1 EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT 2 Trustee Council EXXOII VALDEZ OIL SPILL 3 TRUSTEE COUNCIL Simpson Building ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD 645 "G" Street 4 Anchorage, Alaska 5 July 20, 1992 10:00 o'clock a.m. 6 IN TELECONFERENCE ATTENDANCE: 7 From Anchorage, Alaska: 8 State of Alaska MR. CHARLES COLE 9 Attorney General State of Alaska Department MR. JOHN SANDOR 10 of Environmental Commissioner Conservation 11 Council Meeting Chairman Alaska Department of Fish MR. CARL ROSIER 12 and Game Commissioner MR. JEROME MONTAGUE 13 United States Department MR. CURTIS McVEE 14 of the Interior Special Assistant to the Secretary 15 16 From Juneau, Alaska: 17 National Marine MR. STEVEN PENNOYER Fishery Service Director 18 MR. MICHAEL BARTON 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE (907) 272-3022

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

PROCEEDINGS

(On record)

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: This is a continuation of the July 20 meeting of the Trustee Council. Unless there are, I guess, some objections, or another volunteer, I will continue to chair the meeting. Is that all right with folks in general?

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes.

MR. McVEE: We have two members on the Trustee Council which are in Juneau, Forest Service Mike Barton and Steve Pennoyer of NOAA. And the other Trustee Council members are represented here, representing Commissioner Rosier is Jerome Montague; we have Attorney General Cole and Commissioner Sandor, and myself, Curt McVee.

Dave Gibbons, is there any announcements that you wish to make at this time before we go into the agenda?

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah, I guess I'd like to say that we should include on the Agenda a public comment period at the end of the session.

MR. McVEE: A public comment period at the end of the session, okay. Well, I think, speaking for Commissioner Sandor and I object to that because the public comment period has been set in the agenda or hearing between 1:00 and 2:00 p.m. today, and I think people probably plan on that. Inserted earlier would likely deprive them of any opportunity to make their

I think we should adhere with the schedule as 1 comments. 2 publicly announced, 1:00 and 2:00. John, do you agree? 3 MR. SANDOR: Yes. Juneau, Mike or Steve. 5 MR. McVEE: Jerome? MR. BARTON: That will be fine. 6 Go ahead. 7 MR. PENNOYER: 8 MR. McVEE: He said go ahead? Okay. There will be a public comment period as shown on the Agenda for 1:00 and 2:00 9 o'clock this afternoon. 10 Dave, was there anything else? 11 No, that's all I had. 12 DR. GIBBONS: 13 MR. McVEE: You have the Agenda before your. Are there 14 any additions or changes to the Agenda? I think, John, you had 15 one thought. 16 MR. SANDOR: Yes. Item 3, after the 1993 Project 17 discussion on Restoration, I propose a discussion of the 18 process of identifying critical habitat for acquisition. I did 19 query the staff regarding this, and I think this needs to be, 20 just very briefly summarized. So I would propose adding as Item 3, discussion of the process of identifying critical 21 22 habitat for acquisition. 23 MR. McVEE: Do you plan on doing that this morning? 24 MR. SANDOR: Either this morning or immediately 25 preceding the public comment period at 1:00.

MR. ROSIER: Is staff prepared to do that?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

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: I would like to be present during that discussion. I may not be able to be here until approximately 1:10, so for what it's worth.

MR. McVEE: Okay. We'll schedule that so Mr. Cole can be present during that discussion.

Juneau, any comments on the additional agenda items?

MR. PENNOYER: No, Curt, I had one more item I'd like
to just discuss for a minute or two at some point here.

MR. McVEE: Well, let's just get note of it, Steve, and then we can put it on the agenda. What is it?

MR. PENNOYER: Financial Operating Procedures. We, apparently, have agreement on most items except the appendices, and I want to discuss the appropriateness of approving the overall Financial Operating Procedures, even if we have an appendix or two that's still under discussion, so we are operating under some guidelines.

MR. McVEE: Okay. We'll put that on. I have one item, just, I think, summing the -- I don't know if it really needs to be an agenda item, but it has to do with the cleanup costs that I want to talk about for a moment, if that's all right with everyone.

MR. PENNOYER: We didn't hear what it was, Curt. We

just heard there was one additional item. Can you try it again?

MR. McVEE: Okay. It's the cleanup costs, the costs that were incurred this year by Exxon.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay at our end.

MR. McVEE: Okay. We've got three additional agenda items in; the discussion of the process of identifying critical habitat; and then the Financial Operating Procedures; and the cleanup costs be added to the Agenda. Anything else?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: The reason I wanted to be present during the agenda item proposed by Commissioner Sandor is largely prompted by this letter of July 17th from the Alaska Center for the Environment which states, in general, that in the wake of Governor Hickel's unconscionable veto of the land acquisition monies, he urges the Trustees to seize the moment and proceed along that line, and then he asks us to act at the July 20 meeting and he points out that even the Attorney General has recommended acquisition of Katchemak Bay consistent with the settlement, and I wanted to be here to defend my position in that regard.

Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Would there be any problem of taking that up first? Would the Trustee Council members have any problems

R&R COURT REPORTERS

2 we were to discuss that issue of critical habitats, move that 3 forward on the agenda. It's fine with me. MR. COLE: 4 5 MR. BARTON: That's fine down here. You bet. Okay. Let's move that forward then, just 6 MR. McVEE: change sequence before we get into the Public Advisory Group 7 Membership and discuss the process of identifying critical 8 habitat. 9 10 Are there any other recommendations on the agenda, 11 items or sequence? Well, just under Other, I'd like some 12 MR. PENNOYER: 13 discussion on the next meeting. I didn't MR. McVEE: 14 15 MR. PENNOYER: I suppose you'll have another 16 discussion. Oh, the discussion of the next meeting 17 MR. McVEE: 18 schedule? MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. 19 20 MR. McVEE: Okay. Make sure all are on board for it. 21 MR. PENNOYER: Okay, that will be the final item, is the 22 MR. McVEE: schedule for the next meeting. Okay, are we ready to proceed 23 with this discussion of the process of identifying critical 24 25 habitats?

doing that? We understand that you have a new commitment, if

Do you want to lead that off, John?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

MR. SANDOR: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The reason I asked that this item be added to the agenda is because of the process and experience that we had in looking at potential acquisitions under the State budget/capital budget, formerly HB 411, that was incorporated in the capital budget, and I wanted to use this as an illustration of the importance of moving ahead with this process, specifically, in looking at the threatened areas for harvest at Eyak Lake, at Cordova.

I specifically made quite an effort to examine the merits of that proposal because I was in a position of advising the Governor on whether or not those lands that were threatened for harvest were -- you know, merited consideration. And I use this illustration to, I guess, pass on to the Restoration Team itself of what, at least I as a Trustee and, I hope, collectively the Trustees, should have in the way of this process of identifying critical habitat, both with an on-site visit of Eyak Lake area at Cordova and in checking with both Department of Fish & Game and Fish & Wildlife Service.

We discovered that, one, there are trumpeter swans on Eyak Lake; two, that there's a potential number of eagles that are in that area; also reported harlequin ducks on the lake at times.

And yet we discovered that, one, insofar as swans are concerned, the record reflects that really trumpeter swans are

not -- and this was the information given really by word -- but it's important that we have scientific documentation of this, that there were really three swans that were held as a result of the Exxon Valdez, and we're not even sure those were trumpeters. Secondly, I did talk with a scientist on trumpeter swans, and just asked about the habitat that trumpeter swans require and need. And insofar as the Eyak Lake area is concerned, trumpeter swans do not utilize the uplands. I was told that it was imperative that the lake itself be protected, but when we see the species itself is not damaged by the Exxon Valdez Spill and thus is not qualified.

Secondly, insofar as the eagles are concerned that utilize that area, and this again is by word, that the buffer strips would apparently provide any protection if eagles were impacted significantly by the Oil Spill. So that was not a basis by which, you know, I could recommend that there was this linkage.

Thirdly, the harlequin ducks that are on the lake, there's no evidence of any nesting areas in the timber lands that are actually to be harvested. As a consequence -- well, I also found that, really, there was only about 600 acres eminently threatened for timber harvest, that is in the next fiscal --calendar year '93. And buffer strips provided in that instance -- well, it was really not really feasible to suggest that that area be protected.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

So we informed -- I personally informed the Eyak folks with whom I had contact, but, you know, there's just -- was not any evidence.

What I'm hoping, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Trustee Council, is that we can have, by our next meeting, and I'm talking with at least Mark Broderson, of our staff, the expectation is that we will have by our August 30 meeting, some very specific definitive recommendations on the criteria and the process by which critical habitat are identified. And because it's very apparent to me in the comments we've received from the public, both in writing and by phone calls and so forth, and testimony before this group, that this is a very critical item, and one of high interest.

So, I guess, in summary, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the members of the Restoration Team and Mr. Gibbons -- Dr. Gibbons if it is expected that at our next meeting, August 30, we will have specific criteria that critical habitat can be identified and essentially guides by which we can then make rational decisions. I guess that's the issue I wanted to lay on the table at this time.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I would like to add my usual footnote. I want to say that the Trustees do not have unfettered will to select whatever timber they might personally wish to select for

R&R COURT REPORTERS

acquisition with Exxon Valdez monies. We all have our personal views, and some of us deeply felt personal views on that subject. But we are bound by the provisions of the Settlement Agreement, and in fact congressional legislation, and we are accountable as Trustees for our judgments, and I think that beneath Commissioner Sandor's remarks lies that concept, and what we must do, and to which I subscribe, is to take an inventory, if you will, of the habitat and the oil spill affected areas which meets the criteria, the federal law, and federal judgment, and then proceed rationally from that basis.

Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Thank you. Any other comments by Trustee Council members?

