I believe you
will get proposals from people all over the world. This would
be very healthy competition, and I think would result in overall better quality research and certainly more efficient use of
research dollars, because private -- well, I just think if
there's that kind of competition, you'll find people are more
efficient in the way they spend the money.

And I would suggest that both public and private scientists should have to compete in a very open fashion to this fund so that there's not a separate agency pot and separate pot for independent scientists.

And part of the reason I think -- I think this would be desirable under any circumstances, but I think it's also necessary due to problems with conflict of interest and scientific ethics. And just to give you a little bit of background, and I won't belabor this, but to give you an example of the sorts of problems that independent scientists such as myself have encountered, I'll just give you a little bit of background.

Well, I have been studying sea otters for a long period of time in Prince William Sound and was in the, you know, middle of a monitoring otters that were instrumented as part of

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and in 1990 I was asked specifically by agency personnel to provide ideas for restoration proposals with the agreement, which is a typical scientific -- you know, which is coincident with what's considered good scientific ethics that if I wrote these proposals, that if the proposals were funded, that the -- we would be the people that did the work. And I wrote these proposals in 1990 and they were well received by the Restoration Planning Team, but they decided not to fund them for that season.

Then again in 1991 I also submitted proposals for restoration and continued damage assessment to the Restoration Planning Team and -- and so everyone had access to that first group of proposals, I would like to make that clear. And in 1991 was told that basically the decision had been made that if the agency personnel did not want to administer a contract, that no such proposals were going to be considered, which I was I thought unwise, because I think open competition is good, but basically I wouldn't be worried about it, because I think private funding would be available. Except that then what happened was agency personnel incorporated the research task that we had outlined and designed into their own set of proposals and recommended that they be funded to do so, to do these tasks.

And so basically you have a case a case of an

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

independent scientist who was forced to compete with -- with themselves in a sense, and I thought it raised some interesting scientific ethics questions, and also questions of conflict of interest in terms of people who were going to be taking, you know, taking advantage of a nine-year data base that other people had developed and even in fact taking over an on-going study, about the last third of a study which had involved a tremendous amount of research on other scientists' part. And this is not the sort of thing that in the open scientific world ever occurs. Well, yeah, I shouldn't say it never occurs. It occurs occasionally, but it is not something that is generally considered acceptable.

And so I would ask -- would like to know if the Trustees have a process for addressing these kinds of problems, whether or not any guidelines have been given to the Restoration Planning Team with respect to issues of this matter -- or -- or these -- these kinds of issues rather. Let's see, whether you believe there -- if there's not, if the answer to that is no, do you believe that there should be some sort of a process. And what I would recommend as a totally independent body, basically sort of an ombudsman type of a function to resolve guidelines of scientific ethics and -- and conflict of interest if this occurs.

And then I think he's not here, but I would -- would like you to specifically ask at your next meeting for Dr. Spies

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

to comment publicly on the process of opening this whole scientific -- opening funding for scientific research entirely to agency and nonagency people and ask him whether or not this issue of -- of scientific ethics and intellectual property is one that he views as serious.

Part of the problem is -- is that if -- if you don't deal with this issue, you won't get proposals from the private sector, because they will be -- people will be afraid to, you know, go to a lot of trouble to submit ideas that, you know, then might end up being in someone else's research proposal, and so it's very serious in terms of stifling intellectual discourse and -- and intellectual inquiry.

And so if -- if possible, if at least a couple different trustees could address these -- these issues, both in terms of establishment of a research -- independent research fund, which I think would go a long ways towards alleviating some of these problems, and then also the -- what your process is and what your concerns might be about these ethical and conflict of interest issues.

Thanks.

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: Comments or questions?

MR. SANDOR: Well, .....

MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor?

MS. ROTTERMAN: Oh, sorry.

MR. SANDOR: Well, that concept of -- of

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

opening up the process and then having the independent research fund, how many private researchers or research groups are out there? You know, is this .....

MS. ROTTERMAN: There's thousands of independent researchers. One of the -- one of the .....

MR. SANDOR: I mean ....

MS. ROTTERMAN: .... reasons I've heard .....

MS. ROTTERMAN: .... insofar as focused on the

oil spill area? The whole .....

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

MS. ROTTERMAN: Well, there aren't very many that have been involved thus far, although the questions that I -- or the problems that I've raised -- at least I've been contacted by several other independent entities that have been having some of these same -- same problems, ethics problems. So there aren't very many independent scientists that have been doing damage assessment research, just those few that, you know, for one reason or another were considered to have an expertise that was not within the agencies at the time of the But there are, of course, a considerable number of scientists that have expertise related to disciplines where they could make a great contribution towards understanding restoration or continued damage assessment, and there are other researchers that have prior to the oil spill done research in Prince William Sound, a very large number actually, in -- you know, in a whole host of disciplines.

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

I think that that a criticism I've heard of this
from certain certain agency personnel is that they don't
think it would be fair, because, you know, somebody might come
in with a lower overhead and, you know, more impressive
credentials or something like that, but I think that the
projects that really should go on, and and where someone has
done really excellent science and they have a lot of good
baseline, dependent (ph) regardless of whether, you know,
they they have a Ph.D. or they don't, or what university
they're associated with, I think those would stand out
regardless, and that they shouldn't be afraid of the
competition, because this is settlement money that should be
used to, you know, now just to fund agency people, but to
achieve the best understanding of how to restore Prince William
Sound and what the damages were.

MR. SANDOR: I -- I don't have any questions, but I -- I'd be interested in Dr. Spies observation on the independent research fund and opening up this process. Thank you.

MR. McVEE: I guess that's all. Thank you.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Mr. Chairman?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: I'm not sure whether we're getting ready to lose Mr. Cole or not. He's folded his books and looks like he was going to sneak off into the night.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

But ....

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MR. COLE: Back to Juneau. Down to Juneau.

SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: Apparently it's 88, you

4 better not go home. 88.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: That's too warm. Mr. Chairman, if we might interrupt -- if we might interrupt just for a moment the -- the public hearing, before Mr. Cole leaves or anyone else leaves, one of the previous agenda items that we dealt with this morning in terms of the FY '92 work plan, subsequent to our vote this morning I've looked at some additional review materials that were provided by staff. we approved rather quickly the \$47,000.00 for the -- the reader for the Kenai project and \$103,000.00 for genetic experiments and -- on pink salmon in -- in Prince William Sound. the briefing document that I read subsequent indicates that this project, the total cost of this project may be as much as a million dollars, and that it -- the \$103,000.00 project we initiated -- the \$103,000.00 project we initiated this morning, that that project may ultimately cost upwards of million dollars to complete the experiment, multiple year, and the -the staff advice that -- that I have is that you'd better be willing to make the commitment for the project over the long term, or you shouldn't initiate it, because once you initiate it, once you start it, you'd better be willing to -- to carry it through.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

I have no problem I guess in -- in doing that, but that was -- it was something that I didn't have in hand this morning when we -- when we made that decision that -- that this is a multi-year project, the \$103,000.00 is just kind of the first increment, and we may be looking at ten times that much by the time we conclude.

Now, maybe -- maybe my information is wrong, but I just wanted to make sure that the Council understood that we were kicking off a multi-year project here that may cost up to a million dollars.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Rosier?

MR. COLE: Is there anything to that?

MR. ROSIER: I'll have to fall back on my technical person here on this.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, I -- I don't know if Bob is here, but my memory of it, what Don is describing is somewhat true.

MR. McVEE: Somewhat true?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, let me -- there's two components to the project: one, the field component, and one the laboratory component. The field component stands alone each year and at the end of one year, you certainly have a final product that's useful, and it could go on for more years. The laboratory phase of the project indeed would require a

## 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

certain amount of funding. You know, if both components went to the full five years I think it is, it would be a million dollars, but the -- the one that stands alone every year may well not go that far, and the reason it wasn't brought up I guess is that as in the '92 program, all the other projects, they were just to be viewed as -- on an annual basis. And the 1992 work plan does not in any project commit to anything beyond '92. To commit beyond '92 now would be different from the sixty-odd other projects in there.