I guess I should let the record also show that Carl Rosier is present now, and has been for the last several minutes.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Steve.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. I'd like to second the need to address, in some fashion, areas which might really be critical and a critical threat to habitat that we do agree under our criteria, which we've not yet adopted, of course, that would meet our needs and should be addressed sooner rather than later.

We talked about this before and the need that -- to see

if all this spectrum of coming up with a plan and a more considerate look at the criteria is going to take us a while. We don't have public comment back yet on the criteria. But it does seem that we should have mechanism whereby we can float real urgent situations to the top of our -- the (indiscernible) and take a look at them. And so I, too, am hoping that we hear that by August we'll have some way to try and address any "emergency situations."

And I would like to hear from the staff to that fact that it's going to occur.

MR. McVEE: Is staff prepared to make comment on progress?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

DR. GIBBONS: This is Dave Gibbons. If I can give you kind of a status of where we are to date and where we're headed with it. At the direction of the last Trustee Council meeting, on June 29th, the Habitat Protection Group has met several times, and we're moving forward with an inventory of eminent threat, we're moving forward with an inventory of data collection also to get at the very thing that you're referencing. And we hope by the 31st to have information available to us to identify parcels that are eminently threatened to a point where we weren't going to apply the threshold criteria. That's still out -- we'll be going out for

public comment here. I dropped off the supplement to the framework this morning to the printers, and we'll get that out as quickly as possible. But we are moving to collect the information that is available on parcels that were submitted for 1993, ideas for eminent threat.

MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons, I guess the concern I would have is you're giving priority to areas that are scheduled for eminent -- or harvest within the next year, specifically. Is that part of the plan or proposal?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes, that's correct. The first step we're taking is to identify the parcels that are eminently threatened.

MR. COLE: Do you want to comment on that? If you don't, I do.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. I want to say, Dr. Gibbons, that we just be very cautious about giving high priority to habitat which is "eminently threatened" by logging or other activities which are threatening to the habitat because I think we must guard against giving priority necessarily to those areas or we will be inundated with threats to log, and I also think that we must be very careful if we acquiesce in the acquisition of habitat under threat to log partially, that the following year we will have placed before us a "threat" to log the contiguous acreage. So we must be very careful that we not

R & R COURT REPORTERS

give "undue" priority to what may be labeled habitat which is under eminent threat.

Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Steve.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, I certainly didn't mean to imply by my remarks that we automatically would take any of these items or parcels and assume that we are going to put our resources into that and in some way preclude future choices by doing so. And I would hope until we actually have a plan and look at this in a broader spectrum that we would not be doing all that much. And, in fact, most of our expenditures and plans -- planned expenditures would come after we have public review of criteria, and after we have an inventory of a plan overall on how we wanted to proceed.

It was more from the idea of the fact there was out there something that was critical, and not just general threat of logging or development of some kind, but critical habitat that we would consider critical and could easily see what's critical to the recovery or continuation of some species we are concerned about, and that we not preclude looking at that type of opportunity.

I certainly didn't assume that by August 31st automatically anything that was identified as possibly being

developed was going to become a priority for acquisition of some kind. It was more just a census of what was there so we could make the decision on whether it was a priority.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Barton.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARTON: Yes. It seems to me the eminent threat analysis procedure that Dr. Gibbons laid out deals adequately with the problem. I think there's flexibility available to us if we see something of more urgency than that; I think there are a number of tools available. So, I'm not concerned that we're pre-empting the future options. I think that we do need to look at this very carefully and in total context.

Now, in perspective, these are pretty significant decisions, and I agree that we need to get on and identify critical habitat names, get that inventory completed so we'll have that. That's one of the first steps. But I believe that we're proceeding, as Dr. Gibbons outlined, in a satisfactory manner, you know. I think that we can accommodate any true threats and deal with those, and at the same time act responsibly.

MR. COLE: Would somebody summarize what he said?

MS. RUTHERFORD: I think -- Mr. Chair?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Marty.

MS. RUTHERFORD: I think what he was saying is that he's satisfied that the eminent threat criteria and process, as

laid out, will not -- it won't put us in the position of just responding to any threat that comes along, that we're actually overlaying that with critical habitat analysis and that that will protect us. I think what he's saying is he's satisfied with the process, that's it's going to lead where you want us to lead.

MR. McVEE: Mike, we only heard, I guess, part of what you had said. Marty, who was closer to the speaker, tried to summarize. I don't know whether you could hear what she

MR. COLE: Could we turn those things around?

(Off record comments)

MR. BARTON: Marty did very well. Thank you, Marty.

MR. SANDOR: I wanted to make one additional point, and that is -- and I think the lesson learned in this examination of the Eyak Lake land, in the areas that were scheduled for "harvest" which was something like over 10,000 acres, that in fact were under contract, it turns out that only 600 acres were "in the harvest plan for '93."

Anyway, we also discovered that -- of course they had the buffer strips -- recognizing that for other areas not related -- for other reasons not related to the Oil Spill, you know, there is substantial merit in having that Eyak Lake area protected. So, we -- that is both the state and federal governments, are now looking at opportunities for exchanges of lands and cutting rights as an option for protecting those

R & R COURT REPORTERS

areas for entirely different reasons. And it's important that the public and we as government officials understand that there are various strategies for achieving objectives that may or may not even be related to the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill itself.

So, anyway, I'm satisfied, I guess, with the discussion that one, critical habitats are being identified, the criteria -- that this will be presented at our August 30 meeting, and that, Mr. Chairman, satisfies at least the information that I was seeking with the request just be added as an agenda item.

MR. COLE: May I make one last comment?

MR. McVEE: Yes. Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: If we're not careful about the eminent threat in the logging, we will be like the dog chasing its tail, and we will be going around annually in this fashion. So we have to be, I think, on guard against that and start first with critical habitat, and then make an effort to develop a priority for the acquisition of critical habitat.

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. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Marty.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Could I just point out that that meeting is scheduled currently for August 31st. The 30th is a Sunday.

MR. McVEE: Okay.

MR. BARTON: We couldn't hear that, Mr. Chairman. 1 What Marty said is that meeting is 2 MR. McVEE: scheduled to have the presentation on the critical habitats 3 4 schedule for August 31st. And we will get that down and there 5 will be a little bit more discussion on that at the end of the agenda when we talk about meetings. 6 7 MR. BARTON: Thank you. MR. McVEE: Is there any further discussion either here 8 or in Juneau on this issue? Are we ready to move 9 MR. PENNOYER: No, that's fine. 10 What was that? MR. McVEE: 11 No, that's fine. 12 MR. PENNOYER: 13 MR. McVEE: Okay. We'll move on then. I'm comfortable with where you are. MR. PENNOYER: 14 We're ready to move on then to the agenda 15 MR. McVEE: item of Determination of Public Advisory Group Membership. 16 I'd like to preface our deliberations on dealing with 17 the Advisory Board with some discussion and a presentation on a 18 couple issues that have come up, and I would categorize them 19 first as the -- as a ethics issue on dealing with a public 20 21 advisory group and membership, and then the second one is the 22 concern about filing financial statements. And this is something that's been researched over the 23 last couple weeks, you know. Maybe it should have happened 24

R & R COURT REPORTERS

earlier, but a lot of things I think we get involved in take

time to accomplish, and we maybe not get them on the schedule they should be on, but I'd like to have solicitor with the Department of the Interior talk about these two issues, and she's had -- she's looked into the requirements and had discussion with people who deal with the FACA issues in some depth, and we have some recommendations to make to resolve or to take us through this area.

So, with the permission of the Trustee members, Trustee Council, I'd like to have Regina Slaeter come forward and talk about these two issues for a few moments before we proceed with actions.

MS. SLAETER: Thank you. I've given everyone, I believe, a copy of a little handout, and there will be copies in the back for the public, and we did fax these to Juneau, to DEC, so hopefully -- did you receive them in Juneau?

MR. BARTON: Yes, we have.

MS. SLAETER: Okay. I'd like to start with what Curt mentioned as the second issue first because it's easier to deal with, and this is the concern about financial disclosure statements.

As a little bit of background, a federal advisory commission established under FACA has a possibility of having people on it who fit into two different categories. People can be representatives of another group or interest, or they can be appointed because of their own personal knowledge and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

expertise. In the commission that the trustees have been dealing with, we've talked in terms of 12 identified interest groups plus representatives of the public-at-large. You're talking in terms of appointing these people based on their knowledge and expertise, i.e., choosing the best representative based on the knowledge of the person.

The reason it's important to define where we're starting from with members is because if people are appointed to represent interests or groups, then they do not fall into any category of federal employee, they are not subject to the laws of conflict of interest statements of financial disclosures that apply to federal employees, if, however, people are appointed to serve in their personal capacity, then they are under a category called special government employees.

Special government employees are subject to numerous laws and regulations which are summarized -- basically, I've attached pages from the Code of Federal Register, and must fill out a financial disclosure form, which are the last two pages. It's a general form which requires you to list all corporation companies in terms of which you have employment, basically list your financial interests, property holdings, and those forms would be available to the public upon written request.

Now, having sat through your meetings now for some six or nine months, it looks to me like what you're trying to do is

appoint representatives. As I said, representatives then are representing the groups of interest. These are the 12 interest groups you mentioned and the public-at-large. These people would not be special government employees, if that's how you're appointing them.

The only glitch I see in the process is that the charter does not at this moment accurately reflect your intention to do this. I might -- I don't know if you can advise -- the charter was signed by GSA. What I'm proposing that you do is today pass a technical amendment to the charter. This amendment would not require another round of approval at GSA, it would be forwarded to the Secretary of Interior for his signature as the backup official on this.