MR. COLLINSWORTH: Well, Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, I
-- I didn't ....

MR. McVEE: Mr. Collinsworth?

MR. COLLINSWORTH: .... bring that up to -necessarily to argue against it, but if we make some additional
investment, we've -- I -- I just didn't want us to be surprised
when the '93 work plan came back in and we saw another
increment in the '94 plan and the '95 plan, because this
extends out into that kind of a time period.

MR. McVEE: Yes, I understand that, you know, - or realize that there are probably other '92 projects that
fall within this same -- have this same relationship that we
will see follow-on budgets. There was a number of close-out,
but there are -- there are some newer projects that, you know,
that funding for '93 has not been approved as has not been
approved for this project and would be a subject that would be

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

taken up in the future. But this isn't the only project that has that characteristic I don't believe in the '92 program.

Yes, Mr. Sandor?

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. SANDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, that does illustrate the flaw though I guess in the fact that that was directly placed before us without going to the Restoration Team, and we're not saying, are we, or are we, that -- is there any pay-off to the 140,000 that -- that -- 150,000 I guess, that that -- you know, by itself, or are we really -- had we essentially embarked on a million dollar yellow brick road?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, relative to 47,000 of that for the optical scanner, that -- indeed that -- you know, that doesn't -- isn't committing to anything in the future.

As I mentioned for the -- the pink salmon project, approximately half of it is stand alone each year and would not suffer unduly if it wasn't funded the next year. The lab component indeed .....

MR. SANDOR: Yeah.

DR. MONTAGUE: .... to be most successful, has to go the full five years.

MR. McVEE: I think we -- we should proceed with public comment. If we need to revisit this, maybe -- but we only have another 45 minutes until we're ....

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

MS. ROTTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I just -- I -- I had asked if a couple of the Trustees could clarify just for the record and then we -- we got off on a question, whether or not there had been guidelines given to the Restoration Planning Team with respect to specific ways or specific guidelines on avoiding conflict of interest in scientific ethics matters, and whether there was a process for resolution of disputes, and if -- again specifically if -- if two of the Trustees could comment if the answer is -- to those questions are no, whether you foresee -- whether -- whether you believe that having such guidelines and having a way to -- to remedy such disputes desirable.

MR. McVEE: Does anyone want to comment on that? Yes, Jerome?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, at least relative to the '93 plan, I think I can explain a few things that may help answer your question.

First of all, to avoid some of the -- the ethics problem you're talking about, that is, receiving proprietary information and then taking it for -- giving it to somebody else or whatever, to get around that, our guidance to the public and the agencies for '93 was that if you submit a one-page idea, you give up all your control over that idea. So -- And that was stamped right on the front of the form. So any '93 ideas that came in, whoever came up with the idea should be

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

well aware that they have not particular use of that idea, you know, specific to them.

And then relative to, you know, contracting out, we do anticipate that each agency would make a very strong effort to contract out. And that process would be to -- from this brief project description a detailed request for proposals would be developed and competitively procured, so that for some presumably significant number of the '93 projects, they will be competitively procured through an RFP process.

MS. ROTTERMAN: Well, if -- if -- possibly if you could address this, Jerome, then, since there was -- you know, there's definitely not that kind of an agreement for '91 and '9- -- 1990/91 proposals or -- well, they were for '92, but ones submitted in '90 and '91, how would the Trustee Council or the Restoration Working Group advise one to go about trying to address a conflict such as I've described?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, my, I guess, familiarity is with the -- the '93 program. I haven't given any thought to the particular specific problem that's arisen on '91 and '92 work plans. Perhaps Dave or Byron could ....

MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, yes, as -- as regards to the 19- -- 1990 and '91 activities, they were still under litigation sensitivity, and the -- the studies of that time were agency supported, and Lisa's study was a sea otter

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

study, and I don't know the specifics of that, but I know she The -- the Restoration Team at that submitted one in 1990. time, or the Management Team it was -- as it was called, decided not to fund it. It was resubmitted in '91 like she There was some discussions with one of the federal agencies on -- on the process for what she submitted and what they submitted to be funded in '91. I don't know the details of that, but those were -- like I say, they're litigation -- it wasn't an open process like we have now. I don't know how she can go -- I don't know what we can do to go back and see what -- what to do on the '90 and '91. I -- I think we -personally I think we -- to move ahead with '93 would be -would be the best, but that's just my gut feeling. know how to move back and try to correct a situation that we had in 1990 and 1991.

MS. ROTTERMAN: Well, just real quickly, the reason it's of concern is an activity that was proposed, even though Dr. Spies had recommended, you know, that it not be funded by the Trustees and so it wasn't, but one of the activities proposed in our 1991 proposals is going to be initiated by agency personnel in September, and so there is still -- while it's not really just an abstract issue, it's an issue that is rather timely this summer. So if there -- I mean, if there was some sort of a process in terms of an independent board that could look at this issue.

### 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. McVEE: Any other comment by the Council members? Yes, Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, if I might, Lisa really raises a good point, and this was part of the -- part of what I was -- I was referencing this morning in the discussion, when we had Dr. Spies up here in terms of who we would in fact proceed with -- with the public proposal in conjunction with -- with the agency proposals. And I think that we are supposed to hear back from him on this particular subject. I think that was -- that was the word. But that was certainly my concern at the time that I raised that with Dr. Spies this morning.

MR. McVEE: I guess my reaction is that -- is that Lisa's flagged an issue that -- that we need to give some attention since we are soliciting proposals from the public, and -- you know, and hopefully that will increase. So we need to give that area, that concern some attention. I don't know how we deal with those public proposals. Having been for a short -- for a period of time in the private consulting business, I realize that you put a lot of work into project proposals, and sometimes you just give them away and somebody else picks them up, and that it all is -- it doesn't set very well, so I think this is an area that does need some thought and discussion. Yes.

So to continue with public comment, Pam?

MS. BRODY: Thank you. I'm Pamela Brody with

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

the Sierra Club, and I'd like to make comments or ask questions on five different issues. I'll try to be brief.

First the question of choosing the public advisory group, which you gentlemen were discussing earlier about the --whether or not you needed an executive session, and it occurred to me after I spoke then that the problem might be solved by your power of veto, that is, any particular trustee can prevent any particular person from getting on this committee, and you don't have to give any justification for your reasons, and perhaps that should be something you might want to add to your process. It's not only a majority vote, but also the -- the veto power, and then you might not need this executive session.

And that leads me to my second point, and I hope this will not seem presumptuous for me to suggest something about -- about your process, but I think that it sometimes takes a long time for people to decide how to decide something. It's not necessarily an obvious thing, and -- and the public advisory group was just one example of how you can -- people can talk for an hour or more, to figure out how best to decide something and -- and I thought that you might in the future when -- direct your staff that when they bring something to you that needs to be decided that they might also give options or recommendations about a procedure for making the decision, which you don't have to accept, but it might streamline things.

Thirdly, the -- the question of the EIS, and maybe I

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

have a misunderstanding here. I had thought that the restoration plan was going to be an environment impact statement, and then today as I understood it, there was an allocation for a separate environmental impact statement which seemed to me to be a similar parallel thing, and -- and I didn't understand why the environ- -- the -- the restoration plan couldn't be an environmental impact statement? That seemed more -- more efficient.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Rice, do you want to respond to that?

MR. RICE: Yeah, Pam, I think the -- the thinking that went into trying to separate the two was that there really -- the plan is designed to spell out what you're going to be doing. The EIS has a different -- not -- I won't say audience, but a different -- it's got a different purpose, and it's a disclosure document. It's going to say, "if you decide to do something, here's the effects of what you're going to do," so it's to inform and -- and consider. And to try and meld in a plan that gives direction as to what -- to where the restoration should be going, as well as disclose it all in one document could get confus- -- confusing to present as well as to understand. So if we take the plan, certain components of it are going to go right into the EIS and are going to look exactly the same, but basically what's your intent is -- is a little bit different in each one and it's better to separate

#### 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

them out.

MS. BRODY: Thank you for the explanation.

My fourth point, and I -- I wish that Attorney General Cole were here, because he did touch on this point, but I think that the public would be very interested to know how much money has been spent so far and how it has been spent, and I -- I believe it's somewhere between 200 million and \$300 million that has been spent or committed so far, but I don't know how much it is, and -- and I'd like to see that if that's available, if that can be released, telling how much -- what -- what the bottom is -- line is, but also how much has gone to each agency and for what.

I would -- the reason I -- I have this spread in my mind between two and 300 million is that some months ago

Commissioner Sandor submitted an idea for an endowment in which almost all the money would go into an endowment, and on that document it said that the State would need to be reimbursed \$115 million, and the federal government \$100 million, and then I add to those the \$50 million to Exxon and the approximately 20 million that's been -- been allocated for this year's budget, and I come up with close to 300 million, but maybe there's some double counting in there, so I -- I had question, is -- is that available at this point?

MR. McVEE: Yeah, maybe a brief comment, and, you know, I guess what's been spent, and it isn't spent yet I

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

guess, but what it amounts to, there's been over -- Just slightly over 12 million that's been -- been approved by the Court, so there's 12 million that's been fully committed towards the -- the '92 program, projects in the '92 program. And then in addition to that was the amount, and I don't remember the exact figure, that was -- that was withdrawn from the joint account, or -- or -- I guess for .....

DR. GIBBONS: 54 million.

MR. McVEE: 54 million for reimbursements.

MS. BRODY: I -- I guess I wasn't making myself clear. I didn't mean just the money that's been spent, but that's been committed also, because the agencies were spending money with the understanding that they would be reimbursed, and there was language in the settlement for up to I think 67 million and 75 million to go to paying back that, but then the -- the document from Commissioner Sandor had larger numbers than that.

MR. McVEE: Yeah, I think there's -- there's still some reimbursement required, but I -- to my knowledge I don't think anyone has the absolute number on that. There's still some auditing to do. I think it was mentioned earlier what the -- the upper level of that would be, but I know that discussions on the federal side, that that -- that those numbers aren't completely firm at this time.

Maybe -- maybe Dr. Gibbons can -- can add to that.

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

The

It's

There's some things

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

numbers we have to date. MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman?

expenditures that I'm aware of to date.

MS. BRODY: Is -- is there anything available to the public that -- that is more specific about how much went to which agencies and for what?

DR. GIBBONS: Pam, I think what you're

referring to is that under the settlement agreement, the State

payment for 1992, there's an allocation of about 50 million for

clean-up response activities from -- for '91 and '92, making it

part of that 142 million. Okay. In addition that, the Trustee

Council has approved slightly over \$12 million from the Court,

yet to be determined on reimbursements, but that -- that's the

gotten from the Court, you know, and so that -- that's the

192,000 (sic). Right now the Trustee Council has approved an

addition to -- that -- that 54 million is part of that.

was allowed 75 million reimbursement charges previous, the

federal government was 67 million, totalling 142 million.

Mr. Wolfe? MR. MCVEE:

Yeah, I -- I guess to partially MR. WOLFE: answer her question, is I don't think there's any publication out at this point in time. The numbers are available. At the end of this fiscal year, our financial procedures are set up to include an accounting process, or going back and accounting for all the dollars. So on an annual basis there be an

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

accomplishment report. So given -- give us time, and there will be reports coming out annually on the status of restoration, which should include the fiscal end of it.

MS. BRODY: So that would be the end of September?

MR. WOLFE: It will probably be a time -period of time after that before the final report is out, Pam.
MS. BRODY: Okay. Thank you.