This would clarify the record, making it very clear that the people you're appointing, you're appointing to be representatives of aquaculture, fishing interests, the other interests you've indicated, and then we wouldn't have to -- then the discussion of financial disclosures and conflicts of interests becomes a moot point because you haven't appointed such a government employees; you've appointed representatives to best represent the views of the interest groups.

That's

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I have to leave in -- no long. What is the

R&R COURT REPORTERS

recommendation of the Department of Interior? I'm not sure 1 that these people are really representing a particular group. 2 Loosely, they are, but whether they are strictly, I have some 3 4 questions about it. I guess our recommendation would be that 5 MR. McVEE: they represent -- they recognize as representing the -- a group 6 7 8 of MS. SLAETER: An interest group. 9 10 MR. McVEE: an interest group, a group of people that use public plans or use resources of the area. 11 Our recommendation would be to go for the charter 12 amendment that eliminates the financial disclosure issue. 13 MR. COLE: Would you then nominate those people or 14 15 appoint them today? We've got one more matter I think we need 16 MR. McVEE: to discuss before we would make that cut. 17 I should point out, Attorney General MS. SLAETER: 18 Cole, that the representative capacity we're talking about is 19 not a formal representative capacity. There is much guidance 20 given by the government (indiscernible) office on -- you can be 21 a representative of the public at large, for instance, which is 22 not that easy. 23 Mr. Sandor. MR. McVEE: 24 Mr. Chairman, I quess I would raise a 25 MR. SANDOR:

question or a distinction between representing say a group like aquaculture and having an interest in a specific aquaculture facility, either personally or by representation as an officer of that corporation, whatever. And I thought that's what we were dealing with.

That's the second part of it, MS. SLAETER: Commissioner Sandor. The first part is a mere technicality, it's a bunch of regulations in a form, and you're either on one side of it or you're on the other. But whether you're a special government employee or not, you still should not participate where you have a direct conflict of interest, where you're dealing with a matter that would directly affect your financial well being, your family's well being. One of the guidance given by the Ethics Office deals with a situation which is very similar to what we have. They talk in terms of if you have science and academic proposals. Obviously, you're going to have to poll members of your advisory group from the science community. They're the only people around who can appropriately advise you, but there's an inherent conflict there because my university over your university or whatever. They said, well, you have to live with that conflict but you don't let the members vote on something that -- the direct proposal that would affect the pocketbook, i.e., the one submitted by their department or by their university. And here we're in a situation where we want people who are familiar 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

the Oil Spill. We want people who know the area. If we have that, we're going to have some built-in conflicts. There is no question of it, but we have to deal with it in the best way possible. One approach which I'm suggesting today is a draft letter that would be sent to the nominees where they're appointed, asking them to basically address possible direct conflicts so that you would know before you appointed people how many direct conflicts they had. You could still appoint them anyway but then you'd just know if they were going to refuse themselves from 90% of the vote of from 10% of the vote or every now and then, and you wouldn't be possibly appointing a committee where everybody on it had such a direct conflict on five or 10 different matters that their committee couldn't hold And that's the -- that's basically what I -- and discussions. there I'm talking about very specific direct -- your direct financial future depends on a kind of decision; your employer's financial future, your spouse's financial future, not just the fact that there is a potential conflict.

One of the things also that should be done is when the board -- group gets its walking orders is to make sure that there's an explanation given that it's proposed under the operating procedures for the PAG, that they would refuse themselves from direct conflicts. You want to focus on that because you don't want to prejudice the public process by building into it possibilities that people are working 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

private financial gain instead of giving you their best advice.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

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: Mr. Chairman, does the Department of Agriculture have any views on the subject?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, yes, we do have views on the subject. Now, I've not talked with our general counsel about this, but it's my understanding that their view was that a financial disclosure statement/conflict of interest statement was required.

I see that the regulations that we've been provided are Secretary Interior regulations, and he's the appoint authority as to who knows the appropriate regs. I don't know, frankly, whether Agriculture regs would indicate something different or not, but I do know that our counsel has been talking with the Solicitor's Office, and I thought they were of the opinion that disclosure statements were needed.

Is that correct, Regina?

MS. SLAETER: Mr. Barton, I have been talking to Maria Lisowski of your general counsel's office on this matter, and the answer is no, where -- yes, we probably are in agreement but no, financial disclosure statements aren't necessarily required.

The general rule that we start from, which is published in all of those how to keep out of trouble government ethics

books says that financial disclosure -- says that advisory committee members are special government employees, but upon actually looking into the laws and regulations, in 1982, the Government Ethics Office issued a statement that defined when an advisory committee would be a special government employee and when it wouldn't be, because it became clear that in reality, not all advisory committees function in the same manner.

And that's where the test about representative versus personal capacity comes from. And I did discuss this with Maria, and she said she would defer to my knowledge and expertise in that. I don't know that that's binding on you.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman,

MR. BARTON: I appreciate that. Maria happens to be (indiscernible - coughing) when we tried to hook her in, it didn't work.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: That, generally, having been settled, I think, what is the recommendation to the Trustee Council today about selecting or appointing members of the Public Advisory Group or deferring that until after receipt of the statements?

MR. McVEE: I think that the issue before us is whether we need to go out with a letter to nominees and they're notified concerning the -- and ask for information concerning their conflicts or whether we can go ahead and take the final

R&R COURT REPORTERS

action today.

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

I guess that Regina focussed on the only question, I think, and that is are we concerned about appointing a board where there is substantial conflict of interest that would make it ineffective or do we want to proceed with some risk of doing that.

MR. COLE: What is your view?

MR. McVEE: Our view is that -- I think it would be better to go out and ask people about their conflict of interest. Maybe that's the over-cautious view, but most conservative view, but I feel like, you know, that might be best.

The other -- the financial disclosure, I think we can resolve that with the amendment to the Charter so that can be taken care of.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Yes. Do I take it then that we have concluded that if we amend the Charter then the financial disclosure problem is no problem?

MR. McVEE: That's true.

MR. BARTON: All right. I do think that we should not go forward with naming the membership until we have agreement from the nominee or information from the nominee relative to conflict of interest. It seems to me that there may be some --

there's a possibility that there's a broad conflict rather than the specific conflicts that an individual could refuse themselves in. I don't know of any, but it would be nice to know that before we move ahead.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Does Mr. Pennoyer have a view on that subject? We have now two federal trustees recommending deferral, and since it's a federal matter, my tilt is to accept the recommendations of the federal members, but I would like to hear Mr. Pennoyer's views.

MR. McVEE: Yes. Mr. Pennoyer, can you hear us?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes. Mr. Chairman, thank you. We don't have a separate legal viewpoint, but I think what Maria and Regina talked about is consistent with our views, but I believe it would be better to find out if there is a conflict here.

I don't know if we're going to have formal votes or refusing procedures or how we're going to do that, but it seems to me we ought to know if, in fact, there's a broad conflict of some kind within this committee that we're appointing. So, I guess I agree with Mr. Barton and Mr. McVee that we ought to get something -- feedback from the letter that we're sending out.

I will say I hope that we have all of our ducks in order now and that come the next time around we don't have something else we have to do that's going to cause us not to

reach a decision, because we do have to get on with this.

MR. McVEE: I share that.

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: We've looked into that on the state scene, and our current view is there is no such requirements, but certainly if we receive the federal statements, then the state can have them available publicly.

I would, therefore, move, in leight of the recommendations of the federal trustees, to defer appointment of Public Advisory Members until the statements have been sent and received back and completed.

MR. SANDOR: Second.

MR. McVEE: Motion has been made to defer action on the appointments of the PAG until we have had contact with nominees. Further discussion?

Yes, Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to have this information at hand before the next meeting in August?

MR. McVEE: See, we're proposing an August meeting. I think there was a teleconference meeting scheduled for the 3rd. We're going to get into this next meeting thing, but I guess it's possible that we can get a notice out and set a deadline. I think in the draft we've asked the people to reply by July 29th. I guess I am as concerned -- have some concern that many of the people that we have nominated are very busy during this period of time, thinking of some of the folks that are in the

fishing industry and tourist industry, and I wouldn't want to 1 eliminate somebody with a tight deadline because they just 2 don't get their mail or have a chance to respond to it. 3 would hope that we could get into this issue and wrap up the 4 5 nomination and selection process on the 3rd, if that's 6 possible. Mr. Chairman. 7 MR. BARTON: MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Barton. 8 I assume that it's Mr. Cole's motion MR. BARTON: Yes. 9 10 and it included the amendment of the Charter. MR. COLE: 11 Yes. Yes, it does. MR. McVEE: 12 13 MR. SANDOR: That was included in the second also. Is there any further discussion? Is there MR. McVEE: 14 any objection to the motion? Hearing no objection, the motion 15 is passed. 16 Is there any further discussion on this item on the 17 agenda, the Public Advisory Group Membership? 18 I think we're ready then to move on to the next issue 19 of '93 Project Idea List and Restoration Team Actions. 20 21 MR. COLE: May I be excused at this time? 22 MR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. 23 defer to my vote. 24 MR. COLE: This is Dave Gibbons. 25 This is more of an MR. GIBBONS:

informational item than anything else. In the public package and in the package that went to the Trustee Council is a spreadsheet containing 1,227 ideas that we received for work in 1993.

We have categorized those ideas into six categories outlined in the cover letter on the package, and during the last week that the restoration team has dealt with these ideas, -- well, we've dealt with them all week until Friday at noon, and if you'll go to page seven in that package, the package that has the 1993 -- it's after the Public Advisory Group nominees in the public package, it's called the 1993 Work Plan. And at page seven of that you'll find a form that's entitled "Initial Restoration Team Review of 1993 Project Ideas."

MR. McVEE: Oh, okay. I've got it.

MR. SANDOR: I'm still looking, Dave.

DR. GIBBONS: Okay. It's after the Trustee Council nominees of the Public Advisory Group.