And my final point is, of course, my favorite issue, habitat acquisition, and I was pleased, very happy today to hear what some commission -- some Trustee Council members were saying about the need to move ahead with this, and I was -- particularly would like to agree with what Commissioner Collinsworth said about that the data that we need does exist for -- for the most part. We don't need to gather a lot of new data. The agencies do have the data we need.

And I'd like to go beyond that and say I feel quite sure that in every area the land managers for that area could right now tell you some areas of very critical habitat that -- that they would very much like to acquire, and that while it might take a long time to study, to -- to put a whole priority for their area, for everything possible, that you don't need to do that before you can buy the cream. And so I would really like the -- to encourage the Trustees to allocate a certain amount of money for each area and -- and direct the agencies to

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

go ahead and specify certain areas which very clearly are critical habitat and then they can come back and tell you and then you -- if you like what you hear, you can tell them to go ahead and start negotiating for those areas, and that this would show a commitment to the corporations that own these lands and timber rights that -- that this is really going to happen.

I would also like to echo what Rick Steiner said about the need for interim protection.

Thank you very much.

MR. McVEE: Thank you, Pam. The Nature Conservancy?

MS. RUDDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Susan Ruddy, I'm director of The Nature Conservancy of Alaska, and I want to take just a minute of your time to join the chorus of all those who have commended you today for your discussion about habitat protection needs.

I want to suggest also that I agree with what you had to say about it being critical that you be better prepared to address these needs in a timely manner. For that reason we look forward to seeing the information that's being provided to you by the habitat subgroup and to working with you and with them in whatever way best serves you and the process in the future.

Thanks very much.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you. Yes?

MR. McKEY: My name is Charles McKey, and first of all I want to indicate that I want to preserve the 1892 mining law for myself as a real person, not a legal fiction, in other words corporations. And I want to take and bring back the habitat through access of mining, to restore the pristine environment, primarily under the water.

But first let me go and say what my difficulty is in so doing. First of all I have here a Barry Goldwater campaign booklet and his adversary, or say he who was running against Lyndon Johnson. And he was -- he aimed at getting communism out, and he went on to say that it primarily is centered in centralized government in Washington, D.C.

That's why I focus my effort on the United States

Treasury seal on the money, and that we're working with a very expensive money, which is federal reserve corporate note. It's very expensive, it -- it is a direct impact on the degradation of our environment, because we have to cut corners in environmental safeguards, because, well, we have to pay the interest on the money loaned to the -- the company in question. If it's -- regardless of what it is. So I -- I focus on that.

And, of course, we can look back on Kennedy's

Administration, and I'm reading from a book written to him, "A

Limited War and American Defense Policy," and he had to

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

actually go to Congress and request \$100 million, and we know that he was instrumental in causing the United States paper, or greenback currency to be printed '63 to -- to '66, which I wrote about in that letter to Mr. Dellums (ph) in Congress that you all have a copy of.

Now, the problem is -- is this is their strategy, maneuver warfare. And what happens is, and I'm reading from John C. Roberts editorial, April the 28th, 1992, Anchorage Times, and he says, "The focus is a shattered (ph) enemy is moral and physical -- physically by avoiding his strengths, exploiting his vulnerabilities, and by striking him in a way that -- which will hurt him most."

And that's what I'm -- I've seen that it's -- when you're trying to access the currency to pay for the restoration, they maneuver so much, they're not a sitting target. In fact they're paradoxal, they have many different heads and so they don't -- they're not in one spot and they -- and they diversify.

And so I -- I refer to this article by Dick Randolph,

June the 9th, 1992, Tuesday, Anchorage Daily News. In short he
talks about constitutional convention, need to fix the errors
in the past. And what -- basically it says here, in short,
much of what is now our state, Alaska, Constitution was written
in New York City by a bunch of eastern political scientists,
lawyers and practitioners of government. There is your

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

maneuverability. Right there.

And then another individual, Fritz Pettyjohn wrote another article in reference to it, June 21, 1992, Sunday, Anchorage Daily News.

It's in short, shoplifting. That's all it is. And so what we need to do, rather than -- rather than a convention -- a constitutional convention, what we need to do is simply adopt the California constitution. Just -- I mean, we're so used to plagiarizing one another, that all we have to do is scratch their name off of it, and put our name on it, because Alaska was primarily populated by mining indus- -- interests as well as the fishing industry, but we, of -- of course, gave that to other interests.

But I have right here a 1915 issue by the Legislature of California, and so in lieu of the other proposals, I'd like to go where there's about -- and I've had the other people telling me that you used to have deep sea diving companies that would go down and extract sunken ships. You know, the salvage operations, and they said to me that there's about 4 million gallons of crude sitting at the bottom of Prince William Sound, not to mention what's under the subsurface on the beaches.

They actually -- the crude actually picked up the -- the sediment coming off the glaciers and have filtered around in the water there waiting for the plankton to blow in and use that as a food source. But in other words, that's how the oil

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

got -- lost its buoyancy and started settling.

So -- another thing that I'd like to point out is a little bit of information, the Financial Times, June 4th, 1992, Thursday, it's a European business newspaper, indicated Lloyd's of London lost about \$3.6 billion in 196- -- or 1989, and, boy, that's a coincidence, you know, because we had had an oil spill about that year also in pristine Prince William Sound, and so they had to pay off a lot of agents, but we never got any of their money, not that amount anyway. They're trying to buy us off with 900 million of Federal Reserve corporate notes.

And then all this thing is -- it's based on a tontine princ- -- blue book plan, and it's nothing but a con game, and it's very maneuverable. And I have an article out of a 1906 book describing the tontine principle, i.e. the blue book plan, and how they overpay the agents to sell policies and they overpay them through commissions, and it doesn't get to the consumer. And so it -- it primarily discusses life insurance policy, but it went on into everything else, every policy sold. Every risk. And so I'll leave this with you and hope you refer to this.

Again I'll submit the January 1992 article -- letter that I wrote, the 14th to Richard Dellums, and I -- in addition I added a page out of -- on the back, the last page, I added a page out of a book written by Buckmeister Fuller, and he was referring to J.P. Morgan and how they wanted to -- and how they

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

proposed and has controlled the economy through maintaining control over energy production, primarily electricity, and, of course, we use a lot of fossil fuel for that.

So as I say, they made it difficult for us to recall any officials within the current corporate state constitution, so I suggest that we go for the -- adopt -- simply adopt the constitution of California. And by the way I submitted this to the Presidential Candidate Jerry Brown, faxed it to him Friday. He was campaigning on saving America, collecting \$100.00 bills for doing same, to campaign -- to fund his campaign, and Federal Reserve corporate notes by the way, and he wasn't even aware of the Treasury seal. But I suggested he submit this to Congress, this letter, and to make sure he gets it to the Clerk of Court, because that impacts our resources up here. was the Governor of the State of California prior to his campaigning and candidacy for the President of the United States. Democrat I might add. And so ....

MR. McVEE: Can you leave those things with us. We need to kind of move on. I've ....

MR. McKEY: Yeah. Just .....

MR. McVEE: ..... got to canvas the .....

MR. McKEY: ..... one more thing .....

MR. McVEE: Okay.

MR. McKEY: .... is the reason why I indicated

-- I made reference to public libraries is we have a

### 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

continuation from the Lower 48, a continuation, seeing as how 1 we border with Canada on one instance, we are associated with 2 the Northwest Library Association, and so therefore we do have 3 a continuation through -- down Canada and to the Lower 48, 4 5 because of that. 6 Thank you. MR. McVEE: Thank you. The gentleman in back 8 was next. MR. TOTEMOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My 10 name is Chuck Totemoff, President and CEO for Chenega Corp. I'll be brief. 11 Just a point of clarification. Chenega Corp turned in 13 some restoration projects some weeks ago and I was just wondering if they're under '92 or '93 considerations? I've got 15 some copies here. DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman? 16 MR. McVEE: Yes, Jerome? 17 DR. MONTAGUE: I don't know if we have all 18 them, but we certainly have Chenega proposals for '93 and, 19 20 Byron, were there any in '92? 21 MR. TOTEMOFF: I can leave these copies here. MR. McVEE: Yes, if you would leave those copies, then we can be sure that ..... 23 All right. MR. TOTEMOFF: MR. McVEE: ..... we have a full submission. 25