MR. SANDOR: The heading on it is Initial Restoration
Team Review of 1993 Project Ideas?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Montague.

MR. MONTAGUE: It's page seven of the document that begins like this.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Has everyone got it? Okay, proceed,

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

Dr. Gibbons.

DR. GIBBONS: Yes. The Restoration Team met last week, commencing on Monday through Friday, and used this form to analyze the 400 plus ideas submitted in 1993. Since we completed just the afternoon of Friday, new spreadsheet has not had time to have been produced. We used these factors, however, to look at the 427 ideas, and somewhere -- this is my personal guess, less than a 100 met these criteria or are still in the 1993 package. We'll try to get you a spreadsheet on that as quickly as we can.

The first three factors relate to the resource services injured by the Spill. We looked at every proposal in regard to that. The Critical Factors, was it technically feasible to do, and was it consistent with applicable federal and state laws. And those were the first three criteria we used.

The Damage Assessment Ideas were applied strictly to the first category called damage assessment. There was 12 idea submitted in that category, and those were analyzed using those four criteria.

The remaining projects were analyzed under the category called General Restoration Ideas, and looking at is there a restoration end-point, is it time critical to the recovery of the injured resource/service; the idea to be conducted this year or can we wait until a restoration plan is completed, and we have a complete umbrella so we know the entire restoration

projects. And, three, opportunity lost if not funded in 1993, and also then the fourth one, a long-term commitment. And it was our idea until a restoration plan is completed that we should perhaps not commit to long-term commitments of multi-years and large fundings. And those were the ideas we used -- the criteria we used to evaluate the ideas.

Like I say, the new spreadsheet is being prepared now with the projects that were rejected, using these, and also the projects that will move forward for three-page write-ups.

The next step in the process is to analyze the remaining studies that were still in, to meet these criteria on pages eight, nine, 10, 11 and 12, and there's specific evaluation criteria by category that each of these projects that are still remaining in the process will be evaluated by.

And, basically, that's where we are now.

MR. McVEE: I have a question, Dave. Is the criteria on eight, nine, 10, and so on, are those going to be applied after you look at the expanded write-ups -- the three-page write-ups?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

MR. McVEE: Okay.

DR. GIBBONS: Those will be applied to the ones that are still -- that met the other criteria.

MR. McVEE: Okay. And the deadline for the -- which is set for the detailed write-ups or the three-page write-ups, I

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

quess?

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah, that's early August, and we're prepared to have this package to the Trustee Council for the 31st, or whatever date the Trustee Council sets in August. We would prefer to have it towards the end. That's the only time frame that we can really meet.

MR. McVEE: That package will have had the second set of criteria applied?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

MR. McVEE: Jerome.

MR. MONTAGUE: Just to further elucidate your question there. On the fourth through the seventh will be a meeting of the Chief Scientists Peer Reviewers and the Restoration Team and technical experts from the agencies to apply these project evaluation factors to the three-page write-ups that are going to be prepared between now and July 31st. So the three-page write-ups are due the 31st, and then the 4th through the 7th, they'll be ranked according to these evaluation packages. And then based upon the comments that come out of this coordinating technical review, the three-page descriptions will be modified to change their technical aspects as directed by the Chief Scientists Peer Reviewers, and then it will be put together into a draft work plan to be submitted to you all the week before the 31st meeting.

MR. McVEE: Members and Trustee Council, do you have

any questions or comments? Mr. Chairman. 2 MR. BARTON: MR. McVEE: Yes. Is that Mr. Barton or 3 It looks like MR. BARTON: 4 Mr. Pennoyer? 5 MR. McVEE: a very good way to go, they're very MR. BARTON: 6 well organized. I think the Restoration Team has done a good 7 job in putting this action together for us, and I look forward 8 to the results of the review towards the end of August. 9 Any other comment? Any comment on the 10 MR. McVEE: criteria or schedule? 11 Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to see a process MR. SANDOR: 12 I share Barton's views. 13 like this in place. Any other further comment? MR. McVEE: 14 Mr. Gibbons, you don't need any actions, I understand, on this. 15 That's correct. We were just informing 16 DR. GIBBONS: the Trustee Council of the process that we're implementing. 17 You received a vote of confidence and 18 MR. McVEE: support, so I quess the Restoration Team can proceed on that 19 basis. 20 Moving to the other items, then we had two other items. 21 I believe Mr. Pennoyer had the issue of Financial Operating 22 23 Procedures. Let's take that one up next. 24 Mr. Pennoyer. Mr. Chairman, yes, if I could. 25 We have MR. PENNOYER:

had a set of Financial Operating Procedures in front of us for some time now. I think the majority of that package has been approved by the Trustee Council, and the pieces that are still missing, I think there's only one, if I'm not mistaken, outstanding piece that still has not been decided, and that's an appendix; Appendix F. I don't know -- I don't think the Counsel's got it in their packet in front of them, but Appendix F was the one about the transfer of funds between federal agencies of the NERDA accounts, and it's basically a federal requirement we're going to have to sort out our process, and I guess we have to finalize the it, but my understanding is the rest of the package is complete.

My question is how long are we going to take before we approve this or can we put it on the August 3rd teleconference agenda? It seems to me we should have these procedures finalized and in front of us, and the only thing that's missing currently is an appendix about how the federal government is going to handle its funds internally, maybe that does not preclude us from approving the agreed upon parts.

MR. McVEE: I guess my comment on this is basically concern to us on the federal side, in that we haven't ironed out exactly how that was going to be handled. We haven't had a great deal of discussion at this level on that, but it's possible that by the 3rd of August we could have that resolved -- hopefully, we would have that resolved.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

I think that Attorney General Cole, and he is not present now, had to attend another meeting, had some other language problems with the procedures involving the role of the committee, and there has been some discussion about how -- with the Attorney General's Office on modifying that language though.

I guess my feeling is that I'm not ready to act today on that but, hopefully, maybe by the 3rd, we could have that on the agenda.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was not necessarily suggesting that we get agreement today, although if we could have, it would have been nice to have this out of the way. But I have the need to get on with this, and I would be satisfied with doing something on the 3rd, if we get to that point.

MR. McVEE: Well, I would agree, Mr. Pennoyer, that I would like to see the Financial Operating Procedures finalized so they be a matter of record and provide guidance of our '93 program.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Yes. What do you anticipate having by the 3rd of August?

MR. McVEE: What I would hope we could anticipate having would be a final set of Operating Procedures with the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

language involving the role of the Financial Committee refined to resolve the problems that Attorney General Cole was having with it, and also the federal problem of how we deal with OMB, the cycle of OMB and Trustee approvals or our own trustee actions -- federal trustee member action would be taken.

MR. BARTON: You're talking about Appendix F?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Appendix F, plus the

MR. BARTON: If I understand it, Attorney General Cole's concerns have been addressed at the top of page 4 of the July 7 version of the Financial Operating Procedures. I would advise everyone's attention to that, and hope that we could move ahead. I would like to move ahead without Appendix F, if we still have not come to agreement on the federal side on Appendix F.

MR. McVEE: Yeah, there was a paragraph, as I recall, on the last version we looked at. It was on the bottom of page 5 that was also a problem. I think that was the June 23rd version. I realize there are probably another version that was probably published after that, I believe, but the June 23rd version had a paragraph that was creating problems that addressed OMB -- federal OMB and the role of the trustees -- federal trustees.

MR. BARTON: Yeah, I'm informed that that also has been addressed at the bottom of page five, the July 7 draft.

MR. McVEE: July 7th -- 7th draft?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Yes, that's right. 1 MR. BARTON: That was the draft that followed 2 MR. McVEE: The latest version. 3 MR. SANDOR: MR. McVEE: the latest version. 4 MR. BARTON: Now, the July 7th, I'm told, is the latest 5 version. 6 What do you want to do -- what do the 7 MR. McVEE: members want to do with this; just put it on the agenda for the 8 August 3rd teleconference meeting? 9 10 MR. BARTON: Yes, I think so. That's what I'd like to do, with or without Appendix F. 11 12 MR. McVEE: Okay. MR. BARTON: I'll second that. I guess I can't vote. 13 MR. PENNOYER: I agree. 14 MR. McVEE: Dr. Gibbons, did you hear that discussion 15 16 on Yes, I did. 17 DR. GIBBONS: MR. McVEE: the agenda item for the 3rd? Is 18 there any further discussion on Financial Operating Procedures? 19 20 21 The item that I wanted to talk about was cleanup costs. And in December of '92 -- or December of '93, we will -- no, 22 December '92, the accountant will be receiving the 150 billion 23 payment, less cleanup costs incurred by Exxon for this past 24 25 year.

One of the things, I think, we have to think about is how those costs would be audited, and one option we would have would be to ask Coast Guard, which has not been done at this point, but ask the Coast Guard to provide that audit. other option, I quess, would be to mobilize and do that audit under the auspices of the Trustee Council. But it seems like it would be very desirable to audit those costs before the It's not that it couldn't be done afterwards, payment is made. and certain credits, you know, could be made and so on, but it seems it would be advantageous to audit those costs so that we'd have a precise number for Exxon for that December payment.

12

13

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

I. guess I would propose that we contact Coast Guard and ask them if they're prepared to do that or if they have done that.

15 16

Is there any thoughts on that?

17

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman.

18

MR. McVEE: Yes.

19

Yes, I think that's an excellent idea. MR. BARTON: I'd suggest that the Trustee Council ask the Coast Guard to do

21

that.

20

22

I'll second the motion. MR. SANDOR:

23

24

25

A motion has been made and seconded that MR. McVEE: the Trustee Council ask the Coast Guard to provide an audit of the Exxon expenses for the 199- -- what is it, the '92 cleanup?

1 Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any further discussion? '91 and '92 cleanup. Is there any objections to the motion? Hearing no objection, the motion passed.

Are there any other items for discussion or action at this time?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: I move that we authorize the interim administrative director to investigate and evaluate some decent teleconferencing system and come back in 60 days with a recommendation to the Council.

MR. ROSIER: Second the motion.

MR. McVEE: All in favor -- there's no objection to that.

MR. BARTON: Only one, Dr. Gibbons. That's fine. Good.

MR. McVEE: Any other items? Do you want to talk about next meetings before we recess? You have public comment period from 1:00 o'clock to 2:00.

Dr. Gibbons, can you outline what your proposal is for Trustee Council meetings -- future meetings?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes. The proposal that we had was to hold an August 3rd teleconference to discuss any public comments on the administrative costs of the budget. Those have

been shipped out mid-June. I have not received any comments concerning those administrative costs, and so the August 3rd date is still -- is very flexible. I'm not sure, you know, if I will receive any comments, but to date, I'm not aware of any comments on the administrative budget.

MR. McVEE: Shall we do that meeting by teleconference? We've added two more subjects to that agenda. I guess that's the question, the action on the PAG nomination and the Financial Operating Procedures.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair?

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MS. RUTHERFORD: It's Marty, for those of you in Juneau. I am not convinced at all we'll be able to get a turn around on the conflict statements from the Public Advisory nominees by that date. It's the 20th now. That's less than two weeks. Even if we got -- and I intend to get the letters out today. I'm not convinced we don't get them. Some of the locations will take a week to get there, that's the 27th. I just don't think we can get them back in time.

MR. McVEE: What kind of a problem, Dr. Gibbons, do we create if we delay that meeting for a week? I'm sure maybe scheduling problems, but do we create problems concerning our next request to the court for funds, that type of thing, the scheduling of that?

DR. GIBBONS: Forgive me. The last Trustee Council

meeting we built into the 1993 review process some review by the Public Advisory Group. That looks like that will not occur. That will be a problem. I don't think we'll make it now. Personally, I think it's too late to get that group formed and get the meeting, so that would be a concern. That group's review of the '93 package.

MR. McVEE: Yeah, I don't think that we can form that --get that group formed fast enough to do that.

What are the wishes of the Council and the staff then?

August 3rd, the next Monday would be August 10th. Are there a
lot of scheduling problems?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, I'll be out of the country on August 10th myself. The first time I'd be back would be the week of August 17th or 24th and 31st.

MS. BERGMANN: Mr. Chair.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Pam Bergmann.

MS. BERGMANN: If I recall, there was something in request to the court about the Trustee Council taking actions on the administrative portions of the budget, right around August 3rd, so my question is do we need to have a Trustee Council teleconference to address that particular issue so we're consistent with what we indicated to the court we would be doing.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Barton.

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. BARTON: Yeah, I thought we had agreed to that administrative cost budget subject to public comment. have no public comment it would seem like the approval would just stand. I think that's true. It was approved, as I MR. McVEE: recall, by the Trustee Council, subject to public comment. MS. BERGMANN: What's the -- Dave, what's the deadline again for receiving comments? DR. GIBBONS: Today. MS. BERGMANN: Today. We have received no comments as of this MR. McVEE: I guess my suggestion would be to stay with morning, okay. that teleconference date. If we don't have responses back from PAG nominees, then we may have to schedule something in

addition to that and handle that matter.

I would have suggested MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair. that we fax them out, but I know, from having contacted them for other reasons, that there's a good third of them that don't have access to fax machines.

Yes. It would be later in the month. MR. McVEE: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I think we should stick with this August 3 teleconference date, and if we do not have all of the contacts and responses, which we may well not have, we can still make them subject to the submission of a satisfactory

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

ethics and financial disclosure statements. We really should get on with it.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, if that's the case, I'm not sure how we'll be in a different position on August 3rd than we are now. We don't have them in front of us now either. Maybe what we should do is go ahead and just keep the August 3rd date and let the executive director take a look at what we've got back by then and see how it's coming, and cancel it if it isn't going to work.

MR. McVEE: I think we will have at least an issue, hopefully, two to deal with by that time and we should proceed with that at the August 3rd teleconference.

Dave, I guess

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, what are the other two issues? I mean the Financial Operating Procedures we need to do, but they're not -- I guess I'd just as soon see them done but if not, take half a day, if we get sort of the type of coordination we've got at this session. If you don't have the Financial -- we don't have the PAG group back, then I'm not sure the other issues warrant holding a separate meeting. See what I mean?

MR. McVEE: I think that if we just have the administrative budget to deal with, and it sounds like we may not have that to deal with if we don't have any public comments, and the Financial Operating Procedures, it seems like

we could deal with either or both of those on a teleconference 1 2 without any problem. I would suggest that we go ahead and proceed with the 3 teleconference and 4 August 3? 5 MR. BRODERSON: August 3. What would be the next meeting MR. McVEE: 6 7 date then, Dr. Gibbons? The next meeting date is August 31st. Ιt DR. GIBBONS: 8 will be a full meeting, but it will deal with many factors. 9 The two factors it's going to deal with is the Habitat 10 Protection Project, and the 1993 draft Work Plan. 11 12 the two major factors of that meeting. Is that a one day meeting? MR. SANDOR: 13 Hopefully. 14 DR. GIBBONS: 15 MR. McVEE: Yeah. I'm getting hand signals from the staff here, Dr. Gibbons, that says that we better schedule it 16 for two, and I guess my concern was that the involvement and 17 18 the time that it took to put the '92 proposal together, it 19 might take two days. Any thoughts of Council members on that? 20 MR. BARTON: I would hope we could get it all done in 21 22 one day. We could try for the ultimate. 23 MR. McVEE: Sounds like a beer commercial. 24 MR. BARTON: MR. McVEE: Maybe that would help. Any other 25 Okay.

thoughts on the meeting? 1 Mr. Chairman. 2 DR. GIBBONS: MR. McVEE: Yes. 3 This is Dave Gibbons again. If we start 4 DR. GIBBONS: -- I know there was some concern that we started the last day's 5 meeting at 8:00 o'clock. What time would the Trustee Council 6 7 like to start the meeting on the 31st? I'll let the Juneau 8 MR. McVEE: It's going to go for two days. I'd start DR. GIBBONS: 9 10 on 9:30 or something on Monday and just go into Tuesday. MR. PENNOYER: If it's going to take two days, let's 11 12 accommodate a Monday morning flight from Anchorage to Juneau. 13 MR. McVEE: I think you have agreement among the other two Juneau members here. Any other items before we recess? 14 The August 3 teleconference is a 15 MR. SANDOR: continuation of this meeting? 16 MR. BRODERSON: It has to be. 17 MS. RUTHERFORD: Why? 18 Because there isn't time to announce MR. BRODERSON: 19 We aren't allowed to be adjourned; it has to be recessed. 20 Juneau, did you hear that discussion? 21 MR. McVEE: MR. PENNOYER? No, I did not. 22 23 MR. McVEE: Well, the question of Commissioner Sandor 24 is the August 3rd meeting had to be a continuation of this 25 meeting, and the staff replied that yes, there was not enough

time to get out a public notice to adequately inform the public of a new meeting.

MR. BARTON: Fine.

MR. McVEE: With that then, we'll recess. We'll return at 1:00 o'clock? Well, we're scheduled for 1:00 on the

MR. BARTON: All right. Thank you.

schedule, so 1:00 o'clock for the public comment period.

MR. McVEE: 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

(Off record - 12:03 p.m.)

(On record - 1:00 p.m.)

MR. McVEE: Are you on line now? Steve Pennoyer, Mike Barton, can you hear us?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, Curt, loud and clear.

MR. McVEE: Okay, you're coming through. Let's reconvene the meeting of the Trustee Council. At this point, we're ready to take one hour for public comment. This is not teleconferenced, so it would only be those present here in Anchorage, I guess, that have comments to make. And so with that, is there anyone that wants to be first? It's a matter of raising your hand or coming forward. Yes, sir.

MR. COUMBE: Hi. I'm Mike Coumbe. I'm with the Katchemak Bay Citizens Coalition. And the -- did you need anymore identifying information from me?

MS. BERGMANN: How do you spell your last name?

MR. COUMBE: C-o-u-m-b-e. And just to let you know,

the Katchemak Bay Citizens Coalition is interested in one issue only, and that is the protection of Katchemak Bay State Park and the boundaries that were set aside by the State of Alaska back in 1970 when the Legislature passed a law protecting the state park.

And just to let you know what -- you may already know through the newspapers that -- and that is that currently the 24,000 acres that Seldovia Native Association owns within the lands that were set aside for the park, and the land that Timber Trading Company has the rights to cut trees on, and the land that the Cook Inlet Region Incorporated has subsurface rights to within the park -- designated park land, currently there is no agreement to protect that land.

And I realize that the Trustee Council is here to protect lands that are -- or in the land acquisition program is to protect lands that were affected by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. That property, while just the beaches of the park were lightly oiled, the lands within the state park are, according to the Attorney General, in his opinion to Governor Hickel, they are lands that support the marbled murrelet, which is a bird that was heavily affected by the Oil Spill.

Anyway, the state park is threatened. The logging company is going to go ahead with their plans to seek permits to log on the state lands -- not the state lands but on the lands within the state park. And the \$11 million that we

R & R COURT REPORTERS

originally asked the Council for to buy back these three parties' interests within the state park now balloons to quite a considerable amount more. It would at least include the 22 million that was the agreed upon sale price. But at this point, it's -- we're not that sure that there is an agreed upon sale price.

So, I would just like to say that the quicker this process of determining what lands can be acquired by the Council, the quicker that process can proceed, the more likely we are to come to an agreement with the parties on a price that the Council can afford. Afford isn't the right word, but anyway.

The Katchemak Bay Citizens Coalition is willing to work with the Council in whatever capacity we can to see that the Katchemak State Park lands are protected, and whatever you -- you know, whatever help we can be to you, we would definitely like to serve that purpose.

MR. McVEE: Thank you, very much for your comments.

One question. Do you have any sense of how long it will take
the timber companies to obtain their permits?

MR. COUMBE: That isn't determined at all. I talked with the person at the Division of Governmental Coordination on Friday to ask her where the permit process stood. She said there had been no action since -- no real action with her office since January. But it -- for me to give you a guess, I

R & R COURT REPORTERS

really don't know. I mean, I've heard anywhere from -- well, I really do not actually know how long that process would be.

MR. McVEE: Wait for a moment here.

MR. COUMBE: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McVEE: (Pause) For the benefit of John, Mr. Cole, Mr. Coumbe, Katchemak Bay Citizens Coalition, is speaking with the issue of Katchemak Bay State Park. We're just talking about the permit process and how long it might take to acquire -- for the timber logging company to acquire a permit so I can get some kind of a sense of a time frame that's critical here.

Were there any other questions? Yes, Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mike, you made the linkage here with the marbled murrelet and its nesting habitat. Are there other species in your mind that are in this area that this area provides critical habitat for that were damaged by the Spill?

MR. COUMBE: I'm not a biologist in any sense of the word. I don't -- myself, I don't know. There might be other people in the -- that work with the coalition that would be able to give that information, but I don't know.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Would you summarize his testimony so I would have the benefit of it, please?

MR. COUMBE: Sure. My name is Mike Coumbe, by the way, 1 and I'm with the Katchemak Bay Citizens Coalition, and I was 2 just explaining that the sole purpose of the Coalition is to 3 protect state park lands. And I did mention a letter that you 4 wrote to Governor Hickel regarding the Katchemak Bay State Park 5 and that you mentioned that the marbled murrelet was affected 6 7 on state park land, and that because it was damaged by the Oil Spill, I realize that that's part of the process that this 8 Council has to go through, is determining what species affected 9 by the Oil Spill -- also are affected on the land that you're 10 talking about acquiring. And also that we in the Coalition are 11 willing to work with the Council in whatever way possible. 12 you need assistance regarding the state park, we'd be willing 13 14 to comply with whatever your needs are. Do Council members have any questions or 15 MR. McVEE: comments? Juneau? 16

MR. PENNOYER: No, that's fine, Curt. We're here. Thank you, very much.

MR. McVEE: Juneau is still there. Well, thank you, very much.

MR. COUMBE: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: We worked backwards on that effort.

MR. COUMBE: Yes, we did.

(Off record comments)

MR. McVEE: Is anyone else present who wishes to make

R&R COURT REPORTERS

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

comment? Yes, come forward, please.

MR. HARUN: My name is Kevin Harun. Can you hear me okay? I'm the executive director of the Alaska Center for the Environment. And I represent many members throughout Southcentral Alaska, including members who live in the Sound and other parts of Alaska.

On behalf of our membership, I just wanted to thank you all for this opportunity today because we feel that it's really important that the public process continue, and I think we'll get a lot more ideas out of that public process, and we thank you very much for this opportunity, and other opportunities.

You know, sitting back this morning, watching the Counsel in action, I was struck by the importance of the decisions that you all are faced with, that you all are very much vested with a tremendous amount of power to determine the course of Prince William Sound. And really I think that's what this process is about, that we're really concerned that out of this settlement that the healing of Prince William Sound begin. And I think that's really what we're all working towards. And although there might be differences of opinion on how to get there, I want you to know that we in the environmental community sincerely want to work with you in that process.

One of my concerns, in looking at the process to date is that we're concerned that as the money is spent that it actually go to some real good, to promoting healing of the

Sound. We don't want to see the money go to a massive pork barrel project for the area. We don't want to see it become a process by which museums are established all over the place, even though a museum may be perfectly appropriate.

The purpose is really promoting healing, and land acquisition is one important way to do that, and I realize that there's a criteria for establishing the acquisition. We want to make sure, however, that in the process of establishing that process that we don't lose lands that are eminently threatened.

We were very, very disappointed by the Governor's veto, of House Bill 411, actually the capital monies. I realize that is a separate process from this process here. But we were very disappointed by that and are looking to the Council for some remedy where it's appropriate, particularly with Katchemak Bay State Park. I think that's one area where, you know, we can't afford to lose it. And I don't mean to single that area out. There are other areas that may be eminently threatened as well.

But we look to you to do the best job you can, and I'm sure you will try. If the process is extended too long, we may end up being in a bind and not actually being able to get these and acquire these lands before they are logged. And so I hope you will move with all due speed, as well as with carefulness to make sure that it's fitting whatever criteria that is

determined is necessary.

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

So, that's really our message, is it's real important that certain areas not get lost. We don't want to see the money going just to bureaucrats and pork barrel; we want to make sure that it actually goes out there. And you can leave a legacy for this area that's really important, and I think that's the whole reason for the settlement, is to compensate for the damage that was done.

Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Questions? Questions from Council members?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: say that we appreciate the offer to work with the Trustee Council. I think it would be fruitful for all of us to strive together instead of having this constant apparent tension between the groups, as I think all these members of the Trustee Council are certainly in good faith, trying to achieve the most fruitful ends. So, thank you.

MR. HARUN: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Kevin, you say don't spend the money on pork barrel, and I don't think any of us are interested in seeing that happen. Do you think, however, that there's a role for good science, in terms of

support of the restoration projects in the Sound?

MR. HARUN: I think there is. You know, unfortunately, there weren't a lot of baseline studies in place before the Spill to know what the real impacts were, and I do think science has a role to play. I guess from our membership's perspective, that we would probably rate habitat acquisition as probably the highest, but I do think there is a role to play for science as well.

MR. McVEE: Any other questions? Juneau, do you have any questions?

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't.

MR. McVEE: Thank you, Mr. Harun. Does anyone else have public comment that they would like to make at this time?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Yes, Mr. Parker.

MR. PARKER: Thank you. My name is Jeff Parker, speaking on behalf of the Alaska Sport Fishing Association and Trout Unlimited. I just want to comment briefly upon some of the suggestions for expenditures of restoration monies.

I'm not certain that it's in the list, but it may well be that I don't identify it by the project title. But I think it would be useful to have a project that focusses on inventory of replacement lands for services, particularly recreational use.

Most of the projects tend to be focussed on habitat --

on acquisition of lands or replacement lands of mitigating habitat, and I think what is missed here is recreational services, acquisition of lands for replacement services. What is -- it tends to be along the line of capital improvements, such as camp grounds, that kind of thing.

At least from the perspective of the people for whom I work, that is not as desirable an expenditure as it would be to acquire or conserve lands that are important for remote wilderness based recreational services, as you have in Prince William Sound.

And we think it would be useful to look at the inventory approach because probably a sensible decision making process would depend upon the ability to compare one potential acquisition, whether of title or conservation easement or public access easement or whatever, against another candidate. We look not only within areas proximate to where oil went, but we strongly, and for a long time, urged that the concept of replacement doesn't at all require that you look proximate to the area that was injured.

And I think a previous time that I've engaged in a discussion, and will reiterate portions of it here, about whether or not there are lands, for example, outside of the Sound, Kodiak archipelago area that provide services that in some ways are commensurate or comparable with those that were injured.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

One type of candidate that was not mentioned in the past is lands in the Illiamna region and Bristol Bay region drainages which are very heavily used for remote dispersed wilderness based recreation.

I see Attorney General Cole shake his head because he probably thinks

MR. COLE: No.

MR. PARKER: how is that comparable? I appreciate and laugh at your own smiles on the issue, but this is the way in which I think, with all due respect to Mr. Cole, that I think it has some comparability. It has comparability in terms of the dispersed nature of the recreational use pattern.

The Southwest Alaska drainages are the most intensely used wilderness recreation lands in the state, higher than Denali National Park, for example. When you take off from the fact that on Denali half of your visitor use doesn't go past the gas station and -- I think it's in the low tens of thousands of people who are actually in Denali, are engaged in wild- -- and dispersed recreational use pattern, in that sense Southwestern -- portions of Southwestern Alaska are very comparable to the use pattern that you have in Prince William Sound and in the Kodiak archipelago.

What are they focussed on? They're focussed, in large part, on fisheries and game. Just as you have, similarly, in

Prince William Sound. What do you have? You have salmon stocks, trout stocks. What did we just injure? We just injured trout. We just closed trout fisheries.

You have some rather unique species in the area, too.

You have your only harbor seal -- inland harbor seal population in the United States. One of six inland seal populations in the world was harbor seals that we've got problems with.

Somewhat analogous to our trout stocks, where we have problems with western Prince William Sound trout, and we all know that the Illiamna drainages are the best trout waters in the world.

Similarly, you've got one of your few inland marine birds populations. We've got three in this state.

You have, in portions of Southwest, you have a kayak based recreational use pattern, the same as you do in Prince William Sound. In fact, Southwest Alaska is the only, and the most popular -- I shouldn't say it's the only, but it's the most popular place -- inland place for using clipper kayaks.

Some people say that ungulate deer were injured out in Prince William Sound. Well, that's obviously of some debate right now in the scientific community.

But what do you have? You have the third largest caribou herd in the country in those drain- -- yes, I mean in the country in Alaska in those drainages.

You similarly have in the eastern portion of those drainages very good eagle values. Well, we've got some

R & R COURT REPORTERS

injuries on eagles.

1.2

You -- obviously I mentioned salmon before. I don't think I need say more about the salmon values in Prince William Sound. We'll admit the species is different, the sockeye mostly, but in Prince William Sound, mostly pink. But you can certainly add a genus level, you've got identity.

Now, let me speak, very briefly, about what I think the cost of it would be. In those drainages, you have land rich, cash poor corporations. You have no trees involved, no minerals. Even if you forget minerals and we're just talking about conservation easements and non-disposable easements, you are probably talking about beating the price or the cash inflow that would occur, say across the next 100 years of selling incremental recreational tracks, which -- for which anyone can pick a market or a number as well as I can, but I would say somewhere in the vicinity of a couple thousand lots that place would be saturated for that market.

What do you have to do to beat that cash flow? My guess is that on an average, across 100 years in present day value, those lots will be at the vicinity of \$1,000.00 an acre. At the front end, they're going to be much higher, but as a market saturates, they will decline. So you're talking on the order, on an average five-acre lot, assuming 2,000 lots throughout that region, you're talking on the order of \$10 million in present dollars. That's a very small amount, and it

shows the efficiency of doing replacement recreation lands in the Bristol Bay drainages.

Now, I would point out that the state has -- and you in fact acquire a lot of conservation of habitat for species that are similar to or identical to those that are injured in the Sound if you do the recreation approach, the service approach.

I think I was pointing out the efficiency of that type of acquisition. What do you accomplish in terms of protecting that area? You're probably talking -- there are, in private lands outside of core townships of the four villages involved, the four villages around Illiamna region are -- have about 200,000 acres outside of the core townships. If the market that you have to meet is just \$10 million worth of disposal on cash flow, you could effectively -- because of the strength of the state's land use plan in the Bristol Bay area plan which is pretty much non-disposal throughout that whole region. You would effectively create several million acres of land that are conserved. It would be a very powerful acquisition in terms of the benefits in the context of that larger state land use plan.

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Am I being reasonably clear?

22

to

MR. COLE: No.

23

MR. PARKER: No? Okay. The state land use plan

2.4

MR. COLE: As long as you asked me, I just wanted

25

MR. PARKER: Thanks -- thanks. The state land use plan and the Bristol Bay area plan, put out by DNR, is retention of state lands throughout the area. By conserving the Native corporate lands -- village corporate lands surrounding Lake Illiamna and the drainages that feed into it, such as the Copper, Gibralter, Illiamna River drainage, the Tolerik creeks, those places where corporate land has been selected, you would preserve the character of that land in total, which is about -- for the price of conserving 200,000 acres, you would get 800,000 -- or eight million conserved. And in so doing, I think, retain for recreational character the land as it presently is.

I'm advocating that as -- and I do think I disagree here, with all due respect to Attorney General Cole, on the question of whether or not an acquisition has to be proximate to where oil went. Replacement -- acquisitions for replacement purposes -- I say there's no criterion in the law, that I can identify, that says the replacement has to be -- or any acquisition, actually, has to be proximate to where the oil went. It has to relate to an injured service or resource. And I do think you'd agree with me on that.

MR. COLE: Let me ask this question,

MR. PARKER: Sure.

MR. COLE: as long as we're focussing on that subject. Would you say that we should buy lands in the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

foothills of the Sierras to preserve the services of fly fishermen there? I mean as long as there's no requirement of proximity.

MR. PARKER: I think my gut feeling is no, because the character of the -- but I stated it was a gut feeling, because I think you have to look at to define carefully what service you're talking about was injured in the Sound. I think it's a difficult argument to say that the people who utilize the Prince William Sound area will get a replacement service by buying in the Sierras. But I think it is much easier to say that the people who utilize southern coastal drainages of Alaska, including Prince William Sound and Kodiak archipelago, also utilize -- I'm quite certain of this on Kodiak archipelago -- also utilize the Bristol Bay drainages. And I think

MR. COLE: Then you would say \dots .

MR. PARKER: I think

MR. COLE: there must be a proximity to the people that use those services?

MR. PARKER: I think what you have to do is establish some linkage. I'm not saying that proximity to the people is the only criterion. I think that what we're struggling with is trying to put forward good proposals that bear some relationship to an injury occasioned by the Spill, either to resources or to services that the resources provide. I think that you would probably agree that if there is valuable habitat

R&R COURT REPORTERS

to be protected in California, for birds that utilize Prince William Sound habitat, that it is reasonable to put forward that acquisition in California as a candidate. My hope is

MR. COLE: The Justice Department offered that during negotiations, and I said no, never.

MR. PARKER: I know. And I have not taken the approach as no, never. I have always taken an approach of spend Alaska --generally, you'll get better matching if you focus on Alaska expenditures, and I think you get better matching if you focus on southern coastal drainages, because the use pattern across the southern coastal drainages is much different than the use pattern up on -- in the Brooks Range, for example.

But what I'm particularly advocating here is that you broaden your view within Alaska of where to -- you broaden your view in two respects: One is there should be more focus on acquisition for replacement services, and the other is there should be a broader view as to stepping away or going beyond just areas that are proximate to the Spill, because the notion of replacement in no way implies that acquisition has to be proximate to the Spill -- to where the Spill occurred.

If it replaces the service, it's a decent candidate.

And I think the problem is, Attorney General Cole, that there are many candidate acquisitions, whether easements or title or whatever, that in terms of service they are just like

R&R COURT REPORTERS

acquisitions for a resource and a habitat in that you'll have degrees of matching.

Nothing is going to be perfect matches. If we hold ourselves to a criterion of a perfect match, we will acquire nothing, either for services or for habitat, because I don't think anyone has come forward with a perfect match. And the reason is because everything below the high tide line, you guys own anyway. But -- so you have to step beyond the high tide line.

And I think the question is how do you reasonably evaluate candidates that have varying degrees of match. And what I tried to put forward is that I do encourage you to look beyond just adjacent lands to where the oil went. I think you'll do a much better job for both habitat and services if you give yourselves that flexibility. You'll be in a much better negotiating cluster to begin with. I think that's a very fundamental point.

MR. McVEE: Comments? Questions from Trustee Council?

MR. PARKER: None of my comments say that you shouldn't acquire proximate or oil went. I'm encouraging, again, an inventory of recreational service plans that have varying degrees of comparability on services, whether it's wildlife viewing or activity consumptive use.

That's the essence of my remarks.

MR. McVEE: I might just mention, Mr. Parker, that as I

R & R COURT REPORTERS

understand the staff, the Restoration Team is looking at the 1 possibility of a project which would explore recreation damage 2 assessment, so I don't think there's a project yet in the 3 4 proposals, but 5 MR. PARKER: You may have noted that that's being discussed. MR. McVEE: 6 MR. PARKER: 7 There is a damage assessment out on loss of sport fishing related recreation, and Attorney General Cole 8 may have seen it. It was just published in a treatise on 9 10 natural resource damages by Kevin Ward and John Duffield. Juneau, do you have any questions or MR. McVEE: 11 I'm not sure they're with us. 12 comments? MR. BARTON: We're with you. 13 MR. McVEE: Okay. 14 I'm still not sure they're with us. 15 MR. PARKER: With you. With us, but not with you. MR. COLE: 16 MR. PARKER: That's all right. 17 We're listening. 18 MR. BARTON: Pardon? I missed that. MR. McVEE: 19 We'll just leave it at that. 2.0 MR. BARTON: 21 MR. McVEE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Parker. MR. PARKER: Thank you. 22 Further -- yes, come forward. MR. McVEE: 23 My name is Paul Twardock. I represent MR. TWARDOCK: 24 25 the National Outdoor Leadership School. We've been running

wilderness base expeditions in the Sound for over 20 years.

I've been out in the Sound all summer, so I'm a little behind on what's going on. My understanding is you're in the process of whittling down this list of possible projects for '93.

I guess our concerns mostly center around the acquisition. We are the wilderness value of the Sound and the courses that we're operating are horribly important to our ability to run courses and maintain our operations out there. Things that are incompatible are logging, any sort of resorts, any sort of operation that restricts our use of beaches and such. That's not to say that we need the whole Sound, but the general idea that we like to get across is any sort of acquisition or a project that enhances wilderness values help us run better courses out there, and help us attract people to come to Alaska.

I guess the other point that I'd like to make is the perception of this wilderness values in Alaska of Alaska by people that are thinking about coming up here, I'd hate to see someone going through and decide where they're going to go and all of a sudden decide that well, golly, I heard that they're sort of not doing all they can for Prince William Sound, I'll go somewhere else.

That's sort of the wilderness perception out in the Sound of Alaska as a whole. That includes things like logging in a state park. I'd hate to have to defend that when I went

R&R COURT REPORTERS

Outside to promote our business. Well, I heard you guys did this, what about that. It's something that would be tough to explain.

And that's pretty much all I wanted to say for remarks.

MR. COLE: 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: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Let me ask this question. Here's one of the things that really troubles me.

MR. TWARDOCK: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. COLE: We all know, read and are familiar with the concerns of the environmental groups about logging in Prince William Sound. And we're constantly asked to utilize Exxon Valdez funds to protect the habitat from logging. Right?

MR. TWARDOCK: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. COLE: Now, what troubles me is where were the environmental groups when Congress was enacting legislation to convey these lands to Native corporations, free of restrictions on logging? I mean, you know, how did this happen that there are no restraints in those deeds to preclude the Native organizations from logging those lands. It seems to me that the environmental groups at that time should have raised this human cry and saying don't allow it, these lands to be conveyed free of restrictions, covenants running with the land, if you will, on these lands. That's what troubles me. Do you have an explanation?

MR. TWARDOCK: No, I'm not

MR. COLE: Who has that explanation?

MR. TWARDOCK: I'm not totally familiar with the history of it. I know that they were in there and as can be things in like Denali Lodge (ph) Wilderness Study Area, we still support that kind of thing. And I'm not quite sure -- I know there is quite a few battles fought over Knight Island, and obviously someone lost.

MR. COLE: You know, people come to us as Trustees and say, you know, you've got to save these lands. But the time to save those lands from logging was at the time this enabling legislation was passed.

MR. TWARDOCK: Well, maybe we're just persistent.

MR. COLE: I hope so. Anyway, I just want that -- you know, that's a concern of mine.

MR. TWARDOCK: I don't know what happened back there.

I know that -- you know, people fought that battle, and for whatever reason it came out the way it was, and here we are again. I mean, I know from our perspective or from those perspectives, it's a concern now. I mean, it's a concern for the fact -- and it's not necessarily logging, it's any sort of activity that sort of degrades the wilderness value affects our courses -- affects our ability to run -- affects us to employ people up here. You know, I'm just throwing that out.

MR. McVEE: Thank you. I guess I have a guestion in

that the, you know, the Sound is a large area.

MR. TWARDOCK: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McVEE: Do you -- and I understand what you're saying of the perception, I guess, of the public that it is primary wilderness, a pristine kind of areas is advantageous to your program, but the question is, you know, how much area do you need to have an effective program and do you utilize private lands as well as public lands, federal and state lands within the Sound?

Yes. MR. TWARDOCK: We use all three. We pay fees to Chenega Village Corporation and Chugach and to the Forest I think we're actually one of the few people that Service. actually do all that. And, you know, as far as the amount of area, we've talked a lot about this since the Spill, and we're looking at and doing quite a bit of analysis last winter of what areas we've used in the last 22 years. And looking at corridors that we could -- we're going to be very defensive And corridors of travel that are very important to destinations, whether it's Icy Bay, whether it's Harriman Fjord, Knight Island, you know, specific destinations, and once we get to those destinations then we need an area that's fairly well preserved. What happens in those corridors, outside of those corridors, you know, have a lot of flexibility there. But I think, for instance, right now there's a road being built That's out for us. Quite a bit of the area on Montague.

between Valdez and Cordova has either been logged or being logged, so we can't use that area. The areas right around outside of Whittier, again, you know, that's area we don't have any qualms with that if the City of Whittier and the state have plans for, you know, that's also their priority. But the area is slowly shrinking. That's what we see, that we have the ability to use. It concerns us. We'd like to be there another 20 years, still using the area.

MR. McVEE: I'm sure you have some information, you know, that you talked about that would be very useful to us in the development of the Restoration Plan process that now is in progress. I hope that you would participate in that process and comment.

MR. TWARDOCK: Yeah, it's tough in the summertime,

'cause we're all out making money, but -- as much as I can, you
bet. Love to.

MR. McVEE: Any other questions? Juneau folks, do you have any questions or comments?

MR. PENNOYER: No. Thank you, very much for the testimony.

MR. TWARDOCK: All right. Thanks.

MR. McVEE: Other public comment? Yes. Please come forward.

MS. LANE: My name is Dee Lane, and I'm not here representing anyone except myself. And I want to address the

R&R COURT REPORTERS

17(b) easement identification and marking, because I think if this is done on Native corporation lands, that you will find that some of the problems that some of these people that have just spoken will be resolved.

For the most part, these easements, that I know of, none of them are marked in Prince William Sound. But there are a lot of them. And they go from the mean high tide line, up and through various regular corridors that have been used or are needed for use. If these are marked, and I'm sure you've heard a lot of comment about this in the past, then people will know where they can go. At the present time, they can go along the coast and they can't tell what rights they have.

Of course, I'm speaking to you, Mr. McVee, because you know all this stuff already. Well, having been with the BLM so long.

I also want to address a comment that you asked,

Mr. Cole, the original Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement

Act, the -- each village corporation had to select a core

township. That's where the village was located. They also had

rights to a specific amount of land based on the number of

people in their population. And because most of the land we're

talking about was in the Forest Service, it was in previous

years logged. I mean, that's what the Forest Service did,

right? They logged some of the land in their area. So in the

Prince William Sound area, for example, it was -- you know, US

R&R COURT REPORTERS

forest. So there would be no reason for it to be withheld.

Also, the aboriginal rights were considered paramount because they were first. So other rights were not as important.

Thank you.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

Well, I want to say I remain troubled. Congress could well have imposed restrictive covenants and logging of that land. Not only in the regional corporation lands but certainly around villages -- easily could have put those restrictions in. You know, and somehow it almost troubles me that if Congress, as a matter of national policy said these lands may be logged, implicit in the conveyance without restrictions, isn't it? Then why should the Trustee Council, other than to protect habitat or damage to resources caused by the Spill, we should be implicitly or forwarding implicit congressional policy by saving these lands from logging. And that fundamentally troubles me. That doesn't mean that I'm opposed to the acquisition of "habitat," but it does trouble me why this was allowed to happen.

MS. LANE: I think if you were here at the time, it was a very propitious time for the Alaska Native, and they -- the rights that they felt were inherent were those without restrictions, for the most part, and a lot of people at the time felt that there shouldn't be lots of restrictions on these lands. MR. COLE: Well, then if they thought it at the time,

they'd still think it.

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. LANE: Times change. And most of the discussion was in the late '60s on this issue, so we were just at the time of when we discovered oil in Cook Inlet -- I mean, things were entirely different. In those days, people were still kind of hoping people would come up and live here. I mean that's just

(Indiscernible - simultaneous speaking)

MS. LANE: It's a totally different era, then and now.

I won't take any more of your time unless you have questions.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Do you have any questions from Council? Thank you, very much. Further public comment?

MR. PARKER: I'll respond on Attorney General Cole's question, if he wants me to, about the Native Claims Settlement Act, Section 22(k) is what we're talking about.

COURT REPORTER: Mr. Parker, would you -- excuse me. Step up to the microphone, please.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.

MR. COLE: Let me say this. Commissioner Sandor, and I personally, and maybe perhaps (indiscernible) early has another meeting soon, but we would like to hear you talk, if you can keep it to a thousand words, please.

MR. McVEE: We need to adjourn at 2:00 o'clock.

MR. PARKER: That's pretty hard. That's 500 right

there. Section 22(k) of the Settlement Act is what you have to talk about, and that provided a restriction on timber lands conveyed from the Forest Service to village and regional corporations. The section provides that the corporations were required to adopt a land -- and as I recall for the Forest Service to approve, I may be wrong on that point, but a timber management plan for a sustained yield purposes.

The restriction had a duration of 12 years. There were arguments about whether or not -- and I was involved in some of these arguments and a bit of litigation on it -- Sierra Club, or at least several groups in Southeast Alaska represented by Sierra Club Legal Defense did litigate the 22(k) issue. Primarily, when the restriction -- I expect John Sandor, you probably recall this. The key issue was when it commenced whether at the date of conveyance or at the date of enactment of the Settlement Act, obviously date of conveyance came much later. As I recall, the decision on at least one of the appeals on 22(k), before the Interior Board of Land Appeals -- and I don't know whether it went to court or not, but was commenced at the Settlement Act.

Hence, very rapidly the effect of 22(k) was exhausted as a 12-year restriction. And pretty much because of the non-enforcement by the federal government -- that's right, that guy -- because of -- nothing there, just responding to Attorney General Cole's pointing of a finger. Because of the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

non-enforcement of 22(k), the effect was that the timber was not managed for sustained yield purposes or under that restriction.

And we now -- as I'm certain several of you know, we have a number of corporations that have totally logged within a few years of logging off their land. They were under a sustained yield requirement that was of limited duration, and the environmental community did try and pursue the issue.

And in final hindsight as to why the environment community wasn't very effective at the time of passage of the Settlement Act, it was really only as a national move -- beginning with Earth Day in 1970, it was a very young movement still as a national entity.

MR. McVEE: Thank you.

MR. COLE: We'll talk more about it later.

MR. PARKER: All right. I'm sure.

MR. McVEE: I guess I'll make one more call for any other public comment. No other public comment?

Two other items that I thought about, and this is maybe primary for the RT and for Dave Gibbons is it would be of interest in some future meeting would be the Coast Guard plans on how they would handle the cleanup operations and the identification of Exxon Valdez Oil, and that would give us a chance to reflect upon how this might impact Trustee Council and the future use of joint funds.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

And then, I think, that we probably need a status 1 2 report -- should have a status report at the next meeting, briefly on the process of hiring a -- the executive director or 3 administrative director. 4 Is there any other items that other members have that 5 they want to bring up at this time? Juneau, do you have any 6 7 other items, any comments? MR. PENNOYER: From Pennoyer. Thank you, very much, 8 9 and we'll be looking forward to talking to you on the 3rd of August. 10 Mike Barton, any additional comments or 11 MR. McVEE: suggestions or ideas? 12 I move we adjourn. 13 MR. BARTON: No. I understand that we will have to recess, 14 MR. McVEE: and I'll assume that your motion is to recess. 15 16 MR. BARTON: Do whatever we need to do. Okay. Is there a second to the motion to 17 MR. McVEE: 18 recess? 19 MR. SANDOR: Second. We're recessed till August 3rd. Thank you, 20 MR. McVEE: 21 everyone. 22 (Off record - 2:00 p.m.) (END OF PROCEEDINGS) 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE 1 2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) SS. 3 STATE OF ALASKA I, Rebecca Nelms, Notary Public in and for the State of 4 5 Alaska, residing at Anchorage, Alaska, and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify: 6 THAT the annexed and foregoing is a Transcript of the 7 Teleconference Meeting of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement 8 Trustee Council, taken on the 20th day of July, 1992, 9 commencing at the hour of 10:00 o'clock a.m., at the Simpson 10 11 Building, 645 G Street Building, Anchorage, Alaska; THAT this Transcript, as heretofore annexed, is a true 12 and correct transcription of the proceedings, taken by Meredith 13 Downing, and thereafter transcribed by Laurel L. Kehler. 14 15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and 16 affixed my seal this 23rd day of July, 1992. 17 ecca nelms 18 Notary in and for Alaska. 19 My commission expires: 10/10/94 20 21 22 23

24