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

7

9

12

14

22

1	MR. TOTEMOFF: That's all I had, Mr. Chairman.
2	MR. McVEE: Thank you very much. Is there any
3	more comment from Anchorage before I canvas the teleconference
4	sites?
5	We had had three teleconference sites on line. Juneau?
6	Is there anyone in Juneau that would want to make comments at
7	this time? They may have left us.
8	Homer? Does anyone in Homer have comments at this
9	time?
10	HOMER: There are no comments from Homer, thank
11	you.
12	MR. McVEE: Thank you, Homer.
13	Kodiak Legislative Information Office, any anyone
14	who wanted to make comments from Kodiak?
15	KODIAK: No comments from Kodiak, thank you.
16	MR. McVEE: Thank you.
17	Were there any of the other sites that came on line
18	later on, do you know? Or should I just canvas?
19	MS. EVANS: Canvas.
20	MR. McVEE: I'll canvas them. Chenega Bay?
21	Anyone from Chenega Bay on line?
22	Cordova? Anyone from Cordova?
23	Fairbanks? Did Fairbanks come on line?
24	Kenai Peninsula Information Office?
25	Is Seward on line? Anyone from Seward want to make

ㅗㅣ	Comment:
2	SEWARD: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.
3	Our people have drifted in and out. We're listening intently,
4	but we have no comments at this time, thank you.
5	MR. McVEE: Thank you, Seward.
6	Tatitlik? Is there anyone from Tatitlik, the IRA
7	Council Office?
8	Valdez? Is Valdez on line at the present time?
9	VALDEZ: Valdez is on line and we have no
10	comments at this time.
11	MR. McVEE: Thank you, Valdez.
12	Whittier? Is there anyone from Whittier?
13	I believe we've we've completed the the list
14	of of teleconference sites plus no more no one else here
15	from Anchorage.
16	Do we need to do we need to adjourn the meeting,
17	or or will we stay your next meeting will be on the
18	DR. GIBBONS: 20th.
19	MR. McVEE: 20th, and that will be a
20	face to face meeting with notice and notice will go out on
21	that?
22	Do Trustee Council members have any any comments or
23	additional items they want to?
24	MR. SANDOR: Just to thank, Mr. Chairman, staff
25	for doing an excellent job of preparing and getting the

1	materials out in advance. That was great.
2	MR. McVEE: That was very very helpful.
3	MR. BRODERSON: Mr. Chairman, we might want
4	to
5	MR. McVEE: Yes, Mark?
6	MR. BRODERSON: just recess, because of
7	difficulty of noticing the meeting by the 20th to make
8	ourselves level. We'll notice it, but to make ourselves legal
9	we might want to just recess until the 20th.
10	MR. SANDOR: So move.
11	MR. McVEE: Is there any do do you have
12	any further comment? At that point then, we'll we'll
13	recess this meeting until until July 20th. And we'll
14	you will get a notice out also for that date?
15	MR. BRODERSON: Yes, we'll we'll advertise
16	it, but to make sure we stay within the letter of the law, we
17	should just recess.
18	MR. McVEE: We are recessed.
19	(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
20	* * * * *
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

# CERTIFICATE 1 2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SS. STATE OF ALASKA 3 I, Meredith L. Downing, Notary Public in and for the 4 State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., 5 do hereby certify: 6 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 282 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustee Council meeting taken 7 electronically by me on the 29th day of June, 1992, beginning at the hour of 8:00 o'clock a.m. at the offices of the Oil 8 Spill Public Information Center, 645 G Street, Anchorage, 9 Alaska; THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript 10 requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability; 11 12 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action. 13 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 2nd day of July 1992. 14 15 Notary Public in and for Alaska 16 My Commission Expires: 17 SEAL 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS