

9.4.13

PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP
MEETING TRANSCRIPTS
JUNE 13-14 1995
VOL. I

9.4.13

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT TRUSTEE COUNCIL

RESTORATION OFFICE
Simpson Building
645 G Street
Anchorage, Alaska

PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP

June 13-14, 1995
9:00 a.m.

RECEIVED
JUN 26 1995

VOLUME 1

June 13, 1995

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL
TRUSTEE COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS in attendance:

MR. DOUGLAS MUTTER
Designated Federal Officer

Department of the Interior

MR. RUPERT ANDREWS	Sport Hunting & Fishing
MR. CHRISTOPHER BECK	Public-at-Large
MR. KARL BECKER	Aquaculture
MS. KIMBERLY BENTON	Forest Products
MS. PAMELA BRODIE	Environmental
MR. DAVE COBB (arr. 2:25 p.m. 6/13/95)	Local Government
MR. CHIP DENNERLEIN	Conservation
MR. JAMES DIEHL	Recreation
MR. JAMES KING	Public-at-Large
MS. NANCY LETHCOE (arr. 2:25 p.m. on 6/13/95)	Public-at-Large
MR. VERN McCORKLE	Subsistence
MS. BRENDA SCHWANTES	Native Landowners
MR. CHARLES TOTEMOFF	Public-at-Large
MS. MARTHA VLASOFF	Public-at-Large
MR. GORDON ZERBETZ	Public-at-Large

TRUSTEES COUNCIL STAFF

MS. MOLLY McCAMMON	Executive Director, EVOS Trustees Council
MR. ERIC MYERS	Director of Operations, EVOS Trustees Council
MR. BOB LOEFFLER	Director of Planning, EVOS Trustees Council
DR. STAN SENNER	Science Coordinator, EVOS Trustees Council
MS. CHERRI WOMAC	EVOS Trustees Council staff

OTHERS PARTICIPANTS:

MS. VERONICA CHRISTMAN	Alaska Department of Natural Resources
MS. JUDY BITTNER	Alaska Department of Natural Resources
MR. DOUG REGER	Alaska Department of Natural Resources
DR. JOE SULLIVAN	Alaska Department of Fish & Game
MR. ERNIE PIPER	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
MS. RITA MIRAGLIA	Alaska Department of Fish & Game
MS. DIANE MUNSON	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

P R O C E E D I N G S

(On Record 9:10 a.m., June 13, 1995)

MR. McCORKLE: Gee, it's really fantastic to see a quorum here today, and see all the faces around, we're missing a few folks that got fogged in, and we all understand how that goes in Alaska, don't we. So, we're going to try to get along with things. We'll call the meeting to order at ten minutes past nine, and ask if we could have a roll call, please.

MR. MUTTER: Rupert Andrews?

MR. ANDREWS: Present.

MR. MUTTER: Chris Beck?

MR. BECK: Here.

MR. MUTTER: Carl Becker?

MR. BECKER: Here.

MR. MUTTER: Kim Benton?

MS. BENTON: Here.

MR. MUTTER: Pam Brodie?

MS. BRODIE: Here.

MR. MUTTER: Dave Cobb? (No response). Chip
Dennerlein?

MR. DENNERLEIN: Here.

MR. MUTTER: Jim Diehl?

MR. DIEHL: Here.

MR. MUTTER: John French? (No response). Jim King?

MR. KING: Here.

MR. MUTTER: Nancy Lethcoe? (No response). Vern

1 McCorkle?

2 MR. McCORKLE: Here.

3 MR. MUTTER: Brenda Schwantes? (No response). Thea

4 Thomas? (No response). Charles Totemoff?

5 MR. TOTEMOFF: Here.

6 MR. MUTTER: Martha Vlasoff?

7 MS. VLASOFF: Here.

8 MR. MUTTER: Gordon Zerbetz?

9 MR. ZERBETZ: Here.

10 MR. MUTTER: You have a quorum.

11 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. Quorum has been declared. We

12 now take up the minutes of the meeting of April 20 and 21. I'll

13 entertain a motion for their adoption.

14 MR. ANDREWS: Move to adopt.

15 MR. McCORKLE: Motion has been made to adopt. Is there

16 a second?

17 MR. ZERBETZ: Mr. Chairman, to refresh my memory, is

18 that the April meeting you're talking about now?

19 MR. McCORKLE: Yes, April 20 and 21.

20 MR. ZERBETZ: I believe there was a very slight

21 quotation in there with respect to me

22 MR. McCORKLE: Well, would you like to second the motion,

23 and then we'll have discussion?

24 MR. ZERBETZ: Okay, yeah.

25 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, you're seconding the motion to

26 adopt, and now the Chair recognizes Mr. Zerbetz for commentary.

1 MR. ZERBETZ: I just want to make a slight modification,
2 if I could, there's just -- just so the group is aware, where I
3 mention possibly taking some video clips of some of the field trips
4 when the staff took field trips, is that the -- is that in there,
5 Molly?

6 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

7 MR. ZERBETZ: Okay. I did not mean -- it would look
8 like I meant that they were going to be taking some sort of a
9 running video tape of comments at the meeting, and what I was
10 thinking of was just when people were seeing some type of
11 interesting project or development out there, that it would be nice
12 to have a little bit of a video of it perhaps.

13 MR. McCORKLE: Do you have a copy of the minutes of that
14 meeting, at your place there, Gordon?

15 MR. ZERBETZ: Not with me, sir, no.

16 MR. McCORKLE: Could you take him a copy and turn to page
17 two, the first large paragraph at the top of page two under summary
18 G, the very last sentence, it says, Gordon Zerbetz so forth. How
19 would you like to have that sentence amended to more appropriately
20 reflect what you had in mind?

21 MR. ZERBETZ: Perhaps, Gordon Zerbetz suggested that
22 video clips of interesting projects or programs viewed during field
23 trips would be a good way to provide the PAG and others, to
24 consider. Is that too cumbersome?

25 MR. McCORKLE: "Suggested that video clips of" -- and
26 then after the word "of" we'll insert interesting topics?

1 MR. MUTTER: Projects.

2 MR. McCORKLE: Interesting projects.

3 MR. MUTTER: ... "and programs viewed during field

4 trips."

5 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, does that hit what you had in mind?

6 MR. ZERBETZ: Yes, sir.

7 MR. McCORKLE: Okay.

8 MR. ZERBETZ: I had no desire of seeing a video tape of

9 the meeting.

10 MR. McCORKLE: There being no objection, we'll assume

11 that that has met -- that change meets with the consensus of the

12 group. Any other comments or suggestions with regard to these

13 minutes that you'd like to make or register. Kim, no? If not,

14 then I'll call for a vote to adopt the minutes of the meeting of

15 April 20, 21. All in favor say aye?

16 PAG MEMBERS: Aye.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Oppose, no? (No response). The motion is

18 carried, the minutes are adopted. I'd like now to approve the

19 agenda. Is there anything that anybody in the PAG would like to

20 add to the agenda, or any other comments on the agenda itself?

21 MR. BECKER: Mr. Chair.

22 MR. McCORKLE: Yes.

23 MR. BECKER: I'd like to add at some point a discussion

24 of the scheduling of the PAG meetings.

25 MR. McCORKLE: Okay. Do you want to do that today or

26 tomorrow?

1 MR. BECKER: Tomorrow would be fine, providing it can
2 happen before twelve o'clock.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Why don't we -- why don't we then put that
4 to the -- since we're going to begin tomorrow at 8:30, why don't we
5 put that on the agenda right at 8:30, moving just ahead of the
6 remainder of the work plan. Does that sound like it will be okay?
7 So, at 8:30 we will then add an item to discuss future PAG meeting
8 dates. Pamela.

9 MS. BRODIE: For election of the vice-chair, I think it
10 would be good to have as many PAG members here as we can. Do you
11 know if other people who are fogged in will be arriving some time
12 today?

13 MR. McCORKLE: Well, we don't know. Those who are fogged
14 in are David Cobb, Nancy Lethcoe, John French and Brenda Schwantes.
15 Oftentimes the fog burns out in the middle of the afternoon. They
16 might get in tonight. One suggestion might be to postpone that
17 election until tomorrow, hoping that they could get in overnight.
18 I don't -- do you think they'll come for half a day, or whenever
19 they get in.

20 MS. BRODIE: Unless we're going to be losing people
21 tomorrow, I think that would be a good idea.

22 MR. McCORKLE: Let's do a little -- just a little head
23 nodding here, how many people do plan to stay here tomorrow -- to
24 be in tomorrow? So ...

25 MR. DIEHL: Tomorrow morning?

26 MR. McCORKLE: Tomorrow, yeah, tomorrow morning. Okay,

1 anybody else not going to be able to be here tomorrow. Mr. Diehl,
2 how about you?

3 MR. DIEHL: I can be here.

4 MR. McCORKLE: Okay. Well, it looks like most of us are
5 planning to be here at least through noon, so, would that be all
6 right to postpone it until the time that the other candidates get
7 here, or have the election at before noon, or at least make a
8 decision about future elections tomorrow at noon. Okay. And --
9 yes, Mr. Becker.

10 MR. BECKER: I'd asked earlier of Molly if we'd might
11 be able to spend a few minutes talking about the plans for
12 dissemination of information of research. I was wondering if we
13 might be (indiscernible).

14 MS. McCAMMON: Right, I put that on my (indiscernible).

15 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, Chris that will get included
16 therein. Martha.

17 MS. VLASOFF: Well, I just have -- I just flew in from
18 Nuchek (ph) yesterday -- I don't know if everyone knows, but that
19 the spirit camp that was funded through DCRA proposal that was
20 submitted to the Trustees last year, and if you'd like I'd give a
21 short report on Nuchek and how things are going out there, if you
22 want.

23 MR. McCORKLE: I think we'd like to hear that. (Side
24 comments about microphone.) Well, could we put that just before
25 lunch? I think that would be a nice thing to have before lunch,
26 maybe about 11:45 or thereabouts. So, let's write in there 11:45,

1 Martha Vlascoe -- Vlasoff, I'm sorry, thank you for the correction
2 -- report. Any other additions or modifications the group would
3 like to make? If not, can I have a motion to approve the agenda as
4 modified?

5 MR. BECKER: So moved.

6 MR. McCORKLE: Moved.

7 MR. ANDREWS: Second.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Karl Becker and seconded by Rupert. Any
9 further discussion? If not, the call is for the vote. All in
10 favor say aye?

11 PAG MEMBERS: Aye.

12 MR. McCORKLE: Oppose, no? (No response). The motion is
13 carried. We are now down at the time we will hear the Executive
14 Director's report. Before Molly begins, I'd like to give you my
15 impression of members of the staff, which is wonderful. I just
16 wanted to say that -- as many of you have noticed, there -- we have
17 some staff members that have been in public service and public
18 policy for many years, and I've known and worked with people like
19 Bob Loeffler and Veronica Crissland (ph) and Molly McCammon for a
20 long time before coming to PAG, and even before moving to
21 Anchorage, and we're really quite lucky to have people with their
22 long experience and caliber and quality to be working with us. So,
23 we really have a core of staff people that's really spectacular and
24 superb, and -- not to mention, of course, nor to understate that
25 the qualifications of members of the PAG. We have a splendid group
26 here. So, we ought to be able to get some really neat things done

1 this year. So, with that as a take-off, Molly, could we have your
2 report, please. We're a few minutes late, but I'm sure you can
3 help us make it up.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree, I have
5 great staff, and the only problem with having great staff is that
6 everyone tries to steal them. So, I'm doing my best to keep them
7 on, so -- and, the more you can help me build me as to how
8 essential they are to the process, the better off I think we'll be.
9 There are a number of things I wanted to report to you on today.
10 The first was on the June 1st meeting that the Trustee Council had
11 in Cordova. This, I believe, was the first full Trustee Council
12 meeting in a community outside of Juneau or Anchorage, since the
13 settlement occurred and the Trustee Council, as we know it, was
14 formed. It was not a heavy agenda item day, and the main reason
15 for going to Cordova was to hold a public hearing and listen to the
16 community, and so, out of a four and a half hour meeting, I
17 believe, about two and a half to three hours was actually in the
18 public hearing portion of the meeting. And, it's really valuable
19 for the Council and, I think, for folks like yourself to get into
20 -- to actually go directly to the communities and hear from people
21 there, and it was a very welcoming reception. There was very tough
22 issues that we have going on right now with Cordova, and I think
23 the residents did an excellent job of bring those issues -- just
24 reiterating the community's perspective on those various issues,
25 and I think that's really valuable. We also had the opportunity to
26 meet at the science center and get a tour of that facility, and the

1 things that they had going on there, met informally with a number
2 of people that evening, and then the next day the Council members
3 flew over virtually almost all of the lands under consideration in
4 Prince William Sound. We went over Eyak, Tatitlek, Chenega,
5 Chugach lands, a number of small parcels, stopped at AFK hatchery
6 for lunch and toured the otolith marking project there, and the
7 group that went back to Juneau ended up flying to Cordova and then
8 headed south. The northbound group got near Perry Island, and
9 stayed for about two hours while the SEA Project was going on
10 there, and we went out on one of the -- one of their trawls where
11 they're trawling for pollock -- doing the mid-water trawl for
12 pollock and examining their stomachs to see what they are eating
13 and various things, and they had quite an operation going on out
14 there. There are five vessels that are all doing various things
15 and it was pretty impressive seeing that project out in the field.
16 I think -- me -- the main action items, there were three main
17 action items. The first one was on the Fleming Spit project, and
18 this is a -- a project (Brenda Schwantes enters meeting) -- there's
19 Brenda Schwantes from Kodiak, so Kodiak must be unfogged -- Fleming
20 Spit is a small project that was proposed by the community and by
21 the Cordova sportsman group to purchase a plot land there, dig out
22 some of the existing lagoons there and replace the net pens that
23 are being used for a small coho fishery, in conjunction with Prince
24 William Sound Aquaculture Corporation. A portion -- the Council
25 took action on this in a couple of different ways. The habitat --
26 the land portion of it, they put into the small parcel program, and

1 gave it a -- designated it as a parcel meriting special attention,
2 and so that parcel is going forward under the small parcel program,
3 and it will be appraised, and it will have negotiations with
4 Sealaska, which is the owner of the land. The net pens will be
5 funded as a project by the Trustee Council, pending Department of
6 Justice review -- final Department of Justice review, and we
7 believe they will look favorably on that portion of the project.
8 The boardwalk portion of the project was determined not to be
9 eligible for civil funds, and at the meeting, the Governor's office
10 had several people there from Division of Parks to speak on his
11 behalf, and the recreational funds through the criminal settlement
12 will be used to pave for the boardwalk, and the Governor committed
13 \$400,000 for additional support for that project. So, I think with
14 all of these various sources of funding coming together, that whole
15 project will get funded this year. So, the community was very
16 pleased with the results of that effort. The Council also took
17 action on a few other small parcels, elevating them to parcels
18 meriting special attention, and I'll give a little bit -- go into
19 a little more detail on that in the second portion of my report.
20 And, the other item that they took action on was to give the go
21 ahead for a stream channel project at Port Dick, which is on the
22 outer coast of the Kenai Peninsula. The other action item was
23 related to the Eyak negotiation, and I'll go into that in the large
24 parcel report. So, that -- that was basically what the Council did
25 June 1st and 2nd. We had full attendance, with the exception of
26 Phil Janek, who was called to Wrangell to testify at Senator

1 Murkowski's ANILCA hearing, but other than that we had a full
2 participation of the Council. I would like to give a brief report
3 on the status of our habitat protection efforts. There are two
4 major efforts that we have underway, the large parcel effort and
5 then the small parcel effort. And, the large parcel, the purchase
6 agreement for Akhiok-Kaguyak and Old Harbor were signed in
7 Washington, D. C. about three weeks ago. It was a very nice
8 signing ceremony in Secretary Babbitt's office. It was very moving
9 -- Ralph Aluska and Emil Christianson were very eloquent in
10 describing their feelings -- about how they felt about this deal
11 coming together. There was a large group of people there, probably
12 two or three hundred people packed into the Secretary's office, so
13 it was quite a crowd. It was really nice to -- to have something
14 that was really positive, that everyone felt good about, an actual
15 accomplishment, where -- that you could actually see. So, the next
16 step for those two negotiations are to complete the actual purchase
17 of the entire package over the next three years, and it's pretty
18 much -- the details have all been worked out -- it should be pretty
19 much perfunctory from now on. The next one that Interior will be
20 working on is the purchase agreement with Koniag, and it's hoped --
21 there's some drafts going back and forth, and it's hoped that one
22 will be -- will come to a completion in the next month to two
23 months. On Afognak Joint Venture, we have gotten the revised legal
24 description for that group of parcels, and the timber work on the
25 appraisal will be done this summer, and once we get all the timber
26 cruise information then we hope to go into negotiations in the

1 fall. On Chenega, this is -- has been under active negotiations,
2 and is progressing on track, and we hope to have something to
3 report back sometime this summer. English Bay is still on hold.
4 There are additional meetings that will be held in late June with
5 the corporation and with the negotiating team lead by Buck Owens of
6 the Department of Interior in Washington, D.C. The big question
7 with English Bay is not what lands they want to sell, it's --
8 basically the question is how much -- the question of value. On
9 Eyak, if you'll recall, the Council's proposal for the Orca Revised
10 area, which is the peninsula across from Cordova -- the agreement
11 that was struck in early March was to do some timber exchanges and
12 to expedite conveyance of some additional sections of land owned by
13 BLM, and make those available for timber harvest in order to
14 basically protect the view shed along Orca Narrows and Nelson Bay.
15 The small timber exchange was going forward fairly well until the
16 very last day when a -- a clause in there on severability caused
17 problems with the attorneys, and that clause -- Eyak Corporation
18 offered to go to mediation on that clause -- the Council accepted
19 -- it's been under mediation now for six days, and there's -- it's
20 not resolved yet, so this has become a major issue, and it's still
21 not resolved.

22 MR. BECKER: Molly.

23 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

24 MR. BECKER: Explain to us -- could you explain the --
25 what does that means, severability?

26 MS. McCAMMON: The severability clause?

1 MR. BECKER: Yeah, what's the implication?

2 MS. McCAMMON: Well, essentially, a very small part in a
3 very small part of a what-if this and this and this happens, and
4 it's -- it's gone through many different changes in the last six
5 days, so probably what I would tell you right now may not be
6 totally accurate, but the whole idea is, the agreement that's being
7 worked out is to trade timber interests on the backside of Bomb
8 Point toward timber interests along -- in a view shed along Nelson
9 Bay, and it's a value for value trade, and a value for value is not
10 -- there's no disagreement on that. The question is, what if
11 something -- and the idea is that Eyak Corporation would be able to
12 log the trees on the back side of Bomb Point, the Council would get
13 the timber interests along Nelson Bay, and the issue involved --
14 what happens if for some reason when Eyak Corporation is trying to
15 log that area, there's a lawsuit filed against them that stops it,
16 there is -- timber prices go down and drop fifty percent in the
17 next week -- there's all these kind of what-ifs, and what if
18 something happens where they're not able to completely harvest
19 their trees. And, the clause relates to what interest to you get
20 back then if the deals falls apart, and when you have a purchase
21 agreement and you put a severability clause in it, it basically
22 says the deals comes together if all these -- if all these pieces
23 come together, and if one of the pieces is dumped, then the deal
24 goes -- falls apart, and you each go away with your separate
25 interests. When you have a timber exchange like this that involves
26 actual logging, the question is -- what happens in the middle of

1 it, do people walk away with their interest intact? And, in this
2 case, the Council would get back trees that have been logged, or
3 partially logged, and so then there are all kinds of ways of going
4 back to insure that the Council got equal value and, it's more
5 complicated than I can understand -- attorney's talk, but that's
6 the major issue that's been bogged down.

7 MR. McCORKLE: Does that help?

8 MS. McCAMMON: Does that clear the fog -- so to speak?

9 MR. McCORKLE: But, that was a neat explanation because
10 it is one of these things that is evolving every day as we go, and
11 my information was -- it's like two weeks old, so I appreciate that
12 backup. Thank you very much for asking the question, Karl.

13 MS. McCAMMON: And, until we get this issue resolved in
14 the next -- all of the rest of the Eyak negotiations kind of --
15 would take place after this issue gets resolved. Kodiak Island
16 Borough on Shuyak Island, we're trying to get a complete timber
17 appraisal done, and it's our expectation that it close to
18 completion, and we'll probably be done sometime in the next few
19 weeks. Once a value is determined on that, then the offer that
20 Council made was for the appraised value not to exceed \$42 million.
21 So, once the value is determined, then the offer will be made for
22 that amount, assuming it does go over \$42 million.

23 MR. ANDREWS: Pardon me, that will be fee simple?

24 MR. McCAMMON: Yes. Shuyak is fee simple. Port Graham
25 is -- I think at the last meeting, I can't remember if we had had
26 a meeting with Port Graham before or after the last meeting of the

1 Public Advisory Group, but a team for -- part of the negotiating
2 team did meet with the community at Port Graham in Port Graham, and
3 since that time they have requested an additional meeting to more
4 fully discuss some of the options that would be available, ranging
5 from a conservation easement to the aquisition -- fee acquisition.
6 It looks like we'll be having additional meetings with them in the
7 future. On -- and then I think the last -- the last one is
8 Tatitlek, and in Tatitlek we are scheduling the timber appraisal
9 for Tatitlek lands in the next month, and it's hopeful that once
10 that work is done that we'll go into serious negotiations, probably
11 in late summer, early fall. So, that is the status of the large
12 parcel negotiations. Does anyone -- Chuck?

13 MR. TOTEMOFF: Yeah. I think I'm the only that can speak
14 to with any intelligence here is the Chenega transaction. You
15 know, all of the players here are pretty much keeping their cards
16 pretty close to their chest, and -- but as far as Chenega goes, you
17 know, for the last couple of months there seems to have been lull
18 in negotiations here. There's been some miscommunication between
19 the negotiators and the appraisers on the federal and state side,
20 and I'm wondering if they've gotten that resolved or -- because we
21 haven't had a meeting here in about a month -- almost a month.

22 MS. MCCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that
23 the attorney is gone for another week on vacation, and if there is
24 some information back after that, and what I've been told yesterday
25 from the negotiators that they thought that there was
26 (indiscernible) ...

1 MR. TOTEMOFF: Yeah, even before he went on vacation, we
2 were waiting for some information to come back from your side, and
3 we're still waiting for that.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Chuck, I'll check on that because that's
5 not the report I got yesterday, but I'll check on that.

6 MR. TOTEMOFF: Well ...

7 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. I appreciate hearing that because
8 it sounds like there is some miscommunication if this is what
9 (indiscernible).

10 MR. McCORKLE: Was there another question for Molly
11 before we continue. Yes, Chip.

12 MR. DENNERLEIN: Molly, what's the status, if you can
13 tell me on the -- the relationship or possible relationship between
14 the Tatitlek negotiations and the mental health track lands?

15 MS. McCAMMON: Tatitlek Corporation had sold timber
16 interests in Landlock Bay and Bolder Bay. The Village Council has
17 requested that the Trustee Council buy those timber interests. The
18 company that owns the timber interest now Citicorp Corporation is
19 -- has expressed interest in exchanging those timber interests for
20 timber interests elsewhere, in particular at Cape Yakutaga on
21 Mental Health Trust Lands -- lands that they own there, and we have
22 been discussing this with the Lands Director for the Mental Health
23 Trust Authority. It was brought up before their board yesterday as
24 an issue, and the board basically gave the go-ahead to continue
25 discussions.

26 MR. ZERBETZ: Question, Mr. Chairman.

1 MR. McCORKLE: Yes.

2 MR. ZERBETZ: I'd like to ask Molly the name again of
3 the private ...

4 MS. McCAMMON: Citicorp.

5 MR. ZERBETZ: City?

6 MS. McCAMMON: Corp.

7 MR. ZERBETZ: Thank you.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Anything else, Chip?

9 MR. DENNERLEIN: Well, I have one question on this,
10 these are -- I assume that we would look at the issues that are
11 raised, that this could be a very creative approach. The questions
12 would be we'd look at habitat. I mean, in deals like this, whether
13 they are acquiring habitat -- if the mental health trust lands are
14 lands that would be cut anyway -- or economically (indiscernible),
15 then that -- that might be a very good approach. If it's just
16 switching around a checkerboard, it could be a lot of time and
17 money for we don't -- a zero net in terms of habitat protection,
18 would be one, and secondly, how -- have you confronted the issue of
19 mobilization costs, change -- I mean I assume the company is going
20 to say, but we're here now and, you know, a greater -- what I'm
21 trying to get at is probably greater than value for value. They're
22 going to want to be paid for inconvenience, and I'm curious as to
23 how that works in formulas -- can -- can the Trustee Council
24 approach that question.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I think those are all issues
26 that will be brought up in the discussion, and I know certainly the

1 whole issue of mobilization is -- is a definite issue. And, I
2 don't the Council, in a sense, I wouldn't mind some response and
3 feedbacks back on this idea, because it certainly would not be the
4 Council's intention to exchange -- to protect habitat in Prince
5 William Sound and then to basically go elsewhere outside of Prince
6 William Sound, in this case. But, as it's our understanding that
7 Mental Health Trust Lands, those lands there are slated for
8 logging, they will be logged, they were selected by the Trust
9 Authority for their economic potentials, and that is I understood
10 that they will be logged. The question is who logs them and who
11 gets that -- the benefits from that. And, that's one of the
12 reasons the Council is looking at that area, but if you have
13 knowledge otherwise, or feelings otherwise, we'd certainly like to
14 hear it.

15 MR. McCORKLE: Pamela, before we recognize you, could I
16 say -- the topic that Molly has been reported is the status of
17 habitat protection activities. Do you mind taking a few specific
18 questions on that before moving on, or would you -- what would you
19 like?

20 MS. McCAMMON: No, that's fine.

21 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, so Pamela you'd be next.

22 MS. BRODIE: This is continuing on what Chip and Molly
23 were saying. I agree with Chip that this is a creative approach,
24 and it's a good idea. I've look a little at these lands, and they
25 are going to be logged anyway, and they are surrounded by clear
26 cuts or adjacent to clear cuts. I am confused though because I had

1 thought this was going to be a possible trade with Chugach Alaska
2 Corporation. I didn't know it was Tatitlek, or is that another
3 possibility? You didn't mention Chugach Alaska Corporation in your
4 report.

5 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, we have -- we contacted
6 Chugach Corporation about -- they were contacted early on in the
7 process and basically informed us that they weren't interested in
8 selling any interest in their lands, primarily because of the 7(i)
9 provisions, and we re-contacted them in March, received a response
10 in April that said once again we're not interested in selling
11 interest in our lands, but we may be interested possibly in some
12 form of land exchange or -- some form -- exchange. They are
13 primarily interested, I believe, in an exchange dealing with the
14 subsurface estate that they own underneath various lands owned by
15 the village corporation. But, we have been in touch with them also
16 and are under discussion with them about some possibility with the
17 Mental Health Trust Lands also. The Tatitlek lands are slated for
18 logging in the next year, and -- so, we've had some discussion, and
19 they -- the corporation seems more motivated at this time, so, you
20 know, in terms of priority, we're trying to reach some kind of
21 conclusion pretty quickly; it seems they both want products in
22 Tatitlek (indiscernible), but we are having discussions with
23 Chugach also.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Do you want to follow Pam?

25 MS. BRODIE: On another area, with Koniag, you
26 mentioned that the negotiations on the first half of the Koniag

1 deal are coming towards completion, you didn't mention the Karluk-
2 Sturgeon River area. Is there any movement at all on that or is
3 that (indiscernible - simultaneous talking).

4 MS. McCAMMON: There hasn't been any movement on that,
5 and in fact, trying to -- I think, it will take some tasks -- there
6 are a lot of issues that remain in spite of the fact that the
7 Council's resolution in November had a lot of the details in it,
8 there's still a lot of smaller details relating to the actual
9 purchase agreement that will be worked out of Koniag. Even just
10 the first deal -- getting to the first deal we're still a ways away
11 from that.

12 MS. BRODIE: With Karluk it's twice as many problems,
13 isn't it?

14 MS. McCAMMON: (Indiscernible).

15 MR. McCORKLE: One last question from Chip, then Kim.

16 MR. DENNERLEIN: This -- if I can follow up and at
17 least offer final guidance, but comments on this question of the
18 mental health, I think I'd like to suggest on the record, and I
19 don't know how my colleagues feel, but at least three issues to
20 look for. One, is the question of -- that is often -- it's
21 legitimately approached in environmental reviews in any number of
22 categories which is the but-for question, and that is if -- you
23 know, you're reviewing a land action and you might review a road
24 because but-for the construction of the road, this activity never
25 would happen. It's a linkage that has been standardly -- it's
26 recognized in environmental review, in courts, and everything else.

1 I think -- so the first point would be to clear that in any kind of
2 creative exchanges, that we don't trigger a habitat -- in case of
3 timber -- we don't trigger it cut or a practice or, in this case,
4 degradation of habitat that would -- would not have happened but-
5 for an action that the Council took for a different purpose,
6 somewhere else. The second is one of timber practices. The
7 standards for the harvest of public and private timber in Alaska
8 are different. State Forest Practices Act has a different set of
9 standards, and I would not want to see the Council downgrade the
10 harvest practice of any area without that being a factor in
11 compensation in the first place, and secondly, I'd be leery of it
12 period because I -- I'm not opposing timber harvest, but I think
13 that -- that the practices is -- are what the Council should be
14 mindful of, keeping in place anywhere there's timber in coastal
15 Alaska. And, finally my third point would be that that these items
16 should be probably set forth in whatever directives, letters, best
17 interest finding, record of decision, that is clear that we -- we
18 took a creative approach and that it is in the case of but-for this
19 action -- timber wouldn't have been harvested. I think in the
20 place of the mental health lands, this probably is a very
21 productive discussion. The Trust people capitalized -- we could
22 protect timber in Prince William Sound, we could put timber
23 supplies to use which is going to be ultimately used and was
24 selected for that purpose. There's a lot of -- you know, there's
25 been a lot of opportunity to hit a bunch public policy targets, if
26 people are a little bit creative in this kind of an approach, and

1 so, I -- I encourage that, but these are a couple of the factors
2 that I would think about as I pose this to you as an example and
3 any other deals like it.

4 MR. McCORKLE: Could I ask you, would you resummarize
5 your third point, Chip.

6 MR. DENNERLEIN: The third one, Mr. Chairman, was
7 simply that I think it would be a good practice to set this out in
8 writing, that a director finding, that interest finding, record of
9 decision, whatever tool we use, that would say we -- we considered
10 this sort of creative process and we looked at the question that
11 but-for this we -- other timber wouldn't have harvested, so that
12 it's clear as a matter of precedent, and I say this -- just because
13 of Molly's first comment, which is that we are sort of inventing a
14 response to oil spill, and science, and acquisition as we go along,
15 and so that documenting these kind of purchase in writing so we can
16 look at it in the future, as well as today, is a good practice.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you.

18 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I -- those are points are
19 very well taken, I really appreciate that Chip, and I think not
20 only is the Trustee Council inventing grounds, but I think also the
21 Mental Health Trust actually has been inventing ground because
22 there is also a question about whether they are subject to private
23 or public standards in terms of their (indiscernible) practices
24 because they do have a trust responsibility to maximize profits --
25 for their funds in trust. So, there's some questions there.

26 MR. McCORKLE: Kim, did you want to ask a question before

1 we move on?

2 MS. BRODIE: I think my question has -- is on an issue
3 that you raised earlier, when you were in Cordova and you had gone
4 to look at lands, you mentioned that you went to look at Chugach
5 lands, could you tell me where those were (indiscernible -
6 simultaneous talking)

7 MS. McCAMMON: On Montague Island, we just flew over
8 Montague and then -- and on LaTouche.

9 MS. BRODIE: Were you looking at maybe exchanging some
10 of those, or ...

11 MS. McCAMMON: Possibly. We just wanted to see what the
12 lands looked like from the air.

13 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you very much, I think we should
14 continue on, Molly, with the rest of your report. We'll come back
15 to questions at the end.

16 MS. McCAMMON: Okay, the second part of the habitat
17 program is small parcels, and at the June 1st meeting, the Council
18 took action on eight additional parcels that were -- nominations
19 were received during the phase two portion, and these eight were
20 designated as parcels meriting special attention. I believe five
21 of them are Kenai parcels, Lower Point, the Anderson property,
22 Cooper property, Gurgus (ph) property and Ninilchek River, one of
23 them is Jack Bay near Valdez, one is Horse Shoe Bay in Prince
24 William Sound, and then the eighth one is Fleming Spit. And so,
25 with those eight parcels and the original parcels that the Council
26 had designated to go forward for further consideration, we now have

1 a total of 28 parcels that are under consideration, and these are
2 in various stages of appraisals, hazardous material surveys and
3 various (indiscernible) and it is hoped, it's very optimistic, but
4 it is hoped that we can come back and late August and have
5 something to take to the Council on these at that time. At the
6 last meeting there was a request to provide some information on
7 subsistence easements. I didn't prepare anything specifically on
8 that, but I did want to note -- make note that in the large parcels
9 there -- there is a lot of discussion with the landowners about
10 subsistence use of these lands, and in some of these areas the
11 kinds of things that are being looked are designating certain areas
12 as special subsistence areas, and in those areas not having public
13 access because they're very high value subsistence areas. Of
14 course, in all the lands there, subsistence rights are still --
15 still protected.

16 MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Chairman.

17 MR. MCCORKLE: Yes, Rupert.

18 MR. ANDREWS: Would you kind of clarify that for me a
19 little bit. We're talking about coastal lands?

20 MS. MCCAMMON: Some of them, yes.

21 MR. ANDREWS: Intertidal lands?

22 MS. MCCAMMON: Yes -- well, the intertidal -- the
23 intertidal area would be the above area -- the land that was
24 privately owned.

25 MR. ANDREWS: So, the access would be restricted, you
26 know, the mean high water line?

1 MR. McCAMMON: Correct, in some -- in some areas. Most
2 negotiations it is not across the board, it's in selected area, in
3 a high value for subsistence. And, these are in areas where the
4 Council is not acquiring fee opposition.

5 MR. McCORKLE: Follow up Rupert?

6 MR. ANDREWS: We using public funds and public access,
7 and I just there may be a legal question on that one.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, this has been reviewed by
9 all of the attorneys, and what we're using public funds is to
10 protect habitat, that is the primary purpose of the use of public
11 funds, and with the purchase of a conservation easement, the goal
12 is the protection of the habitat, the primary goal is not to
13 provide access - public access. In the majority -- the vast
14 majority of the areas, public access is provided. It's only in a
15 very few areas that public access is restricted for certain
16 purposes. In some cases it would be to non-commercial types of
17 activities. In some areas it would be restricted, and allowed by
18 permit by the landowner, but this has been reviewed by all of the
19 attorneys.

20 MR. ANDREWS: Could I ask a follow up on that, do I
21 understand then that in a few limited cases public funds are being
22 used to restrict private access.

23 MS. McCAMMON: Funds are not being used to restrict
24 private access. Funds are being used to protect habitat.

25 MR. ANDREWS: Okay. Thank you.

26 MS. McCAMMON: And, in some cases ...

1 MR. McCORKLE: She says she's unaware of any yet, but
2 (laughter).

3 MS. McCAMMON: And, in some cases public access is a --
4 is not one of the additional provisions that's being purchased
5 because it's not being offered for sale by the landowner.

6 MR. McCORKLE: Kim, then Karl.

7 MS. BENTON: We had a working group to talk about some
8 of those issues (indiscernible), but one of the ways that it helped
9 me understand it is, restricting public access was necessary to
10 protect a damaged resource -- an injured resource, and is
11 necessary, and in certain circumstances subsistence was damaged by
12 this failure to allow public access or public use would further
13 that damage rather than restore the resource that was injured, and
14 that's the way I've kind of reconciled it my mind why in certain
15 areas public access hasn't really been restricted. It could not
16 further damage a resource -- habitat, or a species, or a people.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Karl Becker.

18 MR. BECKER: Subsistence use, how is that defined? Is
19 that -- are subsistence users the users that are currently
20 considered under the federal regulations, i.e. rural residence?

21 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, it depends on whether we're
22 talking about private land, federal land or state land, and the
23 rules apply depending on what the land ownership is.

24 MR. McCORKLE: That is, too -- pretty much written down
25 in (indiscernible) -- isn't it, do we -- that's there for us to dig

1 out.

2 MS. McCAMMON: If it's on state lands, all state
3 residence are eligible as subsistence users, but the federal lands
4 then the rural residence have a priority, subsistence users have a
5 priority. The private lands, it's whoever the private landowner
6 wishes to have on their lands.

7 MR. McCORKLE: Follow up? Yeah, Chip.

8 MR. DENNERLEIN: I have a follow up and you may have
9 confronted this question, I just don't know, but settlement monies
10 come to state and federal Trustees, they're required six votes, so
11 the money is technically federal or state money, or mix, it's
12 payment to a Council, is that correct? The question is that
13 somebody buys a piece of land to protect habitat and then it is
14 going to become state land or federal land. That's -- that's the
15 question I was curious to whether you'd look at that.

16 MR. McCORKLE: What is the question?

17 MR. DENNERLEIN: Okay, the question is, does somebody
18 decide -- okay, if somebody decides that we buy Kodiak Island, if
19 it becomes Kodiak Refuge, it's under one set of rules; if it
20 becomes U.S. state park, it's under another set of rules, and the
21 funds are both state and federal, and the rules governing
22 management, as you just said, are not the same, so how does that --
23 I'm just curious how that works. If your -- your Council has
24 looked that over and said yes where the state and federal co-
25 mingled funds and we bought this, and then somebody in the Council
26 recommends it be a federal public land refuge, or state piece of

1 land is suddenly the rules for use will be different.

2 MR. McCORKLE: Have you got enough to help us?

3 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, in most cases what the
4 Council has said is that the land -- the eventually land's owner
5 should be the agency that makes the most sense, and in most cases
6 it's pretty obvious. If you're buying a big in-holding within the
7 Kodiak Wildlife Refuge, it makes sense that it be part of the
8 wildlife refuge system. If it's -- if it's a big in-holding within
9 Forest Service it makes sense that it's a Forest Service. There
10 are a few conflicts between -- or differences between the state and
11 federal agencies. There's still a lot of discussion over Jackpot
12 Bay and Eschamy Bay, part of Chenega lands. They're some of the
13 small parcels. There's a little bit of discussion going on as to
14 which one is more appropriate, but, for the most part it's fairly
15 obvious, pretty obvious. What Department of Justice has put into
16 these agreements and this has taken a lot of -- this is why -- what
17 took Akhiok-Kaguyak and Old Harbor lands so long, was this issue of
18 enforcement -- right to enforce, and because we do have this
19 participation of the state and federal sides together like this,
20 the Koniag -- and the Koniag lands, the state -- there is a
21 provision in those purchase agreements that if the federal agencies
22 are not managing that those lands for the purposes for which they
23 are purchased, and that's all detailed in a purchase agreement, the
24 state has a right to enforce against that and to actually take over
25 those lands. In fact, first -- if there are certain state
26 acquisitions, the federal government has the right to go in and

1 enforce action against the state, and so this is kind of a check
2 and balance with each other to protect -- to ensure that those
3 lands are managed for the purposes for which they are being
4 purchased. In addition, some of the language on subsistence,
5 people want it to be -- assured that even if something happens to
6 title under ANILCA that subsistence uses were still protected on
7 those lands, and so there is language in a purchase agreement to
8 that effect.

9 MR. McCORKLE: Martha, did you have a question?

10 MS. VLASOFF: Yeah, it pretty much goes back to the
11 issues that are brought up about the conservation easements, and
12 like -- I know for sure that -- that Bligh Island is one of the --
13 the parcels, and it's traditional that -- that only Native people
14 hunt on that island. I mean, there's a few exceptions, but it's by
15 permission only, and the traditional hunting grounds of the people
16 of this region are most at risk. It's not reconciliation of why
17 this is should be done or anything like that, it's a -- it's a
18 negotiation -- question of negotiations with the people that have
19 used this land for thousands of years. So, it's -- I don't see it
20 as a reconciliation, you know, to try to figure why this is
21 happening, it's just so important to the people that have lived off
22 the land out there for all of these -- these years, and it's a part
23 of the negotiations -- it's -- as far as I'm concerned, and I think
24 it's -- it just needs to be looked at so carefully that -- you
25 know, the questions that I raised before at the April meeting, you
26 know, are the subsistence rights going to be assured and -- and not

1 -- not end up in the -- in the hands of, or decision-making of
2 another entity that doesn't understand our way of life. So, it's
3 kind of a scary thing, you know, to me anyways, and I know to a lot
4 of people that live out in the village. I've heard comments that
5 Bligh Island is practically a sacred place to us, you know, and
6 it's -- it's a very scary thing to -- to think about ever losing
7 subsistence rights to that -- that property.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Martha. Will you continue.

9 MS. McCAMMON: Yes. Let's see, going onto the next --
10 there are a couple of administrative things that I wanted to bring
11 to your attention. One is a copy of the most recent financial
12 report, as of April 30th, 1995, and this goes through -- it's a
13 three-pager here -- the various states of our current count. We
14 are developing right now a request for proposals to go out in July
15 to have an audit done on the Trustee Council. We hope to have the
16 contract let on that audit in late summer, early September, with a
17 report back from it sometime in the winter or spring, so that is
18 underway. We're also in the process of developing our
19 administrative budget, and if you -- at the last meeting Vern
20 McCorkle and John French volunteered to provide some assistance
21 with that, and when we get -- get it -- a draft developed in the
22 next week, we'll be sending that around, but, pretty much we're
23 committed to reducing the administrative budget this year by -- as
24 close to a million dollars as we can. And, we are very -- looking
25 very closely at all of the agency costs, at our cost here, in an
26 effort of being as efficient, yet still being very responsive to

1 public needs and concerns as possible. And, I will be getting that
2 budget out.

3 On the issue of the phone cards, in the review that we did
4 internally here, the idea of phone debit cards was not received
5 very well by the accounting people. They're still looking at the
6 possibility of doing a reimbursement, of having people submit phone
7 calls -- phone bills and then having the calls reimbursed. But we
8 are in the process of transitioning between Department of
9 Environmental Conservation doing our contracting work and the
10 Department of Fish and Game, and they'll both have different
11 people, and they'll have slightly different rules. And, so that's
12 still being -- we're trying to get that reviewed now by Fish and
13 Game. So, that is still underway.

14 The other items that I briefly wanted to report on was the
15 Alaska Sea Life Center ground-breaking, and I know that some of you
16 were able to attend that event in May, and I did find some more
17 information about it, Gordon, there were -- unfortunately, some
18 people had some very bad experiences there, and problems getting on
19 the boat for the lunch and problems with their -- RSVP not having
20 been received and accounted for. Apparently, over 3,000
21 invitations were sent out, and I wasn't aware of this until
22 yesterday, there were two levels of invitations that were sent out.
23 One level was watching the ceremony, the train ride, free
24 breakfast, and that went out to about 2,000 people, and little over
25 1,000 people were -- the train ride, the ceremony, the breakfast,
26 plus lunch aboard the (indiscernible), that had a limited seating

1 capacity. So, there -- there were some problems, definite problems
2 created by this two tier system, and I wasn't even aware that there
3 was two different invitations that had been sent out until
4 yesterday, because -- I still wasn't quite -- was confused as to
5 why there were so many -- we were getting so much feedback on the
6 problems. And, we have to inform, not only Bradley Reed, which was
7 the advertising agency, but handled the logistics for the ceremony,
8 but also the folks on the Alaska Sea Life board itself and talk to
9 all of them and inform them of some of the feedbacks that we had
10 and some of the problems, so -- I think -- in hindsight they bit
11 off maybe more than they could chew at the time, and it might have
12 been a little bit better to have it scaled down a little bit -- a
13 little bit more in control of the invitation list, but -- overall
14 it was again one of those things that it was nice to have a
15 positive ceremony and have something -- there -- there were a lot
16 of people -- there were over 700 people were on the train and on
17 the ship and -- it was an estimate -- except for few problems.

18 The other thing I wanted to report on was in response to Chris
19 Beck's request for a status of what we're doing in terms of
20 information management, and I think I mentioned to you, at one
21 point, when I first came on, a little more than a year and a half
22 ago now, there was -- in this building there was not a list -- one
23 list of all the projects that have been funded by the Trustee
24 Council, and the Trustee Council had been in existence at that time
25 for over two years. Since that time, I think we've really taken
26 great strides in terms of putting together, consolidating the

1 information that we're developing it -- developing here and trying
2 to package it in a way that is more accessible to researchers, to
3 the greater scientific community and hopefully, eventually to the
4 public. What we're doing with that, first of all is, setting up a
5 database -- we'll have a database of all the projects, and where
6 they are in terms of their final report, but we're also expanding
7 that database so that it includes abstracts of each project,
8 contacts with phone numbers and addresses, and we'll have this in
9 place for our all of reports and active projects, and it will be on
10 Internet and available throughout the state, and actually
11 throughout the world. The library Oil Spill Public Information
12 Center has developed a worldwide web-page, and it is getting a
13 number of questions and requests for information as a result of
14 that. We're now in the second phase of information management,
15 which is looking at all of the -- the GIS systems that we have
16 throughout the oil spill research and trying to identify any gaps
17 that may be there, and contacting various members of the public to
18 see what kinds of things that the public sees as unmet needs in
19 terms of GIS mapping needs. And, the Council is holding a special
20 workshop on that in July to really focus on those needs -- that
21 effort. And, the third phase that we'll probably start sometime
22 this winter will be taking the database that we have on all of the
23 reports and projects that the Council has funded in the last few
24 years and going beyond that and doing developing more of a point-
25 and-click, you know, here's a harbor seal playing, what kind of
26 harbor seal, and what do we know about harbor seals now, and try to

1 take you through the various levels of information, and that is
2 something that we see would be available to schools, to libraries,
3 to -- you know, at various visitor facilities and information
4 centers, and things like that. So that we hope to have developed
5 sometime this winter. And, those are the first three phases of the
6 information network that we're developing at this point, and we'll
7 be looking beyond that probably in the -- within this year if not
8 probably beyond that.

9 MR. McCORKLE: Chris, would you like to have follow up
10 question?

11 MR. BECK: Yeah, let me try and think of which of the
12 several that come to mind, I'm going for. The ...

13 MR. McCORKLE: Only the first one is important.

14 MR. BECK: Okay. I think -- I guess I'll limit myself to
15 two, on the academic side, and I talk some with Eric about this,
16 and maybe Eric you can help clarify my memory of our discussion,
17 but what I understood was that there was a set of -- the
18 limitations on the ability to use some of the research as a
19 function of this -- academic status, and whether or not it had gone
20 through a peer review process that allowed it to be distributed in
21 scientific and academic journals, and a certain form -- form, and
22 will sort of formalize the kind of review that in the absence of
23 which it didn't have the same official status that other types of
24 academic research might have, and therefore, it made it less likely
25 to be used, and maybe you can expand on that and just clarify where
26 we are now, Eric, Mr. Chairman.

1 MR. McCORKLE: Eric.

2 MR. MYERS: The question that Chris alludes to
3 concerns the development of what is referred to in the scientific
4 communities as gray literature, and it's utility to researchers.
5 There were reports that the Trustee Council has been obtaining as
6 a result of the various projects that have been funded over the
7 past several years are regarded as gray literature.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Will you define gray literature.

9 MR. MYERS: I will. Inasmuch as they have not been
10 published formally in a peer review journal, such as Fisheries
11 Today or Bird Genetics Today, or whatever it is, there -- and as a
12 -- as a result of that, some researchers will choose not to utilize
13 the reports for purposes of preparing further reports that they
14 could -- that they would perhaps want to cite in a formal document,
15 and so there is -- there is a certain amount of -- I don't know if
16 attention is necessarily the word, but there have been suggestions
17 that the -- that the emphasis should be on the publication --
18 formal publication of findings and results from the Trustee
19 Council's research in the form of journal articles and other kinds
20 of published submissions. The counter to that consideration is
21 that the Trustee Council, of course, needs to get final reports on
22 the work that is funded, and needs to ensure that the full scope of
23 the work that they have funded, all the objectives that are
24 articulated in the detailed project descriptions are accounted for
25 and that a full and -- full sweep of the information that has been
26 generated is captured in a single document. Sometimes the -- some

1 aspects of a project may be of more interest to, say, fisheries
2 journal, and there might be an interesting -- in publishing that
3 particular facet of the report first. I think that we've got is
4 sort of an inevitable situation where we've got a need both to
5 accumulate these -- these final reports which provide an essential
6 and fundamental accountability for the completion of the reports as
7 well as it serves the necessary function of making sure that we do
8 get the information that we've -- we've sought to obtain, while
9 recognizing that there's also an interesting as well as to -- and
10 the Trustee Council has indicated, a strong encouragement of
11 publication within journals as well. The two are not mutually
12 exclusive, and can be complimentary and the Trustee Council has
13 indicated that it does seek to encourage the publication of results
14 in these journals, and I'm not sure if that's fully answered your
15 question or not, but that's the issue that we were sort of
16 struggling with internally.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Chris, anything further?

18 MR. BECK: I have a second question about the public side
19 of it. Maybe we'll talk about (indiscernible - simultaneous
20 talking).

21 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, well, Martha did you raise your
22 hand?

23 MS. VLASOFF: In regards to the final reports and, you
24 know, from Molly's comments, I understand that the Trustees
25 themselves are saying that if the final reports aren't given then
26 they wouldn't fund the projects any further, is that right Molly?

1 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, there is a policy in the
2 restoration plan that actually says past performance on prior work
3 projects will be looked at when you look at whether you should fund
4 future work, and the Trustees have made it very clear to me that
5 they do not want funding to go to principal investigators for a
6 project that they are behind on -- past reports. And in some cases
7 there are legitimate reasons for having delays in the reports, and
8 in some cases there's not, and they have made a very strong message
9 to me that they -- they want the facts reports cleaned up and
10 updated -- with a few exceptions we're pretty much on track.

11 MS. VLASOFF: What I'd like to say is that I think the
12 PAG should be just as -- and come up with a similar edict or
13 whatever to make sure that those reports that are lagging, are you
14 know, penalized somehow and shows that's not a good practice, and
15 that it don't let us understand the picture -- you know, if that's
16 happening, so I think we should be just as strong from the PAG.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Jim King.

18 MR. KING: Well, I'd like to set the -- last year ...

19 MR. McCORKLE: That's old news (laughter).

20 MR. KING: ... and as Bob Spies said that there was
21 a major encouragement to the investigators two years final publish
22 outlets, peer reviewed outlets, and I got the feeling that he felt
23 that the -- you know, the scientific aspect of getting this out
24 where people can use it was being done. A second thought on that
25 is that there have been big projects in Alaska in the past, where
26 they have been wound under several volume publications resulting in

1 others of two volume set on -- on the Bering Sea that the
2 University of Washington published a few years ago, so there's a
3 big book on the Anchitka (ph) studies by, you know, AEC, and it
4 might be that at some point down the road to -- there will be an
5 opportunity, and this should be considered, perhaps to have a
6 formal -- one price publication depository for a lot of this
7 information that may not get into some other formal product.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, there are -- there is a
9 central location here at the Oil Spill Public Information Center of
10 all of the reports. As they get put into final -- into their final
11 whatever you call it ...

12 MR. McCORKLE: Form.

13 MS. McCAMMON: ... by the final form, and actually gets
14 placed here as well as, I believe there are eighteen other sites
15 throughout the site where there will be whole sets of these
16 documents. I think what this also brings up is maybe another level
17 of this discussion of information, which is, there is a formal
18 proceeding that is being developed and will be published out of the
19 papers that were presented at the symposium, but they are pretty
20 much damage assessments type reports, and what we're finding, in
21 terms of this ongoing development of our science program, is a need
22 now from -- synthesis and integration of all of the studies and
23 efforts that are currently underway, and as we go through this
24 review process, our core reviewers are spending more time at
25 looking at -- well, we now have five people who read all of the
26 projects. We have five people who have read all 128 project

1 proposals for FY '96, and they've read FY '95 proposals, and a good
2 number of them read the FY '94 proposals, and they have a good idea
3 of where things have been and where we're going with this program,
4 and are able to provide, I think, a lot greater direction in terms
5 of what are we really finding out about the various ecosystems.
6 One of the major questions actually that we need for management
7 purposes and for solving some of the problems, that continue to
8 present following the oil spill and how to we get to those answers,
9 and I think the idea of having continued focus on calling it all
10 together and trying to really analyze this, and again, what does
11 this all mean, I mean, we don't want just 50 individual reports
12 sitting on a shelf without some idea of what we've got here, and
13 that kind of information and -- I think we'll be focusing on this
14 winter at our annual workshop.

15 MR. McCORKLE: Molly, could I just paraphrase what I
16 think I heard Eric say about these reports, and that is at the
17 present time the state of the art is developed to the point that
18 many reports are not available to researches because they have not
19 had the "seal of approval" by peer review groups or publications.
20 Is that sort of what I'm hearing?

21 MS. McCAMMON: Well, the peer review process that we
22 have, when a report -- a draft report is submitted it goes to our
23 Chief Scientist, and our Chief Scientist has it peer reviewed, and
24 this is done by, for the most part, paid reviewers who have a
25 particular expertise on the subject and provide this kind of
26 analysis. What's happened is that in a number of cases, is that a

1 number of the researchers would rather publish in -- in a
2 professional magazine or a professional journal, which has a much
3 wider distribution early on, but it has a different kind of peer
4 review process than we have, and so we've been trying to make
5 arrangements so we don't say, we can't publish anything until you
6 get our report done. On the other hand, the Council has paid for
7 the report, and we believe that, I mean, this is something the
8 public has paid for.

9 MR. McCORKLE: So, it isn't just strictly independent
10 research?

11 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

12 MR. McCORKLE: Right, okay, that's a good point.

13 MS. McCAMMON: This is something the Council has paid
14 for, so we believe that there should be a priority to getting the
15 Council's report done. On the other hand, we also are very
16 sympathetic and have a lot of support for the idea of getting
17 information out into the greater scientific community, which is
18 done through a professional journal. In some cases, in the past
19 what's happened is that an article has been published in a
20 professional journal that hasn't gone through our peer review
21 process, and our peer review process has resulted in changes, or
22 there is dispute in the interpretation of that data. So, you have
23 one article with the conclusion after saying this, our peer review
24 process is disagreeing with that, this. And, so, there's some
25 potential problems there too, and we're trying to work out ways
26 where people can still publish and have that, but finish our

1 process too.

2 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. Chip.

3 MR. DENNERLEIN: I think I understand -- I understand
4 the question and the answer. What I haven't heard is that -- what
5 I've heard is that you're wrestling with this program -- in this
6 process and you're focusing on you know how to handle it. What I
7 want to know, in a sort of simple answer is that at the end of the
8 -- at the end of the process, that there's no gray reports, that
9 after the public spent one bizillion dollars on science in the oil
10 spill, actually scientist read these reports and use them, and
11 managers use them, I mean, that's what I want to know, and two, is
12 that somebody's academic career is of interest to that person, and
13 maybe even to me, but not as interesting as getting the results for
14 -- the Oil Spill Council, and so, I guess what I want to say is
15 that no -- if I were to put out some markers, nobody publishes
16 their independent reports unless it has been peer reviewed by the
17 Council, or they never work again. (Laughter) That should be my
18 starting point, because I'm not in this to fund somebody's academic
19 career. Secondly, I would say that once peer review is by the
20 Council, if it is a viable or valued and valuable component of
21 ongoing knowledge, we should encourage them to publish those pieces
22 in -- in a scientific journal in the community in which they work,
23 and then, thirdly, at the end of the process, whether it's our peer
24 review, a scientific committee, the editors of these journals we
25 hired to look over everything, that there is a big body of
26 information with a Good Housekeeping scientific seal of approval,

1 and he didn't spend a bizillion dollars for gray reports. Those
2 are the three things I'm interested in.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Eric and then -- Molly.

4 MR. MYERS: I've said enough.

5 MS. McCAMMON: I think -- I think we're right on track
6 with that recommendation, Chip, with the exception that, what the
7 Council has decided is that assuming people are on track with their
8 report, and, you know, it's on-line with the schedule that's been
9 established, that articles can be published in professional
10 journals ahead of time, but they have to have a disclaimer that --
11 that although this money had been funded by the Trustee Council, it
12 is has not been reviewed by the Trustee Council peer review
13 process, and there's some disclaimer language that we've developed.
14 And so ...

15 MR. DENNERLEIN: Why would we do that, if I can say,
16 why would we do that? We paid for this report. Why would we have
17 somebody publish it for their academic credentials when we might
18 even disagree with it? I don't understand that.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Because for -- Mr. Chairman, in a lot of
20 cases the Trustee Council is only providing partial funding, and so
21 ...

22 MR. DENNERLEIN: Okay.

23 MS. McCAMMON: ... what a researcher is doing is taking
24 -- combining something they're doing for the Trustee Council with
25 other work that's being funded by somebody else, and they're going
26 off and doing a separate effort. Stan would you like to add?

1 DR. SENNER: No, you're doing fine.

2 MS. McCAMMON: There are some good reasons for -- our
3 process by the time you do the field work in the summer, analyze
4 the data in the fall, you write the report in the winter, we get a
5 draft in the spring. So, it's a year since the work was done, and
6 then that goes through the peer review process, and the back and
7 forth of the peer review process can take over a year, sometimes
8 two years. I mean, it -- it can be a lengthy process because it's
9 all done by letters and some -- in some of the cases the peer
10 reviewers, some of them have volunteered to do it, so they're doing
11 it voluntarily, they're not getting paid. Those that are getting
12 paid -- and then there is some that -- that are being paid, too, a
13 mix there, but it takes time to do this, and then you get it back
14 to the researcher, then they have to make revisions, send it back
15 again, have it reviewed again, it's back and forth. So, through
16 other efforts there may be -- that they may be working on -- there
17 may be an article that is appropriate to go forward with that kind
18 of an article habitat restoration. Certainly, the Council's
19 priority is getting this report done, completed in the form,
20 available to the public. But, also our other priority is just
21 getting information out, and some of it, I think, that there is
22 legitimate disagreement in some areas over interpretation of data,
23 and in a number of cases of reports that are late, that aren't
24 completed, it's because we're at a basic stalemate between the peer
25 review process and the researcher, and it's not necessarily that
26 somebody's right and somebody's wrong, it's just that there's a

1 disagreement. In some cases they reflect -- a disagreement in the
2 greater scientific community, and what we have to deal with now is
3 just bringing some resolution to those that are outstanding like
4 that. So, even if it goes forward with a disclaimer that nobody
5 could ever agree, or whatever, we're trying to figure that one out.

6 MR. MCCORKLE: Eric.

7 MR. MYERS: Yeah, a simpler example might help. The
8 report that is being prepared for -- marine mammal six, which is
9 damage assessment report, it's actually a compilation of perhaps a
10 dozen or sixteen individual reports having to with, largely sea
11 otters. It involves a whole variety of different aspects of sea
12 otter biology. It's taken many years for that project to
13 ultimately be compiled, reviewed, analyzed as a final report
14 through the Trustee Council's final report, independent peer review
15 process. At the same time, over that period of time, the principal
16 investigators have opportunities to take some particular facet of
17 the information that's been developed during the course of that
18 effort and publish it in some journal. The Trustee Council is
19 interested in seeing those opportunities available to the public --
20 to the principal investigators, but at the same time doesn't want
21 necessarily tie itself to the -- to the results of that peer review
22 process or the conclusions that might be reached in that -- in that
23 journal article, that's -- that's for disclaimer. At the same
24 time, once this great body of information, which captured the
25 universe of all the -- all the information that's been paid for by
26 the Trustee Council, and (indiscernible), we'll have the final

1 report to get to the Trustee Council's independent peer review
2 process. It's a -- you know, it's credible, independent peer
3 review process. Notwithstanding that, that report, when it's
4 finalized will still inevitably be regarded by some researchers as
5 gray literature. It's an -- it's an inescapable matter of the
6 scientific research protocol -- that's not to say that it's invalid
7 or that it's -- you know, that it's not sound science, but that it
8 hasn't been published as part of an independent peer review
9 journal, but other publication is -- is just sort of the inherent
10 nature of the dilemma that we're in, and the Trustee Council is
11 basically trying to, you know, run down the river and navigate the
12 rapids in the most constructive -- constructive manner possible and
13 encourage both independent peer review journal publications, while
14 also insisting upon the publication of a final report which serves
15 a number of purposes, one of which is to insist upon a basic
16 capture of an executive summary and an abstract of two hundred
17 words that can be put on the National Technical Information Service
18 System, and an executive summary that can be then lifted and
19 utilized for the purposes of our database, so that we can review
20 the point and click -- harbor seal -- then we'll have a maximum
21 four page set of information that we know we can fit in that field
22 -- in that database. So, there's multiple objectives that are
23 being searched simultaneously. The fact that these reports may be
24 perceived as gray literature inescapably, I think is -- it enhances
25 the process, it's not necessarily stigmatized these report as
26 unusable. Some people will use them, some people will snub them,

1 but that's just the nature of the beast.

2 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. I'm going to point and clink
3 here on a recess in a few minutes, but I want to seek your account
4 for the vice-chair. There's one or two points that I wanted to
5 follow through on this. Pam, I know you wanted to speak on this,
6 and I think maybe Karl is next, and then we have point two from
7 Chris, and then we have a couple of other things to do as well, so
8 do you want to finish up the points that we have been -- the
9 discussion on Chris's first point, then take a few minute recess,
10 or do you want to do away with Chris altogether (laughter), do
11 point two and then recess. What do you want? We'll finish up
12 point one, take a brief recess and come back for point two -- Chris
13 -- so don't -- we're always doing this to you, you know, leave
14 something for a day (indiscernible).

15 MR. BECK: Wouldn't it make sense just to finish up
16 the topic before recess and then quit, or is that ...

17 MR. McCORKLE: I'm seeing a bunch of nods of head saying
18 no. So, a couple more comments on this -- Chris point number one,
19 Pam and then Karl, and then Jim, and then recess. Okay, here we
20 go, Pam.

21 MS. BRODIE: Gee, but I have so many things to say.

22 MR. McCORKLE: We thought yuo did. (Laughter)

23 MS. BRODIE: I'll be quick. Regarding the gray
24 literature, I -- I don't think, and maybe I'm disagreeing with Chip
25 on this, that we should have real hard and fast rules, I think it
26 should be flexible. I like what I'm hearing from Eric, and the

1 reason is that I think the purpose of the study, one study or
2 another can be somewhat different. As many years as I've been
3 doing this, I have never felt I've had as good a handle as I
4 should on why we do these projects. But, I am figuring that some
5 of them, it's more important, that it in fact usable by the great
6 international world of science, and some others it's more important
7 that it's used in terms of better fisheries management in Prince
8 William Sound or something like that. If it's fish management in
9 Prince William Sound so what if it's gray literature. But, if it's
10 something that's very important for the scientific community and
11 maybe for oil development and control of oil development around the
12 world, well, maybe it's gray literature, maybe it's not really as
13 useful as others. And maybe to what degree the Trustee's can
14 control getting something from gray to white, or whatever the right
15 color is, but I think that -- that case-by-case way of handling it
16 logically in terms of purpose (indiscernible). I want to commend
17 Molly on trying to get administrative costs down, and I think that
18 Jim Ayers was doing a good job of that and I'm glad you're
19 continuing that. Maybe, going from paid peer reviewers to
20 volunteer peer reviewers is one of the ways to get cost down,
21 because from what I've heard, volunteer peer reviewers are
22 something that scientists are expected to do, a lot of academicians
23 are expected to do, and that volunteer peer review is often
24 profitable because peer review isn't (indiscernible).

25 MS. McCAMMON: If I could just respond to that, real
26 quick, Mr. Chairman. In that case, volunteer peer review is

1 preferable, however, it's not as final. It's just (indiscernible)
2 in the process, and often quite substantial. So, there is a trade-
3 off there. The other thing, I think that by developing the
4 database with all of our projects in it, one of things that we can
5 also make available to the greater scientific community is, if
6 somebody is interested in how the fields are -- pink salmon or
7 whatever -- they can see the current work that's been done, and
8 even if a final report hasn't been published, or it is still in the
9 review process, we can find out who has worked on it, what that
10 person's phone number is or their address, and contact that
11 research directly, and make that kind of connection without waiting
12 two years down the road for a final report. I think that will
13 really help get information out too.

14 MR. McCORKLE: Karl, or pardon me, are you continuing?

15 MS. BRODIE: The Sea Life Center, who pays for this
16 (indiscernible)

17 MR. McCORKLE: Oh, you've asked that question?

18 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, almost all of it was
19 donated. It was organized by Bradley Reed, and they did have a
20 contract for communications for public relations, and they got
21 donations from -- for the lunch, for the train ride, for -- the
22 breakfast was donated, a good portion of it was donated.

23 MS. BENTON: I'm not sure about Pam is done, but I used
24 to work with Bradley Reed, and they times are anywhere from \$85 to
25 \$100 an hour, and I counted ten people. So, I'm just curious who
26 funded that portion of it, whether that came from the state money,

1 or ...

2 MS. McCAMMON: They -- they have a contract under the
3 state criminal fund, and ...

4 MS. BENTON: Okay.

5 MS. McCAMMON: ... so, I don't know, it's two or three
6 hundred thousand for it this year. I don't know what they --
7 determined what the exact amount was, but it was kind of
8 (indiscernible).

9 MR. McCORKLE: You still have the floor.

10 MS. BRODIE: One more thing, and that's about
11 reimbursement for phone calls. I've been just the one who has
12 really pushed for that, and all the time I've been saying
13 (indiscernible). I have had an unanticipated change, and I wanted
14 everybody to know that I'm going to be taking a six months leave of
15 absence from the Sierra Club from the end of this month through
16 the end of the calendar year. I will stay on the Public Advisory
17 Board, and I will stay as the environmental rep, I will stay
18 involved in Trustee Council, but working as a volunteer, I won't be
19 paid during this six months period. I will be living in Homer, so
20 if in fact we can get reimbursement, I may in fact want some
21 reimbursement, (indiscernible).

22 MR. McCORKLE: Sorry, you can't change your mind, so we
23 can't let you go. Thank you, any further comments, Pam, before we
24 move down the table. Dave, you're next.

25 MR. BECKER: Karl.

26 MR. McCORKLE: Karl, I'm sorry, I'm not getting these

1 names ...

2 MR. BECKER: Are there -- are there any significant
3 differences between Trustee Council -- the Trustee Council peer
4 review process and the process that would be used by a peer review
5 journal?

6 MS. McCAMMON: They -- to my understanding there's no
7 significant difference. However, who you have reviewing it could
8 be different. For example, there's a number of the report and
9 projects that we have, especially early in the damage assessment
10 involved the influence of oil -- the impact of oil. A lot of our
11 reports gets reviewed by folks who are specialists in hydrocarbon
12 analysis, and oil toxicology and things of that nature, in addition
13 to specialists in fisheries and marine mammals. And, if your were
14 submit a journal to the American Fisheries Society on the influence
15 of oil on the pink salmon genetics or whatever, maybe they would
16 only have it reviewed by a pink salmon specialist, and not someone
17 who had the kind of oil (indiscernible). So, who you have review
18 it, could vary.

19 MR. BECKER: So, this -- this ...

20 MS. McCAMMON: Actually, I'm going to ask Stan Senner,
21 the Science Coordinator of the Trustee Council to step in here and
22 add to the (indiscernible). We've had a couple of issues more
23 recently.

24 DR. SENNER: Just a couple of quick responses to that.
25 The basic process involved for peer review in submissions to a
26 journal versus the Trustee Council is basically their analogous,

1 very, very similar, but there are few differences. One, Molly
2 alluded to is the issue of timeliness, and we will often request a
3 turn around on a review in, say, forty-eight hours, and typically
4 when you get a journal manuscript submitted to you as a scientist,
5 you get a month to six weeks, sometimes even more than that,
6 depending on the journal and the complexity of the manuscript.
7 But, we ask for a fast turn around and believe that you do have to
8 pay to get that. Two, is that when you as a scientist are invited
9 to review a manuscript for the most prestigious journal in your
10 field, that's sort of an honor, and it's something you do as a --
11 as a public service in your, you know, in your scientific
12 community. And, that's -- that's something that you desire to do
13 as a scientist. Typically though, government reports do not get
14 anywhere near that level of peer review. That's one of the
15 problems with government reports, is that -- is that they're not
16 subjected to that kind of review, and therefore, the scientific
17 quality of them is also not so good. We think, in this case, since
18 we don't have the prestige to -- of a highly rated scientific
19 journal to offer, but that is yet another reason that it's
20 important to be able to pay a peer reviewer to peer -- to review a
21 government report. So, in other words, they don't get the same
22 kind of credit in the scientific community for reviewing a report
23 for the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council as they do for a top-of-the-
24 line journal, or to serve on a National Academy of Sciences or NSF
25 review board or something like that, where it's a real feather in
26 your cap to -- to be able to do that. But, the basic process is --

1 in terms of -- you send out a manuscript to one or more reviewers
2 who are experts in their field, you get comments, you go back and
3 forth, you know, that fundamental process is similar for both the
4 journal and the Trustee Council.

5 MR. BECKER: What about the forty-eight hours versus
6 the four of six weeks, providing that forty hours is paid for,
7 results in -- an equivalent of decree of scrutiny?

8 DR. SENNER: Well, yes, in general, and I -- I will say
9 that forty-eight hours is the routine. We do like get more time
10 than that, but on the other hand when you are paying someone, and
11 you do have a short time frame, you can insist on it -- a rapid
12 turn-around. But, we do think we do get good peer review. I have
13 served for this Council as a peer reviewer, and I've also reviewed
14 lots of journal manuscripts, and I know how those go. You put them
15 in your brief case, and you -- you take a look for half an hour
16 after you get the kids to bed kind of thing, and it stretches on
17 over a month's time, and maybe you get your comments back in a
18 timely way and maybe not. When you're paid to do it, you take a
19 block of two or three hours, or whatever it is, it takes, and you
20 sit down and you do it, and then it becomes a job to you, and I
21 actually think you get a very credible review that way.

22 MR. McCORKLE: Karl.

23 MR. BECKER: So, I guess this concern about this gray
24 literature may be one more -- kind of a traditional practice versus
25 actual substance in terms of a final result. So, I guess I would
26 say that that being this situation is, one, if it's recognized in

1 the research community, plus it shouldn't arise as a significant
2 impediment to what -- to the review process as it is ongoing among
3 the Trustee Council, I think it is what we are looking for, results
4 that can be used to mold ongoing research, as a kind of feedback
5 loop, and time is of essence in that situation, and the academic
6 aspiration of the researchers should be considered secondary. I
7 don't think that hearing what I have now, that I am as concerned
8 about gray literature as I was at the beginning of this discussion,
9 indeed it does seem that there is a good quality control on the
10 products put out by the Trustee Council.

11 DR. SENNER: I'll only add to that, that the ultimate
12 goal is to have both a -- a properly reviewed report in our system
13 here, and published literature. If there's a project that never
14 gets beyond the government report and doesn't get out into the open
15 literature, that will not have been money as well spent as if it
16 gets out there for the public, because in the end, what is truly
17 accessible to the widest array of users world-wide is going to be
18 the -- the peer review scientific literature, not a government
19 report. So, we need to do both. I'm only aware of right now two
20 instances where we actually have publications that are out there
21 that have kind of gotten ahead of the reports for approval --
22 approval process, and where there's really some actual conflict in
23 terms of the conclusions drawn, and we're going to have some of
24 those, there's no doubt, but as long as we're only talking one or
25 two at a time kind of thing, we just have to deal with it
26 individually, and I don't see a reason to restructure the whole

1 protocol just to make sure that doesn't happen again, because it's
2 not that big of a deal.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, very much. We will be taking
4 a recess in a couple of minutes. I think this has been a very
5 productive discussion. The PAG has been talking since we sat down
6 about trying to get the research data out into the world where it
7 could be used. We all have recognized the fact that it does very
8 little good to send out the data which is inclusive perhaps,
9 reached a conclusion before the duty was done, so to speak. By the
10 same token, anybody who publishes a report based upon gray data
11 does so at his own peril, not ours. So, I think it's important
12 that we still stick with our guns of the past, and that is to do
13 everything we can to encourage that this process not become just a
14 traditional mishmash, and wheels just turn for the sake of turning,
15 but at the end of the day, we do get something out that people can
16 use either in mid-course and it says so, or we move it along
17 quickly so that these reports don't just gather up dust, and I
18 certainly want to thank Molly for helping us point out the fact
19 that that is the goal that everybody has. We'll have one more
20 comment on Karl's point one, and then we'll recess until 11:00.
21 Was there one more -- I mean, Chris's comment.

22 MS. McCAMMON: Could I just call your attention up before
23 you take a break, because you might want to look at it during the
24 break, we're sponsoring a training session in September called the
25 Systematic Development of (discernible), this is the Bleiker
26 process if anyone else has ever never heard of it. You might have

1 been offered -- even Bleiker-ized or not, and I would encourage PAG
2 members, if you have the opportunity to take advantage of this, and
3 just sign up. It's fairly expensive, and it's not something that
4 would be covered under the PAG budget, but if you have the time,
5 opportunity, inclination, I think this would be something that
6 would be very valuable, and it's at (indiscernible) building, and
7 how to achieve getting to (indiscernible). But, it's up to you
8 guys.

9 MR. BECKER: Is that the (indiscernible) what I pay
10 them?

11 MS. McCAMMON: Beg your pardon?

12 MR. BECKER: Let me know if you have our bill, right?
13 We'll pay for this ...

14 MS. McCAMMON: No, they're charging anybody -- we're
15 making this available to agency folks, and they have to pay the
16 full price, but it will be paid for.

17 MR. MYERS: This (indiscernible) PAG members are to be
18 individual responsible for paying a fee.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Yes (indiscernible).

20 MR. McCORKLE: On that we'll take ten minute recess.
21 Let's try and get back at 11:02. Thank you very much folks.

22 (Off Record 10:58 a.m.)

23 (On Record 11:02 a.m.)

24 MR. McCORKLE: We're not too far off schedule, but we do
25 need to move right along because we have a great deal of
26 interesting things coming up, including the report from Kim and

1 Martha, whom I'm hoping are ready for your report in a few minutes.
2 Okay, get a bagel, get some coffee, and we'd like to -- like to
3 begin if we could. First, let me -- again say thank you for all
4 coming. I've got to apologize for getting my Chris's, my Karl's,
5 my Dave's, I've got a lot of short names to remember, I've got
6 twenty-one or twenty-two of you guys to remember and I'm struggling
7 to do that with accuracy. I'd like to recognize Jim King to begin
8 with, who got chopped off in the middle of comments that he wanted
9 to make, and then we'll come back and go on to Chris Becker's point
10 two, and then we'll have a report from Martha and Kim, then we'll
11 have an introduction by Bob Loeffler and company, and then it
12 should be about lunch time, so, Mr. King, if you would please.

13 MR. KING: Well, I just going to make a comment,
14 Vern, that -- the peer review process is only part of the finished
15 scientific work, so getting into the far more publishing process,
16 the results of world-wide indexing which the gray literature
17 doesn't get, and so, I think that's a matter of concern. I also
18 wanted to say that, I guess I didn't make it clear, but having
19 discussed this a year ago and again today, that I would like to
20 endorse what I understand the staff and the Council are doing, and
21 I think, there's some compromises have to made, and practical
22 considerations, but, I guess I'm satisfied it's going quite well.

23 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. For those of you who are on
24 the Internet or have a ramp onto it once in awhile, you can click
25 on Alaska, you can click on oil, you can click on Valdez, and the
26 board that comes up is money in Alaska, it's on every university

1 across the world, and if you want a grant, if you've got a project,
2 by golly, you can send your report in and your request into the --
3 to the Valdez Exxon money bag, and -- just thought you ought to --
4 those of you who get a ramp want to look up that because our
5 project is widely disbursed across the world with respect to
6 sources of funds for projects. So, I expect we're going to be, you
7 know, having more of that in the next round here. A lot of people
8 would like to follow this through. So, following through, Chris
9 still has the floor for point two.

10 MR. BECK: Thank you, Vern. I can be fairly quick.
11 I guess I feel that my recurring interest and my role in this group
12 has to do with the -- sort of the longer range legacy of -- all
13 this expenditure, and that doing a good job of public information
14 is one of the places where we can have greatest impact, and I think
15 that the public information process is hierarchial and the way
16 we've been talking about is maybe the first tier of the, you know,
17 a more strict scientific and academic in the research, it goes down
18 below that into a certain agency use, and then final to public use,
19 and it sounds like the efforts underway now to make sure that that
20 first tier is as successful as possible. The point that was made
21 -- across the way -- I'm forgetting the gentleman's name who is --
22 Stan -- whereby that we were ought to shoot for good government
23 report, and then secondly broad -- peer review publications,
24 scientific journals. I think we ought to try to make sure that
25 happens, and then we ought to work our way down the tiers. I
26 personally would like to see something more formal occur, and

1 maybe, it's even -- I might be so bold as to propose a motion here
2 in a second, in order to throw out the idea and see what people
3 think, but there ought be a more explicit program by the staff to
4 manage the dissemination of information coming out of the research
5 that's underway. And, they ought to have those have those three
6 levels, they ought to have the academic/scientific and then the
7 agency, and then the public. Molly said, with regards to the
8 public layer, hopefully and eventually, we'll get onto the public.
9 That leaves me concerned. I think, you know, each of these issues,
10 it sounds like the staff has thought about them. It's not like
11 we're proposing things that no one's thought about. That seems to
12 be almost never the case. But, that maybe some more explicit
13 attention is needed on the means by which this information is made
14 available to people, and so, I guess where I would go is that as a
15 group, I recommend that the PAG take more aggressive responsibility
16 to look over the shoulder of the staff, and to make recommendations
17 on how that occurs. My strongest concern is that as you get
18 further down that hierarchy from the scientific/academic where most
19 of the attentions gone to date, what specific actions are less and
20 less clear, and there's maybe some room for improvement, and that
21 perhaps, therefore, we ought to be more explicit about what exactly
22 is being done, what's the schedule, what's responsibility, where's
23 the money coming from, are there better ways to do it, and so
24 that's -- that's kind of a long comment, but my -- I guess I'd like
25 to ask the other members of the group if this is sufficiently
26 important that we ought to try to take it on, and I'll volunteer to

1 put some time towards it, to try to make a set of more explicit
2 policies for the dissemination of information, so that the most
3 value from all the stuff is harvested.

4 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Eric.

5 MR. MYERS: Mr. Chairman, I -- the number of the
6 project escapes me, perhaps Sandra knows off the top of her head,
7 but there was a project approved last year that's in progress
8 that's an information management project that has been underway,
9 Carol Freis of the Department of Natural Resources is heading it
10 up, that the project grew out of the same kind of interests that
11 we've been discussing here that reflects multiple objectives to try
12 and get information out to different kinds of communities for
13 different kinds of purposes, as a range both from the, you know,
14 the third grader, fourth grade, point-and-click all the way to the
15 -- to the academia and resource managers, and the first step along
16 the way that Carol Freis is working on at this point, is to fully
17 inventory the various reports and the knowledge base that we have
18 presently, either as a result of completed final reports, or as
19 reflected in detailed project descriptions, in the form of a
20 database that would be accessible widely to the general public at
21 large, but more skewed towards, say, the high school, college,
22 undergraduate and upper levels of education, if you will, at this
23 point -- but, basically, the inventory, everything that we've got,
24 according to the systematic database that's accessible to people
25 who can find out from one single source what kind of information is
26 available. Over the -- and the next generation, or the next level

1 of effort will be to take that kind of information and synthesize
2 it and put it into a even more user-friendly format that could get
3 us to, if you will, the point-and-click level. An adjunct -- an
4 aspect of that information project is the GIS or Geographic
5 Information Services workshop that Molly McCammon alluded earlier,
6 as a type of -- specific type of information that the Trustee
7 Council is working with and requires a -- or warrants a work
8 session to try and make sure that we're utilizing the best
9 available information and that we have the best techniques and
10 technologies in hand to perform the things that the Trustee Council
11 is working on. But I -- I think that you're right on track, and I
12 actually think it's appropriate that the PAG take an active
13 interest, in this and that's -- and that's something that Jim Ayers
14 took a very strong interest in and Molly has been preparing for it.

15 MR. MCCORKLE: Thank you very much, Eric, I would just
16 like to say, gosh, that's exciting, to catalog and inventory
17 everything we've done is just brilliant. But, it's the very safe
18 way, too. That's always what we do, is we catalog and inventory
19 and we study and analyze, and I think we should continue to do
20 that. I'm not being sarcastic, here, but I do think we should
21 discuss Chris's topic a bit more too, which begins to talk -- point
22 a little bit more toward the policy, and I think we -- we're
23 getting the cart in front of the horse, or maybe we can both go
24 down the trail at the same time, but I think we should, and maybe
25 not today, but we should discuss policy. What do we think should
26 happen to information, whether it's gray or yellow or white or

1 blanche, and at the same time we've got to have an inventory, but
2 as I understand it, this inventory is going to show us what kind of
3 not-quite-yet-gray material is really not available, yet. So, I
4 think -- I like the idea of what Chris has brought up, and
5 obviously, either of you have spoken, Chip has too, is how we get
6 this data available to people. Maybe, it has to carry, you know,
7 a statement that says, this information is not only not good for
8 your health, but it's not finished yet, and you -- you know, you
9 can look at it, but understand that you use it at your -- at your
10 own peril. So, is there more discussion on this point? Yes, Karl.

11 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I think Chris hit the nail right on
12 the head, that there is this need for a -- if you want -- ongoing
13 dialog between the Trustee Council and the public and resource
14 users in the EVOS area regarding the research and the ultimate
15 restoration process. I was disappointed that one of the projects
16 that has been doing this, Project 96320Z, which is a public
17 information/public involvement project for the SEA program, which
18 has disseminated a newsletter, and has prepared and presented radio
19 spots on the SEA program, I thought was a very meritorious project,
20 but unfortunately didn't get a very high review from the Chief
21 Scientist, and I'd hope that there would be a second look taken at
22 things like this because not only was that a source of information
23 for people on what actually is happening, with this process, but it
24 was also an -- and I think was becoming a very successful way of
25 involving people at the local community level to make these things
26 really something that will work and so that they'll take ownership

1 of this entire thing that we're doing here.

2 MR. McCORKLE: I recognize that we're really are talking
3 about multi-levels here -- two that I really know -- recognize are
4 the ones to which Eric has spoken, and also Stan, and that is the
5 scientific community, that it does have a protocol that must be
6 observed, but we as the PAG are responsible for making sure that
7 our various constituent groups also have some feeling for what's
8 going on, and we've talked a lot in the past about ways to help the
9 public, just the person on the street, know and understand and
10 appreciate what the Trustee Council is going through, what the
11 staff is having to come up with what the PAG contributes, so there
12 at the end of a -- of a given point, there's some realization in
13 the community as to what is going on. We've been at this process
14 now a number of years, and I don't know, but I speculate that if we
15 were to talk to any ten people on the street, we'd be lucky to find
16 one who knows what we're doing, and I'd see -- I would see a great
17 achievement if there were two who knew, and I think that's too bad.
18 For all the hard work that you all put in as PAG members, the
19 Trustee Council themselves, the agencies, and the staff, we need a
20 little more recognition. I'd like to find a popular way to do
21 that, like Chris and Karl have spoken to. Chris.

22 MR. BECK: Maybe a suggestion is that those
23 interested, and I offer my name to that list, find the time between
24 now and the next PAG meeting to meet with appropriate staff people
25 and work out a another piece of paper, a couple -- two page, you
26 know, short summary of exactly where the efforts are today to

1 disseminate information. My own thought that those three layers,
2 sort of academic/scientific agency and then public, and make it as
3 clear as possible what's currently planned, what the schedules are
4 for things that are being proposed that have not actually taken
5 place, bring that back to the group and make it a matter of
6 discussion at our next meeting, and that way it can be disseminated
7 to this group, the description of this program prior to the
8 meeting, people can have a chance to look at it, and we can then
9 maybe have a more fruitful discussion about how we proceed. It
10 sounds like a lot of these things are underway, but I think there
11 are some places where there's some possibilities for improvement.

12 MR. McCORKLE: Well, certainly it's not our policy to
13 turn down volunteers. So, you are hereby named as chairman of that
14 ad hoc group. Are there one or two, three others who would like to
15 volunteer to serve with Chris on that? Would you signify that
16 now? Martha are you saying yes?

17 MS. VLASOFF: Yes.

18 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, Martha will join you. Are there
19 others?

20 MR. BECKER: Yes, I have a -- tentatively I will
21 volunteer depending upon when the next meeting is. If it's
22 sometime after the first of September, I could certainly
23 participate. Between now and then it's almost going to be
24 impossible.

25 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, Karl is doubtful. Any other
26 volunteers. Okay, Gordon. Okay, Gordon. We have three, and

1 Brenda, is that right? (Nods her head yes) Okay, Brenda, you're
2 in Kodiak, but you could participate by phone, right? Okay, so
3 Brenda Schwantes would be willing to work on that, and not that --
4 if you decided now you -- your undecided to now participate, you
5 certainly can join the group, but Chris I'll ask if you would then,
6 before we adjourn tomorrow, sort of maybe come up with a
7 preliminary time to get together if you couldn't clear that with
8 the folks who are willing to go ahead. So, I think that's been a
9 very noteworthy point too. Yes, Chip.

10 MR. DENNERLEIN: I just have a question. Eric, you
11 mentioned the -- in terms of -- I'm sorry -- (indiscernible) in
12 terms of information dissemination. You're going to develop this
13 layer of the whole point-with-the-click type of information, and
14 you reference that it would be available to schools or one of the
15 ways to get information out extraordinarily broadly would be to
16 show case that. Most of the school districts have science fairs.
17 I don't know -- you know, there's a simple way to have that -- have
18 at the annual science fair the opening demonstration of this being
19 available, and I suspect within months, or if not weeks, that the
20 school teachers would be using it and students would be using it to
21 write their science reports. I mean -- and so, I don't -- is there
22 a plan -- this goes along with Chris, but to take things that we're
23 already doing and figure out how to sort of market them when we do
24 good work.

25 MR. McCORKLE: Why don't you make sure that Chris gets
26 that idea. Chris put that down on your agenda, as well as putting

1 down cataloging -- hope I can say -- everything that's in the
2 pipeline now. We know that there's at least one story, there might
3 be a couple, that are approaching this -- this project, or this
4 kind of dissemination of information.

5 MR. MYERS: One clarification, the cataloging
6 inventory which sounds definitely boring, I realize ...

7 MR. McCORKLE: Oh, yes, definitely boring.

8 MR. MYERS: ... is underway presently as part of the
9 information management project that DNR is heading up, is intended
10 to provide fundamentally a database bibliography that can be
11 accessed electronically, so that people can look up all the works
12 that's being done, all the projects being done on the harbor seals.
13 But, basically it will give you an electronic printout of the
14 reports, their findings if they are available, and citations, and
15 who did them, so that if you're in Omaha and you want to know
16 everything there is to know about harbor seals that the Trustee
17 Council has funded, you'll have essentially a bibliography that's
18 accessible that can be down-loaded so that if you wanted to get a
19 copy of the report then you can call OSPIC for it, if you want to
20 talk to Kathy Frost who did the research, you'll know where to find
21 her. The next aeration or generation taking that -- all that
22 information that's in those various reports, and distilling it into
23 some sort of point-and-click kind of an application is something
24 that we -- I'm not sure that we've got a specific time line on
25 right now. We have seen a sort of, kind of a model or prototype
26 demonstration product a while back that was prepared in the

1 context, I think it was San Francisco Bay, where there was a number
2 of environmental issues there, and it was -- I think it was using
3 hypercard, or something where it was a point-and-click kind of
4 thing where you could explore different levels of complexity on
5 different issues. How, soon we'll be able to get to that kind of
6 an end product for purpose of, say, a science fair distribution
7 through the school system is something that remains to be
8 determined. But, the very first step is -- is to gather all of
9 our, you know, all of our factoids about harbor seals or -- or, you
10 know, whatever it is that we want to, and then, in turn, try to
11 display individually or otherwise in a very interactive kind of a
12 engaging computer game-type format possibly.

13 MR. McCORKLE: Do we have any kind of budget that can be
14 put to that, this is not cheap?

15 MS. McCAMMON: (inaudible - no).

16 MR. McCORKLE: Not yet, so that's the first process.

17 MS. McCAMMON: The infamous information mismanagement
18 portion?

19 MR. McCORKLE: Well, the -- the creation of exhibits,
20 things for science fairs, all that kind of stuff. We really don't
21 have anything for that yet, do we?

22 MS. McCAMMON: Not a specific budget has been developed
23 for that, yet.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, so that's -- that's a goal we've got
25 to have -- now, there was a hand up over here, first? Karl.

26 MR. BECKER: What is the possible cost for something

1 like this? Much?

2 MS. McCAMMON: For developing the actual point and click?

3 MR. MYERS: We're dependent entirely on the software
4 system we're trying to use and how complex you're trying to get
5 visually, what kind of -- you know, if you're using complicated
6 graphics with -- that were animated or something like that, I could
7 -- you could spend a lot of money on it. We've seen -- probably
8 you've seen computer -- interactive computer games like -- you
9 know, Sim City or Mystick or some of those which are extremely
10 sophisticated, and I'm sure you could spend as much money as you
11 wanted to. If you do something relatively simply, I think, is what
12 we would try to accomplish first, and I'm not -- I can't give you
13 a budget figure, but, that's what we want to try and -- and head
14 for, is having something that's relatively simple and that can be
15 utilized and run on computers in a wide number of places.

16 MS. McCAMMON: I think we're looking at something -- when
17 we were tossing around budget figures originally, it was somewhere
18 between \$50,000 and \$150,000. It wasn't -- and that's depending to
19 a great deal on existing staff to do kind of the research and text
20 development and things like that. And, if you actually had to go
21 out and hire somebody to read everything and put the text together
22 and develop the knowledge that we already have in hand, then I
23 think it would be a lot more expensive.

24 MR. McCORKLE: The colored data page on just an average
25 information board on the Internet is about \$40,000 for one page.

26 MR. BECKER: Is that what our bills were (indiscernible

1 - simultaneous talking)

2 MS. McCAMMON: We're not spending \$40,000 on our world-
3 wide web page.

4 MR. McCORKLE: I don't know what we're spending here,
5 though I do think ...

6 MS. McCAMMON: We have free access on the Internet
7 through the university.

8 MR. McCORKLE: We should put some -- some discussion into
9 that kind of thing, because that's a good place to put news. But,
10 even going onto the university, through the university, and if
11 you're just going to be a black and white type of page, that's one
12 thing, but that doesn't compete with the rest of the stuff that's
13 probably going to be involved out there. Martha.

14 MS. VLASOFF: Is this public information project through
15 DNR, is that through DNR with Carol Sneed (ph)?

16 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

17 MS. VLASOFF: Is this already, is this a '95 project
18 that's already been funded?

19 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

20 MS. VLASOFF: And, it's ongoing?

21 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

22 MS. VLASOFF: Alright. I just wanted to say that
23 through the language grant that we received, we're doing a similar
24 kind of project, and there's other software besides hypercard,
25 there's -- there's more advanced software. Macromedia has author-
26 wear which includes video and you can incorporate a lot more video

1 into a CD Rom, so there are a lot of different.

2 MR. MYERS: I was not suggesting that there had been
3 a decision to use any particular software.

4 MS. VLASOFF: Right, yeah. So, there's ...

5 MR. McCORKLE: Folks, I don't want to cut this off, but
6 let's not discuss these details. The place to discuss those
7 details will be in the committees and I think with staff, because
8 I think we're on to something good here, and we want to maybe
9 follow that through a bit, but I do think beyond the general
10 policy, we're probably not prepared to productively discuss that.
11 In a couple of minutes we're going to hear a report from Kim and
12 Martha on their attendance at meetings. Is there anything else on
13 Chris's second point? Chris has had to leave us and will be back
14 at 1:00, so we'll take up the official agenda when he returns then,
15 and we'll have our quorum, but anything more before we hear the
16 report from Kim and Martha? Okay, thank you very much. I think
17 we'd like now to -- where did Kim run off to, is she gathering up
18 her data? Martha, where is your cohort?

19 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could just lead off
20 by describing the process that we've been using and how Kim and
21 Martha's participation last week fits into that process and the
22 time line. What we're in the process of doing now, if I could
23 borrow a prop from you. If you'll recall, this document went out
24 in March -- March 24th -- it went out the public for review, and
25 what this -- this is an invitation for FY '96 projects, and it's
26 also a draft long-range restoration program. This was the first

1 attempt to try to foresee into the -- into the foreseeable future
2 -- the efforts that we were undertaking to try to really start
3 looking at when you vote on a project for this year, what does it
4 really mean? What are we really trying to achieve with it, and how
5 long is it really going to take before we get some results and some
6 answers that are useful, and what is the cost attached to that? As
7 a result of that document, we received 128 project proposals on May
8 1st. This counts the SEA project, which has -- I'm not sure how
9 many components SEA has, but it's multi-components, it counts there
10 as one project, and it counts -- it has the apex project as one
11 project and the nearshore vertebrate predator project is one
12 project, and they each have -- those are the three major ecosystem
13 projects, and they have multi-components, but we received 128
14 proposals, totaling requests -- almost \$40 million. Those
15 proposals immediately went to the Chief Scientist and to core peer
16 reviewers. A few of them went to additional specific reviewers
17 with expertise in particular areas. Those -- the core reviewers
18 met the last week of May here in Anchorage, and reviewed them on a
19 whole realm of -- of items. The scientific qualities of the
20 projects, if it was a research or monitoring proposal, it's
21 technical merit, how well it's -- the project worked to achieve the
22 restoration objective, the qualities of the proposer. There were
23 a number of items they looked at. After their review, and they met
24 for four days, they ranked all of the proposals and gave them ones,
25 twos or threes, and the ones were -- these had high priority, two
26 were -- in most cases they had some kind of problem or issue, and

1 threes were pretty much do not fund, low technical merit, or do not
2 fund at this time, maybe next year, or two years down the road, or
3 whatever. The Chief Scientist took the advice of the core
4 reviewers and developed this ranking of one, twos and threes, as
5 well as the narrative recommendation for those proposals. We then
6 gave those to the agency staff, to the coordinating committee which
7 are people who are active in certain specified research circles,
8 such as fisheries, marine mammals, nearshore, archeology, and
9 subsistence. They reviewed them and we met here in Anchorage last
10 week for two days. There were two representatives of the Public
11 Advisory Group, Kim Benton and Martha Vlasoff, who participated in
12 that meeting, and through that effort we developed a preliminary
13 Executive Director's draft recommendation. This is now going
14 through another level of review here, and that's what we'll be
15 discussing in the next day is this draft document that we have. We
16 started with a goal of trying to -- following up with what the
17 Trustees had -- direction they had given me to try to reduce the
18 work plan effort and start scaling it down to that year in 2002
19 when the last payment comes in. And, with that in mind, we were
20 targeting a goal of about \$18 million, for work plan projects,
21 that's research, monitoring and direct restoration. We got fairly
22 close with about \$19.5 million, something like that as the draft
23 recommendation. So, with that I would -- if Kim and Martha want to
24 ...

25 MR. McCORKLE: It's time for Benton and Vlasoff.

26 MS. VLASOFF: I'd like to make some general comments

1 about the whole process. As we were introducing ourselves at this
2 meeting that Molly has just mentioned, she said to go ahead and
3 introduce ourselves and where we're affiliated -- who we're
4 affiliated with and our biases, which is kind of a joke in a way
5 because the people that are sitting around the table there, as
6 Molly said, representing the different groups, the archeology, the
7 natural resources or fish or forestry, actually work for the
8 agencies, and so we do bring in a bias to this process. I believe
9 that the core reviewers, and I want to compliment them that, I
10 don't see that on that level, and I feel really good about that
11 because their recommendations are adhered to, but on the level of
12 all of the -- some of the principal investigators were actually
13 sitting in that room and making comments about their projects, and
14 I'll read to you the comments that I made. The Public Advisory
15 Group were verbalizing their opposition to funding projects with
16 EVOS Trustee's money that were basically a normal operational
17 function of a particular agency, and I don't know how we can
18 determine difference, but this is an issue as the legislature cuts
19 budgets in Juneau, are they doing it because the agencies are
20 seeing having other funding sources. And, that's a real key issue
21 to me that the EVOS Trustee money not be used for funding agency
22 functions that could be done through their own agency. I don't
23 think it's a good use of money and I don't know how you feel on
24 that, but I said it very strongly, and what you do have there
25 within that group is agency people that are making the decisions of
26 how this money is going to be spent. Now, the Public Advisory

1 Group, we do have community projects that we would want to see
2 carried forward, but we don't have that basic need for -- you know,
3 just economic, you know, budget issues, you know, for our different
4 agencies, as this group does. But, so I'd kind of like you to
5 think about that. I think it's a real key issue. As far as the
6 projects, I would really -- I wrote down in my notes that I would
7 really, really like for us -- when I first went to the church
8 meetings, and I first got involved in this whole process, I noticed
9 that the principal investigators were -- were not even willing to
10 share information with each other on the research that they were
11 doing, which is -- I'm not sure where that comes from. I suppose
12 it's an economic kind of issue also, but as -- as we go on with the
13 research and the data collection, like Molly mentioned here before,
14 we need to see an integration of all of these research projects, so
15 that we can see what the total picture is, you know, what -- what
16 it's going to take for restoration of natural resources, which is
17 the -- the main purpose of the settlement. And so, it -- I think
18 that at our work session in the coming year here that we should
19 really take a look at, as Molly said, at -- at how all these --
20 these research projects can be used together to understand that --
21 that main goal. Basically, I see -- see a lot of them just being
22 concerned with their own species, or with their own resource, and
23 I think we should really emphasize to them that -- that less money
24 should be spent on agency budgets and they should concentrate and
25 really give us a clear picture of how inter-related all these --
26 these resources are, and how it relates to the data that they're

1 collecting and the research that their doing. And, I don't know if
2 you want me to go through individual projects, but -- those are my
3 -- my general kind of comments on -- on what I saw at that process.

4 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Martha, those are splendid
5 comments, we appreciate them very much. I think we ought to put
6 aside for just now the specific comments on projects. You'll have
7 a chance to address them more specifically later, but, Kim, do you
8 want to add anything to -- I'm sure you have something you'd like
9 to add.

10 MS. BENTON: The most important thing that -- that the
11 day and a half did for me is it put some faces to the dollars. And,
12 in all the years that we've sat and gone through these works plans
13 and we get to science and my eyes kind of roll back into my head
14 and I just go, oh great, I don't know any of this. It was
15 interesting to be watching and see all the people who care, and
16 there's a lot of hard working people behind these projects, and
17 I've never seen that before, and I wouldn't wish any of you to have
18 to sit there a day and a half, but if you took that away after a
19 day and a half it would well worth it. I feel real comfortable
20 with the recommendations and I saw an awful lot of budget control
21 this year that I think in years, the early years, was missing. A
22 lot of things were looked at, administration was looked real
23 heavily, there are a lot of budget controls. Meeting the FY '96
24 budget parameters meant reducing and delaying a lot of projects,
25 and it made everybody focus on the most important and the most
26 vital projects. I'm real comfortable with how this shook out, and

1 for the first time I feel real good about the science end of -- the
2 big dollar end of this, the projects and this work plan.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Well, thank you for that comment because
4 as you pointed out, we don't all get a chance to go and look in on
5 that, and it's nice to know that somebody that has a critical eye
6 for detail as you do, has been able to -- to cut through to that
7 important point. We -- talk on that for a couple of years here,
8 and also, I think thanks to staff for bringing off that meeting,
9 and I think you can probably thank Molly for making sure it
10 happened in two days rather than four or five. There was one that
11 was -- ran four days last year. So, I think that was pretty great.
12 Is there a sum-up you want to have to that before we go then into
13 the -- the Loeffler-Christman show?

14 MS. BENTON: No.

15 MR. McCORKLE: Martha, you get the last word if you wish.

16 MS. VLASOFF: Go ahead and go.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Okay.

18 MR. BECKER: I just really appreciate the two of you
19 having sat in on that and giving us a real feel for the -- I don't
20 know, is negotiations is the proper term, but the hard decisions
21 that have to be made, and some of the politics behind the making of
22 those decisions. I think that that's something that -- I know the
23 general public doesn't appreciate -- I've been exposed to it in
24 other ways through my relationship with different research projects
25 in the Sound, and I think that's a very well taken point, that we
26 be very concerned about the dollars and the purposes to which they

1 are supposed to be put that this organization is concerned about be
2 kept distinct from what agencies have as their best interest, and
3 it's -- it's not a critique of agencies, they are faced with some
4 terrible constraints these day, and any pot of money is as good as
5 any other pot of money, but that's not our role here. Our role is
6 to be a little more specific than that. So, I really think you've
7 done a great job.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Well, Karl, I'd like to thank you for your
9 comments as well. It is, however, our role to make comments --
10 about specifically that's about all that we're limited to, and
11 we've always been concerned that where agencies have the
12 opportunity to do something which is critical, than something which
13 is just nice to do but they could never fund before, would they not
14 look at EVOS money as the way to do it. So, it's important that we
15 keep bringing this back to the table so that you get your dollars
16 worth here, and that we not just do stuff which is lovely and
17 delightful, but for which we really don't have any other sources
18 except this big pot of gold. Martha.

19 MS. VLASOFF: Well, I'd just like to make one more
20 comment that -- that if you are -- if this is concern which it is
21 to me, I -- at some point I think we need to look at the way those
22 decisions are made then, you know, because if you do have, you
23 know, I hate to be the one that says the Emperor has no clothes,
24 but if you do have the agencies on the Trustees, and then you have
25 the review, the liaison person from the agency, then what if -- you
26 know, what's there -- you know, constraint as far as, you know, how

1 do we make that differentiation between, you know, what is
2 operational and what is basically in the best interest of the
3 research, you know, to restore the natural resources. It needs to
4 be looked at, I think, you know.

5 MR. McCORKLE: We certainly agree. No doubt we'll find
6 a way to continue to be doing that on an ongoing basis. I'd like
7 to consult the group now for some direction. We have two things
8 before us. First of all, we're a little bit late for Bob and
9 Veronica's presentation. We have a little report that we'd like to
10 hear again from Martha on the spirit camp, and we also -- lunch has
11 arrived. So, would you like to have Martha do her little report on
12 the spirit camp, and then break for lunch, or would you like to
13 have Bob and Veronica start and then stop and put Martha on, and
14 then go off to lunch, and then come back for Bob and Veronica, or
15 how would you like us to this. Rupert.

16 MR. ANDREWS: I'd like to hear this report on -- and is
17 it called spirit camp.

18 MR. McCORKLE: Yes.

19 MR. ANDREWS: Yeah, I'd like to hear that report.

20 MR. McCORKLE: Bob and Veronica would you stay for lunch,
21 and if we have the public comment ...?

22 MR. LOEFFLER: I think we're at your leisure.

23 MR. McCORKLE: We have the public forum at 1:00. Does
24 anybody know if there will be people from the public to address us
25 yet? There's no one signed up that I know of. Are you folks going
26 to address the PAG after lunch? (Unidentified people in audience

1 shake heads no.) So, it may very well be that that will be an
2 abbreviated session, and we can begin right away. During the hours
3 of one and two, we're probably obligated to take a brief session if
4 members of the public do show up, so there would be that potential
5 for interruption, but it sounds like what we'd like to do is hear
6 Martha's report, then have the break for lunch and then come back
7 for public session, and then the report. Chip, you were going to
8 ...

9 MR. DENNERLEIN: I was just going say during the
10 public session, I had a discussion with the folks over here, and
11 there is one issue that I just want to bring up.

12 MR. McCORKLE: It's not public session yet.

13 MR. DENNERLEIN: No, I was just saying after -- just
14 so you know in case you say there is nobody here.

15 MR. McCORKLE: But there is, there really is. Okay.

16 MR. DENNERLEIN: And, if they don't speak - choose to
17 speak, I just want to advance one thing that is germane that is a
18 question that they brought to me which I think other people in the
19 public would be interested in.

20 MR. McCORKLE: We'll certainly take time for that. So,
21 with the consensus of the group before us, and Chuck has come back.
22 Chuck, we're so glad to have you here. Hey, you haven't said a
23 word today. You've got to promise to say something today.

24 MR. TOTEMOFF: No, I'm not going to say something unless
25 (indiscernible - laughter)

26 MR. McCORKLE: We got Rupert to say a couple of words

1 here, but right now we'd like to recognize Martha Vlasoff who is
2 going to give us a report on a spirit camp project which is
3 important to her and of very much interest to us.

4 MS. VLASOFF: Well, I guess I could say in the
5 background, for you folks that don't know, this actually started
6 out as a project last year for teaching subsistence practices.
7 Since there -- there is -- there have been gaps in the natural
8 resources that subsistence users can take advantage of, like the
9 herring and salmon to some extent. We thought it was important to
10 teach, you know, to pass on the traditional subsistence gathering
11 information to the youth. So, the Trustees themselves -- evidently
12 it was a legal issue or something that they wouldn't fund this
13 project last year, but we did get the funding from DCRA, from the
14 other settlement. At any rate, I went out last -- this past
15 Saturday and the camp is all set up on Nuchuk (ph) Island, and
16 there is a total of twenty people out there, and it's just one of
17 the best experiences I have ever had. I've heard of other spirit
18 camps around the State of Alaska, but was -- the primary goal is
19 the preservation of our cultural heritage, language, subsistence
20 practices. We have a hunter out there that has been bringing us
21 the seal and the fish, and it's put up in traditional manner, and
22 the young people listen to the elders tell stories of -- of things
23 of importance to the elders to pass on, and it's a real exciting
24 project. This year it's a bit of a pilot project in that we didn't
25 have enough time to actually do a full blown spirit camp where we
26 -- in the old days a fish camp would be established around a salmon

1 stream, and then families would come out, whole families would come
2 out and stay for whatever time it took to put up those foods. And
3 so, this year it's more like, kind of a western way, you know,
4 where we have a cook tent, tents and -- and everything is done, you
5 know, in a western way, but traditional knowledge is being passed
6 on at this camp. And, then next year we will have it more
7 traditional, where whole families from all over, our Chugach
8 region, will be coming to Nuchik next year and we anticipate a real
9 exciting time out there where people can all gather together and
10 revitalize our culture in that traditional way. So, I've got a
11 glowing report, it's absolutely fabulous out there, and I have
12 invited Molly to come out for the -- for the pilot session which is
13 July 6th through the 8th, and I'd like to extend the invitation to
14 the PAG. You know, I'm not sure as far as how able you are to come
15 out there, but, you know, I'd just like to invite you anyways to
16 come and see what's going on there, it's very exciting.

17 MR. MCCORKLE: Well, thank you for that report. Would
18 anybody like to have a follow up question?

19 MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Chairman, just a clarification. I'm
20 from Southeast and we have Tlingit and Haida and Tsipsian (ph),
21 what groups are involved here?

22 MS. VLASOFF: Well, that's interesting because this site
23 was a Russian fort in the old days where the -- where the Russians
24 had set up a trading post there, and all the tribes came to there
25 to sell their pelts and to buy western kinds of products. And,
26 it's very interesting because we have all the Native groups

1 represented in our regions, there's Yupiat people living in Seward,
2 there's Eyak people in Cordova, there's Tlingit people that live in
3 all of our area, and then there's -- the main group is Supiaq, and
4 that's -- what -- down in Kodiak they call Alutiiq, so, it's a
5 multi-cultural experience. We have all those -- those different
6 Native races represented at the Nuchik Spirit Camp, and we're all
7 sharing information about how, you know, like we were talking the
8 other day about smoking fish, and then, how does a Yupiat person
9 smoke fish, how does the Athabascan person, you know, smoke fish,
10 and how do the Tlingit people smoke fish, so it's just -- it's a
11 mixture. In fact, Carol Napoleon at Sobriety Celebration in
12 Cordova said, he called us "agudok" (ph). He said that we're a
13 mixture, and no part is better than the other, but the total -- the
14 total of all of our Native groups together is like "agudok" and
15 it's, you know, it represents a lot of different cultures, but the
16 main -- the main culture, or the dominant -- or, I don't know how
17 you say it, I think there are more -- there are more Supiaq or
18 Alutiiq people than anything else.

19 MR. ANDREWS: Thank you.

20 MR. McCORKLE: Thanks, Martha. Would you give us those
21 dates again of the -- of the -- so that ...

22 MS. VLASOFF: Yeah, July 6th through the 9th is the --
23 will be the grand finale or pilot of the camp.

24 MR. McCORKLE: The conclusion of that camp.

25 MS. VLASOFF: It's all the people that come in for a one
26 week session and there's about twenty at a time, all come back for

1 that 6th through the 9th to share all the information and prepare
2 for next year.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, very much. Chip.

4 MR. DENNERLEIN: I just have a question, Martha. Is
5 -- is this camp specifically for culture, because I ask -- I'm
6 familiar with, in fact, I teach at -- we'll be going out again this
7 year to the camp in -- on the Tuluksuk (ph) River at Niak (ph), and
8 that's a cooperative effort with the university, Calista, ABCP,
9 Fish and Wildlife, and it's a -- elders are there, there is
10 traditional food days, but it's also science, western science. I
11 mean, we do steam surveys, and part of the interesting thing there
12 is that the kids get comfortable in a way between contemporary
13 science and traditional knowledge as both valuable parts of -- that
14 they're not in conflict that they can be, you know, used together.
15 It's a very interesting experience, and I was wondering if there is
16 any plans to -- this is specifically for cultural preservation or
17 are there any plans to do a combination of, you know, science and
18 culture together at the same?

19 MS. VLASOFF: It's strictly cultural, and except for the
20 fact that Dr. Lora Johnson, who is an archeologist, a shareholder
21 for our region, is out there and has discovered some new sites,
22 archeological sites out there. That's the only scientific aspect
23 of what we're doing right now. And, I guess, it's kind of related
24 to how -- how much of a need there is to preserve your culture, and
25 whereas up north there they're, you know, very strong in what their
26 knowledge base is, and incorporating western scientific knowledge

1 is -- is important right now, whereas it's more important for us to
2 document and we learn and we vitalize our culture at this point, I
3 believe. And, next year, I think, there's going to be a lot of
4 room for incorporating western scientific knowledge and working
5 closer with the Science Center and the Park Service or whatever.
6 But, at this point, it's real important for us to just pass on our
7 traditional knowledge.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Karl? Kim?

9 MR. BECKER: I was just going to ask, Martha, how many
10 -- how many days long is the camp this year?

11 MS. VLASOFF: There's three sessions that are a week
12 long, that -- it started on June 10th, and then there will be the
13 pilot session, 6th through the 9th, and then -- then it'll be a
14 breaking down of all the tents, and, you know, closing down for
15 next year.

16 MR. BECKER: How many people were there? How many kids
17 or adults?

18 MS. VLASOFF: Right now, the first session, a lot of the
19 kids dropped out because of other employment opportunities, logging
20 or whatever, you know, so we only ended up with four this first
21 one, but we'll probably end up with at least seven to ten each
22 session, and then there's a staff of eight. So ...

23 MR. McCORKLE: Yes.

24 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I know that that's a typical problem
25 in the summer in the Sound that I wonder if, do you have any plans
26 for doing things in the winter, that would be along these same

1 lines?

2 MS. VLASOFF: No, we don't.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Any further comments? Yes, Chuck
4 Totemoff, you have the floor.

5 MR. TOTEMOFF: Yeah, just had one comment. I think one
6 of the objectives in this project is to recognize that subsistence,
7 you know, as a service was disrupted by the oil spill, and this is
8 one of the reasons why, you know, have the elders out there, and
9 some of the hunters out there, and the young people. So, they're
10 trying to make sure that this information isn't lost because of the
11 oil spill. Isn't that one of the objectives?

12 MS. VLASOFF: That's why we received the money. You
13 know, basically, I think , you know, because of, you know, the
14 different resources that just haven't come back, you know, like the
15 herring and the salmon -- the pink salmon didn't come back for a
16 couple of years, and so we want to make sure that the young people
17 are learning those, you know, those traditional skills, even though
18 the resources, you know, may be not there, we need to still
19 continue that process of learning those subsistence skills.

20 MR. McCORKLE: Jim King.

21 MR. KING: I appreciate Martha's invitation to
22 attend. I won't be able to do that, but perhaps she could say
23 again where and how you get to the place in case somebody does. I
24 missed the location, and my second question is, will there be a
25 report, gray or otherwise, out of the camp?

26 MS. VLASOFF: Yes. It's on Hinchinbrook Island in

1 Constantine Harbor, and Nuchik is attached to Hinchinbrook Island
2 by a spit, a long spit, and as far as getting out there, you have
3 to fly out or come out by boat from Cordova. But, as far as a
4 report, we are video taping and documenting as much of the
5 activities as --as we possibly can, and we are planning on
6 developing a curriculum for next year for the subsistence
7 activities, which will be submitted to DCRA, the agency that gave
8 us the funding for ...

9 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Martha, I'd like to now call on
10 Jim Diehl to give a minute wrap of the proceedings of the morning
11 before we return for lunch. If I can get a word out of Jim.
12 You've got to say something this afternoon, you guys have been
13 quiet all day. So, if there is nothing else compelling, what is
14 compelling is lunch. We'll recess until the stroke of 1:00. Thank
15 you, very much for a productive morning.

16 (Off Record 12:00 p.m.)

17 (On Record 1:05 p.m.)

18 MR. McCORKLE: We're up and going, well not quite going.
19 We're going to go ahead with our meeting, and there may be some
20 temporary delays while we hook up the telephone so that Dr. Spies
21 can talk to from -- where is he -- in California, Dr. Spies is in
22 California, out there at La Jolla catching the Ninth Wave, and
23 we'll catch him if we can. In the meantime, I'd like to call the
24 meeting back to order please, and it's just a little past 1:00 and
25 by the agenda, this is the time reserved for public commentary and
26 presentations before the Public Advisory Group, and I now entertain

1 any such commentary. People who are here and would like to address
2 may use these microphones, I ask them to state their name and spell
3 it, if they would, so we can have it properly recorded, and then
4 we'll be glad to hear your message. Are there any public members
5 who would like to address us at this time? Chip Dennerlein, where
6 are you? Does anybody know where Chip has scooted off to, or is
7 that the wrong question to ask?

8 MR. LOEFFLER: I will go look this way for you.

9 MR. McCORKLE: All right. We're going to send a
10 delegation off reconnoitering to the south, and see if he might be
11 rounded up some place. We do have a full program before us today,
12 and it is getting warm, and getting late in the day, so we want to
13 move onto to that. If there is not an hour's worth of public
14 testimony or presentation, we will go into the afternoon program.
15 And, between now and 2:00 if members of the public do show up,
16 we'll take a very brief recess to hear them. Now the report.

17 MR. LOEFFLER: Chip is located and is indisposed, he will
18 be here in a few minutes.

19 MR. McCORKLE: A likely story. When was he ever
20 indisposed? Right, now, apparently is the case. I suppose then
21 what we could do is ask the group what its wishes are with respect
22 to election of the vice-chair. We've not been able to do that for
23 a couple of meetings because of a lack of a quorum. I'd like to
24 know, should we have one now? 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. I need
25 ten. We need two more. We'll get Chip out of the "porta-da-bana"
26 and that will give us eleven. So, we still can't make it. If we

1 get a quorum today, shall we do the election< Do you want to put
2 it off until our next meeting?

3 MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Chairman.

4 MR. McCORKLE: Sir.

5 MR. ANDREWS: I think we ought to have the election as
6 soon as we get a quorum, because there's not going to be any long-
7 winded campaign speeches, are there? (Laughter) So, and we know
8 that (indiscernible - simultaneous talking), let's just do it, you
9 know.

10 MR. McCORKLE: Well, we've heard one view. Is that the
11 consensus of the group? Okay, so when we have our twelfth person
12 with us, I don't know how much longer you can delay this, we'll
13 call for the election. Pam.

14 MS. BRODIE: I guess I completely disagree with that.
15 I don't see any harm to wait until tomorrow in case we have more
16 people, because if we do, I think it would be better to have as
17 many people vote as we can. And, the vice-chair isn't going to do
18 anything between now and tomorrow, unless you have other plans we
19 don't know about.

20 MR. McCORKLE: Well, there's -- now we now have two
21 views. Martha.

22 MS. VLASOFF: Is John French coming in?

23 MR. McCORKLE: We don't have a report on John. I was
24 hoping maybe that Brenda could tell us. Should we have a round of
25 applause for Mr. Dennerlein, who is now disposed -- he was
26 previously indisposed. We really actually have to have one more

1 person here, don't we. What we should do is whoever is sitting
2 next to Brenda, ask her if she either has information about John,
3 or maybe we could call around and see what his plans are. That
4 would help answer Pam's question.

5 MS. WOMAC: Vern.

6 MR. McCORKLE: Yes.

7 MS. WOMAC: I talked to John this morning, and he said
8 if he didn't make it out on the flight today that he wasn't coming
9 for tomorrow. He didn't see any point in coming for just a half a
10 day tomorrow.

11 MR. McCORKLE: Okay.

12 MS. WOMAC: So, his plan was to get the first
13 available flight that was going to get here in time to be at the
14 afternoon, today or he wasn't coming for tomorrow.

15 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, you all heard that report, I guess,
16 that I think it will be that Dr. French will not get here,
17 probably.

18 MS. VLASOFF: The other people now say, Dave?

19 MR. McCORKLE: Nancy is here, but I think she is ...

20 MS. McCAMMON: Nancy is not here.

21 MR. McCORKLE: I don't mean Nancy, pardon me, I mean
22 Brenda is here.

23 MS. VLASOFF: But, Nancy Lethcoe and Dave Cobb, I think.

24 MR. McCORKLE: No, Dave and Nancy -- as far -- there's
25 been no report on them coming in from -- from Valdez. So, I would
26 guess that the lateness of the hour in the day, indicates they

1 might not get here. Here comes Brenda. We're ready to go. So,
2 we're now ten minutes into the public -- public presentation
3 comment, and we've been waiting for -- to hear from our first
4 public presenter, which I understand has elicited the expert
5 services of Dr. Dennerlein, who will now address us.

6 MR. DENNERLEIN: It's just a follow up of some folks
7 that I had talked to about the proposal process, and it was -- it
8 was clarifying that how people might propose whether they had to
9 have an agency sponsor, whether individuals could propose, that
10 sort of process, Mr. Chairman, and I had suggested to them, which
11 they did, that they pick up this review document, which was --
12 which is a public document, available for people to look over, as
13 well as -- and this is a question to staff, if people have
14 questions, Bob, would it be appropriate to -- I'd suggested you,
15 would it be appropriate for you to give them sort of the sideboards
16 guidelines, the way in which different types of proposals come in,
17 and the advance funding cycle. They're well aware that we're
18 already in a funding cycle for FY '96, and this would be looking,
19 you know, on some things down the line, but would you be the prime
20 target?

21 MR. LOEFFLER: I'd be very happy to work with people, we
22 do it all the time, and we encourage people to call and get help.
23 We try not to have it be an impersonal process, and so, we have an
24 800 number, our phone numbers are available, but you can certainly
25 give them my name.

26 MR. MCCORKLE: And, it is true, is it not, Bob, that we

1 do have one or two projects now that were begun and maybe are even
2 being undertaken by individuals, or very small groups of people.
3 I recall that a couple of years ago there was a couple of proposals
4 that came through in the process from one or two individuals, and
5 I think one or two of those actually got funded.

6 MR. LOEFFLER: I believe there are and there are some
7 recommended for funding by small consulting firms and certainly the
8 Native community have implemented some projects as well.

9 MR. DENNERLEIN: Great, thank you.

10 MR. McCORKLE: So, the process definitely is open. I
11 can't speak for the Trustee Council, but my impressions are that
12 they are always looking for good ideas that match the requirements
13 of the settlement and the conditions under which the funds are
14 available -- always looking for good ideas to fulfill that -- that
15 commitment and the need. So, definitely, the answer is yes, the
16 door is open. Please do call the staff. Loeffler is a good person
17 to talk to. He's a -- besides everything else, he's smart, and can
18 at least point you in the right direction. Is there any further
19 comment from members of the public? Hearing none, we will close
20 this session now until the next public person may appear between
21 now and 2:00 o'clock after which the session will close, and we'll
22 defer then to the -- to the team of Christman and Loeffler, who are
23 going to carry us through the afternoon program. Who speaks first?

24 MR. LOEFFLER: I'll do it, Mr. Chairman.

25 MR. McCORKLE: Bob Loeffler, yes, please.

26 MR. LOEFFLER: I would like to just give a brief

1 introduction, and then I think get onto some of the significant
2 issues that we'd like to discuss with you today. But, by way of
3 introduction, I'd sort of like to remind you of where we're coming
4 from, and that is sort of a mission that we propose with respect to
5 the '96 Work Plan is to give scientifically informed public
6 opinion, so that -- so that we have then two ways we wanted to do.
7 One, is to get you the Work Plan so you could at it over --
8 overall, and second, is to get you specific detailed looks at
9 portions of the Work Plan. At the last meeting, we did the three
10 ecosystem projects, if you remember. For this meeting, we had
11 promised to do the fish portions, fish and marine mammals, and then
12 subsistence and archeology we figured we'd do in July. We reversed
13 that order on you, and I apologize for not letting you know
14 earlier.

15 MR. MCCORKLE: I take everything I said about Bob
16 Loeffler back. (Laughter)

17 MR. LOEFFLER: The two reasons we did so are -- in fact
18 I think our first -- we had some conflicts with the PI's who we
19 wanted to have available, and it turns out they were just more
20 available in July. Second, I think the subsistence, the oiling and
21 the archeology issues are typical issues for the Council, for the
22 staff, or in some ways they're ones which I think would be more
23 interesting. So, we wanted to get you into those issues a little
24 earlier, and so -- so for that, that's the reason we reversed it.
25 So, with that as a background for where we're going, and where
26 we've been, the ecosystem issues, the subsistence, archeology are

1 the issues today, and in the future some details of the rest of the
2 plan. We're also today going to give you, or today or tomorrow
3 morning, an overview of the Executive Director's draft
4 recommendation because I think -- then I think we want to go
5 through that in overview form in this session and in detail in
6 July, if that's all right with you. So, let me do one more thing
7 by way of introduction before we begin to get in archeology, and
8 that's -- is you -- my introduction -- what the draft
9 recommendation looks like at the moment and some of the legal
10 terminology is. For some reason, I seem to speak better standing
11 up. Molly talked about the process where we published the
12 raspberry book, or whatever color it was we published it, and then
13 we -- we went through a review process, and have now come to the
14 point that after -- Kim and Martha's help sitting in -- where we
15 have a draft -- preliminary recommendations. But, I think it's
16 important -- and that recommendation is on your desk as that
17 spreadsheet, but I think it's important to help you understand some
18 of it, and so I'm going to go through some of the lingo. If you
19 note -- when we went through a -- through a project that the Chief
20 Scientist gave it one of three categories, funding, further review
21 and recommend not funding. Those are the Chief Scientist's
22 categories. Molly, used those as a starting point, and then she --
23 she gave them -- put them in categories of her own, and so the
24 Executive Director's recommendation falls into these categories.
25 That is, to fund -- fund contingent on something happening, that is
26 ...

1 MR. McCORKLE: But-for. (Laughter)

2 MR. LOEFFLER: That's right, but-for. Contingent on a
3 budget reduction, contingent on something coming out of the
4 proposal, something being added to the proposal, review of results
5 of previous years. It's something that in order for the best
6 possible product, something needs to be revised. So, there's fund,
7 fund contingent, and then there is defer. Defer is where we can't
8 actually make the decision yet, and it's depending on -- an example
9 being the apex program, which is the seabird forage fish program.
10 It's one of the ecosystem projects you heard. There first year is
11 going to be this summer, and so they need a -- there was some
12 question as to what they would accomplish or how far they would
13 get, and so until we can -- when we can make a recommendation on
14 that, we need a review in the fall. So, fund is fund. Contingent
15 -- the contingencies are specified, and if you read the Executive
16 Director's recommendation, you'll read the contingencies, and
17 defer, something needs to happen, or we can't make a decision until
18 it does. Lower priority is just that. It is lower priority, or
19 things that currently they would be useful, they're not as
20 critical, and currently we don't have as much money. They don't
21 look like they would be within our budget parameters. And, the
22 last is do not fund. Now, do not fund carries a multitude of sins
23 and opportunities. In some cases it means it's outside of the
24 restoration mission. In some cases it means that it's, do not fund
25 this year, but it's appropriate for a later year, and in a few
26 cases it means, do not fund because you have a late report and

1 until you get that late report in, forget it. So, some of the --
2 the specifics of the recommendation are in the Executive Director's
3 paragraph in your spreadsheet. So, this is the lingo. When you
4 talk about funds, fund contingent, defer, this is what we mean.
5 Now, let me give you the punchline, so to speak. Just make sure
6 that you can see this. The punchline of (aside comments). The
7 punchline so far, in my view, this is a draft recommendation, is
8 this. So, I've included in this, in the categories, a number of --
9 I've included the funds, fund, contingent, and I've also included
10 defer and those that were do not fund because of late reports, and
11 I put that category in as a subcategory. It's four projects for
12 the do-not-fund because by the flurry of activity we've seen, you
13 know, since the word got out that theirs were do-not-fund, I expect
14 that some of the late reports will be in. So, we've identified,
15 \$19.7 million of projects for funding for this year. This is where
16 we're at. Our target was \$18 million, so we're about ten percent
17 over the target. I'm quite happy with that, so far, in a sense
18 we've been able to get toward our budget guidelines, and I think
19 that there will be additional scrutiny before the file comes out of
20 the budget and that's the problem -- projects. Now, you can also
21 see from this a sense of the kind of relative budget weights that
22 the different components get, and so it might be useful to keep in
23 mind later when we go over it. We're going to go over each one of
24 these components after we discuss archeology, subsistence and oil
25 issues. So, with that, I think I've given enough introduction that
26 you kind of see where -- hopefully can see where we're going, and

1 then I think what we're going to do a substantive, more detailed
2 discussion of the archeology, subsistence and some of the oiling
3 issues involved with the Work Plan, and then after that Stan Senner
4 and I will give you an overview of the rest of the story, so to
5 speak. Sure.

6 MR. BECKER: Bob, how does -- how do those figures you
7 just had up there square with the Executive Director's draft
8 recommendation that we have here, and the reason I ask that is
9 because I notice that your herring projects up there are for \$1.4
10 million and the herring project figure I see on page six says
11 \$90,000.

12 MR. LOEFFLER: The difference is, one, do not fund
13 because of late reports. And so, I threw -- there are four late
14 report projects which I threw into this channel, and ...

15 MR. BECKER: Which aren't fundable within the
16 spreadsheet.

17 MR. LOEFFLER: Yes. So, for example, let's look at
18 herring. Herring project 166, herring natal habitats, the first
19 line of -- it's on page 7, the last one on page 7 -- the first line
20 of Molly's recommendation is do not fund due to PI having late
21 report. But -- I was waiting for you to nod, Karl, to make sure
22 you're there.

23 MR. BECKER: I'm here, and there.

24 MR. LOEFFLER: Okay, good, so you see that it's a zero in
25 the recommendation. I took the liberty of adding those in because
26 I -- just so that you could see kind of where we're going because

1 I -- from the flurry of activity I suspect the PIs will add those
2 in.

3 MS. BENTON: Would it be possible as they go through
4 these different categories and we're supposed to start looking at
5 them, to make copies of that available for us so we can kind of see
6 the way we're spending the most as we go through.

7 MR. LOEFFLER: Sure, we'll have that -- we'll have this
8 done as we go through the overview. Okay? Well, with that, I'm --
9 I'm done, and I guess I'm ...

10 MR. McCORKLE: So, we now adjourn, go out and enjoy the
11 sunshine.

12 MR. LOEFFLER: I'd like for the archeology portion,
13 Veronica, I will trade places.

14 (Aside comments)

15 MR. McCORKLE: Ladies and gentlemen, this is Veronica
16 Chritman, one of my dear old girl friends from a way, way back.
17 Veronica and I go back 15 years, well a few years. Delighted to
18 have you here, will you -- when you're settled and ready introduce
19 your cohorts there and we're awaiting your report.

20 MS. CHRISTMAN: Thank you. I have with me Judy Bittner,
21 who is the State's Historic Preservation Officer with the Alaska
22 Department of Natural Resources, and also Doug Reger (ph), an
23 archeologist with DNR. And, what we're going to try to do is very
24 briefly go over the long-range plan, what's in the raspberry book,
25 as far as archeological resources are concerned, and I'd like to
26 also describe how the Executive Director's draft recommendations

1 match the long-range plan, and then I would like to turn it over to
2 Judy and Doug to describe two of the projects that are proposed for
3 what we call local heritage preservation. What a nice name. What
4 that means is the subject that we'll spend much of the afternoon
5 discussing, because it really does raise a number of issues that
6 the PAG could be very helpful in discussing with us, and part of
7 the discussion on local heritage preservation will be a discussion
8 of a draft site protection plan, which was developed by the
9 Department of Natural Resources at the request of the Trustee
10 Council. What I thought would be useful today, once you -- you
11 really know what's in the raspberry book, you really know what's in
12 the Executive Director's draft recommendations, is for you also to
13 know what the draft recommendations are from the site protection
14 plans, and I'm hoping that would give us a better basis for
15 discussing the proposals that have been submitted on archeological
16 resources, and it also anticipates a "Chris Beck questions" which
17 is how does all of this fit together, and you have given thought to
18 all the -- and we have in fact, given fact to how all these things
19 fit together, and we have quite a ways to go, but we're making a
20 good start. Of course, you have your raspberry book right in front
21 of you, and on page 89 of that book, you can share books in case
22 you don't have it, but on page 89 of that book is the summary
23 section on archeological resources. We designed the summary pages
24 so that they could very quickly give you an idea what the long-
25 range plan looks like and at the very bottom of that page are three
26 bullets, and that gives you the three parts of what we're

1 projecting to be the long-range program for restoration of
2 archeological resources. The first is to periodically monitor a
3 small number of index sites to gauge whether there is a resurgent
4 in looting and vandalism, and to continue hydrocarbon testing, and
5 this is recommended to continue for ten years. So, archeological
6 site monitoring is one part. The second part of the long-term
7 restoration program, is to complete curation of artifacts from two
8 sites, in Prince William Sound, which are part of a data recovery
9 exercise. Some of us relate to the term archeological excavation
10 a little better than data recovery, but that notion of recovering
11 data from a site before it's lost either to vandals or erosion is
12 the second part. The third part is what we'll spend most of this
13 hour discussing, and that is to consider local heritage
14 preservation projects in the context of the site protection plans
15 being developed by the Alaska Department of Natural Resources under
16 a project funded in fiscal year '95. There were eight projects
17 proposed for archeological resources at fiscal year '96. Four of
18 them were recommended for funding under certain circumstances, and
19 four of them not recommended for funding at this time. One of the
20 projects deals with the first bullet, that is with archeological
21 site monitoring. The project that is recommended for funding is
22 project 96007A, and it is for \$146,500, and the proposal is to
23 monitor eight sites throughout the spill area. These sites are all
24 on public lands. They were all damaged in 1989. Two of them are
25 -- yes.

26 MR. BECKER: I'm sorry, Veronica, what page is

1 that one on the Executive Director's recommendations.

2 MS. CHRISTMAN: It's under archeological resources, which
3 is page 30.

4 MR. BECKER: Thank you.

5 MS. CHRISTMAN: So, we're talking about 96007A, okay? So,
6 the archeological site monitoring proposal is to monitor eight
7 sites throughout the region, two in Prince William Sound, two in
8 the outer Kenai coast, and four in the Kodiak area, including
9 Afognak Island. All of the sites would be monitored for any
10 evidence of continued looting and vandalism, and two of those sites
11 would also be tested for hydrocarbon, for the presence of
12 hydrocarbon. What we're looking for is whether it is migrating,
13 whether the oil is migrating into the cultural deposits, because
14 that may impair our ability to radiocarbon date in the future. I
15 might indicate that the cost of the project is less than half of
16 what was approved in fiscal year '95, so the costs are beginning to
17 come down. The proposal is to continue this monitoring for ten
18 years, that was also a recommendation of the peer reviewer.
19 However, if after five years there is no further evidence of
20 damage, then the recommendation is to cease the monitoring. The
21 second bullet, complete curation of artifacts from the Seward 440
22 and 488 sites, is addressed under project 96007B, and this project
23 is for \$78.4 thousand. It is what we love to see, which is a
24 close-out. This indicates the conclusion of a project. Much of
25 what will be needed in this close-out is curation of the artifacts
26 that were gathered, and also report writing. And, these two sites,

1 by the way, are on Eleanor and Knight Islands in Prince William
2 Sound, and that's being conducted by the Forest Service. The final
3 two projects that are recommended for funding with some
4 contingencies, are under the topic of local heritage preservation,
5 and they are projects 96149, which is the site stewardship program,
6 \$74,400. And, Judy Bittner and Doug Reger will be able to describe
7 this project in some detail to you. It does, however, deal with
8 communities that are committed to this project, that requested this
9 funding, and the funding will be used for training and logistical
10 support. The notion of a community commitment to a volunteer
11 effort of this sort was key to the peer reviewer's recommendation
12 for projects of this sort. The second project, under local
13 heritage preservation, that is recommended to proceed, is -- not --
14 project 96154, and this project would conduct planning for
15 archeological repositories. And, the conditions on the
16 recommendation for proceeding with this project are that further
17 work needs to be done in developing the planning project, and in
18 particular the recommendation entails gathering together the
19 affected parties to an approach, and the affected parties as far as
20 archeological repositories are concerned, are certainly number one,
21 the communities in the spill area, and secondly, the existing
22 museums in the spill area. There are museums in Cordova, in
23 Valdez, Seward, the Pratt Museum in Homer, as well as, of course,
24 the Alutiiq Museum which the Trustees contributed to, and also the
25 University of Alaska Fairbanks Museum, which is currently the
26 repository for artifacts that were collected during the clean-up.

1 So, the recommendation is that in the near future those affected
2 parties would gather together to address how we would proceed with
3 planning for archeological repositories. The kinds of things this
4 group would need to address would be, what is it -- what is it we
5 need to accommodate? How would we approach a facility needs
6 assessment. Also, how would we approach plans for operation and
7 maintenance of these facilities? And, also what services can be
8 provided by these various parties in the process of developing
9 this. The University Museum, for example, has offered it's
10 services in providing traveling exhibits. That information needs
11 to be made available, as we approach this effort. I might add that
12 the recommendation for funding planning for archeological
13 repositories is at \$125,000 right now, with the understanding that
14 that amount might be modified as this working group develops. As
15 the raspberry book indicates, the local heritage preservation
16 projects, any of them that are submitted, will be considered in the
17 context of the site protection plan that were developed by the
18 Department of Natural Resources. What I would like to do is turn
19 to Judy Bittner and Doug Reger to describe the site protection
20 plans in a little more detail, especially underscoring the
21 recommendations from the effort because they will affect how we
22 proceed in any effort dealing with archeological repositories. In
23 case you don't have enough paper, I notice, you know, you didn't
24 have much paper this time, and in case you have not yet received a
25 copy of the site protection plans, we could pass them around.
26 Would you like a copy, yes. Oh, I might add that Alex Swiderski is

1 in the audience, and if as we proceed with our -- if as we proceed
2 with our discussion you have questions about the legal context of
3 some of your ideas, Alex would be available to address them.

4 MR. McCORKLE: We now have a raspberry book and I think
5 we're going to have a banana book, is that all right, and who knows
6 what we may have next.

7 MS. CHRISTMAN: I might add that the draft report is
8 draft, it's not been peer reviewed, it has not gone through either
9 legal review or review by the Trustee Council.

10 MR. McCORKLE: So, it's a real draft.

11 MS. CHRISTMAN: It's a draft, yes.

12 MR. McCORKLE: Is it coming around, did it get stuck some
13 place? (Aside comments) Oh, pardon me, I'm sorry, we're being
14 electronically adjusted here, probably sent away.

15 MS. BITTNER: I will be looking at on page 3 there's a
16 summary of the recommendations, and I wait for just a minute so you
17 can get a copy of those and you can follow along through the --
18 through the summary, that's on page 3 and 4, I'll wait just a
19 minute.

20 MS. CHRISTMAN: While Cherri is passing that out, I might
21 add that the four projects that were not recommended for funding at
22 this time go to drafts, actual construction, a request for funding
23 for actual construction of facilities, and one of the projects
24 requested funding for a training program to staff these facilities
25 and other related efforts. And, we -- we recommended -- the
26 Executive Director is recommending proceeding with planning first

1 before addressing recommendations about either facilities, or
2 training to support those facilities. Judy.

3 MS. BITTNER: Okay, on page 3 is a summary of the
4 recommendations, and the -- some sort of longer explanation of the
5 recommendation starts on page 24. Starting on page 3 we can start
6 with -- sort of going through these recommendations. Based on our
7 findings and what -- what our -- Doug was the principal
8 investigator on this, and worked with others and went around to the
9 existing facilities, interviewed people in various communities as
10 to what their wants, needs and existing programs and facilities
11 were, and that is summarized in the text of the report. One of the
12 first recommendations, or a recommendation, on page 3 is that the
13 Trustees should entertain proposals to either construct new
14 regional repositories in the Prince William Sound area, in the Lower
15 Cook Inlet area, or support expansion of existing facilities in the
16 two areas. Supporting expansion of existing facilities, or partial
17 support for multi-use facilities appears to be the most efficient
18 and economical approach. Either approach needs to include strong
19 consideration for meeting federal territorial standards outlined in
20 regulations and address concerns of the Native communities. Second
21 recommendation, is that the Trustee Council should entertain
22 proposals for developing local storage and display of small
23 collections of artifacts which come from local sites. Development
24 of local storage and a display should be supported by training,
25 professional advice and materials. Local people should be trained
26 to work with and interpret local collections. A third

1 recommendation is that the Trustee Council should continue to
2 support monitoring damage sites for vandalism and future damage
3 from buried oil. Monitoring could be accomplished through funding
4 agency monitoring as now, support of a program of local side
5 stewards or to monitor sites or a combination of methods. A site
6 stewardship program involving local residents should be effective
7 in the long-term and should be strongly considered by the Council
8 for funding. The fourth recommendation from the report, is that
9 for the most efficient long-term protection of damaged sites, and
10 sites newly damages as a result of increase vandalism, the Trustee
11 Council should support presentation of information about the
12 cultural heritage of the spill area in order to educate people
13 about the harm of site destruction. Education should be
14 preparation of pamphlets, videos, oil presentations or support of
15 heritage preservation programs. Educational efforts should be
16 aimed at both Native and non-Native communities. Training youth in
17 traditional practices and values would be one significant method of
18 education about the value of archeological remains. And, do we
19 have any questions at this point on those recommendations?

20 MR. McCORKLE: If there are questions, would you please
21 address them directly to Judy Bittner? There being none so far,
22 maybe we could have a raincheck and have some questions later, if
23 some come along.

24 MS. BITTNER: Okay. The -- related to these
25 recommendations is the site stewardship program, I think Veronica
26 is better at the numbers than I am. I think it's that 96149, and

1 the 007 that relates to the monitoring project, and the 154 is --
2 is further planning relating to the displays, repositories and that
3 aspect of it. So, we do have projects targeting some of these
4 recommendations.

5 MR. McCORKLE: Rupert.

6 MR. ANDREWS: Can you help me a little bit. I know that
7 archeologists don't like to divulge a location of archeological
8 sites, but I'm looking at the recommendations, aren't we talking
9 about sites that are quite remote, that require long flights, or
10 boat travel to get to these sites?

11 MS. BITTNER: Yes, yes we are in remote sites, and
12 that's one of the difficulties in monitoring.

13 MR. ANDREWS: Yes, that's what I wanted to understand,
14 thank you.

15 MS. BITTNER: And, it's going to beyond the scope of
16 some existing agency coverage, and that's why we've -- and they
17 have become vulnerable because of the exposure from the oil spill
18 and the clean-up in these remote areas, and so that is the
19 connection with the oil spill and the restorations.

20 MR. McCORKLE: Pam.

21 MS. BRODIE: This says monitoring and checking for oil.
22 I have two questions, if you're checking for oil, what's the reason
23 for thinking there might at this stage, six years after the spill,
24 be new contamination from oil, and for the monitoring part, if you
25 find out that indeed there is vandalism, what can you do to stop
26 it, I don't mean you, I mean what can be done to stop it.

1 MS. BITTNER: I think there is presence, the oil is
2 present in many of the sites, and I can also let Doug continue
3 answer further on that, and what we're also looking for is a
4 continuing leeching into the site of the existing oil, and its
5 contamination of the information and the ability to date the site
6 and what affect it has on the archeological materials, so it's --
7 one is looking at the continued contamination of leeching through
8 and what affect that has on the data recovery and how to analyze
9 that data once recovered, and then maybe, and I don't know if
10 through the monitoring if there is new oil that's moving onto the
11 site, because they are documented areas where oil has been found in
12 the past, and sometimes buried into the site now.

13 MR. BECKER: So, these are subtidal sites?

14 MS. BITTNER: Most of them are, I'll let Doug ...

15 MR. REGER: Most of the sites are -- they're partially
16 upland and partial in the beach deposits, yes. Several of the
17 sites have been bioremediated in the past year to get rid of the
18 oil, and that's -- some of those are -- a couple of those are those
19 that we've identified to go back and monitor in FY '96.

20 MS. BITTNER: And in relation to the vandalism side of
21 your question, these are sites that are public lands, and we work
22 with the land managing agency to -- to monitor and patrol that
23 site, try to -- so often it is related to seasonal activity, to try
24 to target and to find out who maybe vandalizing that site, and
25 either pull in both the law enforcement side, as well as the
26 educational side to see if is it -- is it fishermen, is it the

1 local people in that area, is it people from outside trying to
2 identify who might be doing that, and a targeting of both on an
3 educational as well as a law enforcement side in trying to stop the
4 vandalism, and decide if we can't then to then as part of the
5 restoration, that site may be then recommended for data recovery,
6 and that has happened in some areas of the site where the vandalism
7 can't be stopped or controlled, and so the data is recovered from
8 that site.

9 MR. McCORKLE: Karl.

10 MR. BECKER: How expensive is vandalism on these sites?

11 MS. BITTNER: Some bad and some not so bad. It really

12 ...

13 MR. BECKER: Can you describe maybe extremes.

14 MS. BITTNER: Okay, Doug.

15 MR. REGER: Okay, one of -- actually some of the more
16 extreme examples are not on public land and therefore aren't
17 subject to these kinds of proposals that the agencies are able to
18 put forward, but, for instance, on Sheyak Island, there's one site,
19 Afognak 81, that was dug into probably -- it's a very large site,
20 so in terms of total area of the site, it's not as impressive as
21 when you look at whole that was dug into it, and that was probably
22 on the order of several cubic yards of deposits that were removed.
23 On some of the other sites, they are eroding into the ocean. Not
24 related to the oil spill particularly, but they are exposed a n d
25 therefore subject to vandalism because of the easy identification.
26 Those are -- those are running areas like perhaps three meters a

1 stretch, and maybe a stretch along the bank of 50 meters in length
2 where these -- where people have been digging through the deposits.
3 So, those are some of the more extreme.

4 MS. BITTNER: (Indiscernible) focus on the sites as they
5 come to the intertidal zone that people will dig under the -- under
6 the sod, and then create some collapsing. Most of my travels was
7 during the clean-up phase itself, and a lot in the Kodiak area,
8 where you could see the very freshly dug areas, and often there was
9 -- one had pictures of the footsteps going up to it before the tide
10 had come and washed those away, so we could tell that some very
11 fresh -- fresh digging in some of those areas. But, particularly
12 where it was easy was where it came right up to the intertidal
13 zone, and then spilled on into it, and you could dig into the soft
14 bank very easily under the sod, and then that accelerated then the
15 collapse of the site and further damage.

16 MR. McCORKLE: So, it's another but-for. But-for the
17 digging of souvenir hunters and others, the intertidal zone may or
18 may not have been oiled? I'm trying to figure out what -- what our
19 logical tie here is to this for a restoration project.

20 MS. BITTNER: These areas were -- were oiled and the
21 intertidal zones oiled and there was, you know, clean-up in that
22 area, as well as bringing crews to that area, and more exposure to
23 ...

24 MR. McCORKLE: Oh, that was the cause of the exposure?

25 MS. BITTNER: Yes, that was the cause -- actually the
26 clean-up was the causing exposure and bringing ...

1 MR. McCORKLE: Part of the problem.

2 MS. BITTNER: Part of the problem, and one idea is that
3 people would come back and visit those areas that they became
4 knowledgeable about, but not necessarily each year, and a few years
5 might be intercede before they actually get back to the site, and
6 that was one of the comments from our peer reviewer. Say, well
7 they might not get back that next year, so you need to kind of look
8 at it for awhile, and kind of this -- this discussion ourselves,
9 what effect that incident had of that exposure would then dissipate
10 over time, and that is another reason for the -- because of the ten
11 year time period, both look at the contamination and the tie back
12 to that particular, you know, clean up time from '89 to '90.

13 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. Molly.

14 MS. McCAMMON: Not yet.

15 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, Karl.

16 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I just -- if I could, I just
17 wanted to highlight maybe some of the issues that you see in this
18 cluster, and the kinds of questions that we've been asking about
19 them. There are -- from the types of projects that were submitted,
20 there are four basic efforts that are being proposed or ongoing.
21 There's direct restoration of a damaged site, and there's one
22 project to do a completion, so that's actually going in and trying
23 to stabilize the site, and get it to the point where it won't
24 continue to degrade, so there's actual site restoration. And, it's
25 my understanding that the project that's proposed for this year is
26 the last one to be done on public lands. There is the issue of

1 site stewardship and monitoring. Should the Trustee Council fund
2 a long-term or short-term program of going around to these sites
3 and monitoring them, or paying, having a program for local people
4 to go around and monitor them on a regular basis? Is this
5 something that the Council look at, paying some start up costs,
6 with the idea we'll transition to some other entity down the road,
7 or is this something that the Council should commit to forever into
8 the future, an uncertain time? So, that's an issue we've been
9 looking at. The third question is the idea of repository for
10 artifacts, but what -- what is an appropriate response to -- an
11 appropriate scope or level of repositories in the spill area? The
12 Council's already taken action on a repository for Kodiak. What
13 about the rest of the spill area? Is there a need for another
14 regional facility? Does -- what's appropriate at a local level?
15 What was the scope of the damage, and what should be the
16 appropriate response for that. And, this is where we're looking at
17 trying to get some planning money to continue figuring that out in
18 the future. And, I think the fourth issue, or the fourth effort
19 that was highlighted within this cluster, is a proposal that was
20 submitted for training of local people to be able to identify
21 artifacts, handle them when they're discovered, take it all the way
22 from finding a site, how you stabilize a site so it doesn't get
23 degraded, how you excavate the site, how you prepare artifacts for
24 collection display, and for some form of permanent protection. Is
25 this something that the Council is able to participate in? Is this
26 an appropriate use of the settlement funds? So, I think there are

1 kind of four major categories within the archeology cluster, and
2 these are the kinds of questions that we're grappling with. This
3 is an area that the attorneys look at real closely, and because
4 it's a grayer area maybe than their perspectives than a project
5 dealing with pink salmon. But, I think when the Council takes
6 action on a number of these items, they're going to want to keep
7 some of these questions in mind, and have an idea of where are we
8 going with these projects. I don't think they want to get on a
9 track down one road without really thinking through, is this a
10 long-term commitment, are we doing this for a short time, is this
11 a stop-gap until some other entity can take it over, or whatever.
12 But, I just wanted to highlight those issues.

13 MR. McCORKLE: Well, I think that's been very instructive
14 and quite helpful, and it would be even more so if you could tell
15 us what you think about those. Or, at least how has -- how far has
16 your thinking proceeded at this time, for example, with respect to
17 whether or not there should be an artifact repositories? What
18 might be the criteria on which would help us decide to build
19 another one in another area, or the site stewardship and monitoring
20 over time? What's the general thinking so far on those points?

21 MS. McCAMMON: I think the general thinking overall, is
22 that the Council, if there's a long-term monitoring program, they
23 want to see some into the future. They want to see some kind of
24 transition to either an agency or local entity, being willing at
25 some point to take it over, and for the most part, they've been
26 willing to fund a certain number of years of a program with the

1 idea that it would end at some point. But, they were -- they don't
2 want to do with the idea that after five years then all protection
3 goes away, so they want somebody, some responsible entity to be
4 able to say, yes, we will do it, and we've worked this out. So,
5 one of the questions that we had on site stewardship, and
6 particularly had a -- a major discussion on this last week, the
7 proposal that DNR put forth is a very modest proposal for \$75,000,
8 but it's (aside) three communities -- three communities, or three
9 areas within the spill area. If this effort was to go forward, are
10 we going to see a -- and extentional expansion of this program in
11 the future? Is this just the beginning? Does it make sense to get
12 started on this effort, if we have it fully start out future years?
13 I don't think we have all the answers on these things. A lot of
14 this process we just throw out the questions and we start figuring
15 out what the answers are down the road.

16 MR. McCORKLE: Well, that's most commendable though, I
17 think, to approach it from that point of view, and I do think maybe
18 we're beginning to see something that has always been on our
19 agenda, and that is, for worthy projects such as these may be, the
20 possibility of -- of early funding, facilitation funding, seed
21 money, with an end point in view, to use a Loeffler term, and that
22 the willingness of local people to carry on, seems to be, that's a
23 commendable approach, at least at this juncture. So, thank you
24 very much for those questions. Rupert.

25 MR. ANDREWS: I'd like to address a question to either,
26 or both Judy and Doug, what's the ultimate objective of -- of your

1 project or your approach? It's not to dig these sites up and put
2 all the artifacts in a museum. It's probably a compilation of --
3 what protection and to display some of these things, am I -- am I
4 correct?

5 MS. BITTNER: Yes. I think the ...

6 MR. ANDREWS: I understand the protection part of this
7 very well.

8 MS. BITTNER: It is our preference to leave this in
9 place in the ground undisturbed. It is really the -- our
10 preference, with the archeology sites, and, I think, the -- what we
11 approaching, just kind of we in a broader sense, kind of working
12 with all the interagency archeology group is to provide a
13 combination of monitoring and public education to foster the
14 stewardship by not only the agencies responsible, but those who
15 live nearby, or have a cultural ties to those sites, and it's
16 through, I think, it's really from the very beginning -- it was a
17 pre-oil spill, but this is very applicable to the oil spill area
18 and the injury done to the cultural sites in the oil spill area.
19 One of the most effective ways we think to do long-term
20 preservation of these sites is through education and through a
21 stewardship program, and get the people that are living near those
22 sites, care about those sites, have a cultural tie to those sites,
23 or even just, you know, care about them, when they know about them,
24 and it's in there -- in they're area. And, this is -- we looked
25 into this in other states where they do have stewardship programs
26 trying to see of those programs and what is successful. How can

1 you apply that to the situation in Alaska, because we're very
2 different. We're not on a road system, and it's very remote and
3 rural, and trying to see those successful elements or knowledge of
4 Alaska, village Alaska, remote Alaska, to set up a program, and the
5 sites -- the communities that were chosen for this -- this year's
6 proposal, the '96 proposals, are communities that have expressed
7 active interest and are already engaged with our agencies, both the
8 Fish and Wildlife Service and DNR, because this is where the
9 stewardship program is one of the very first that we proposed, and
10 this is a group of archeologist from all major land managing
11 agencies in the impact area. I -- thinking that is really one of
12 the most effective areas of protection because it's very difficult
13 to predict an archeological site because it's a non-renewable
14 resource. And, the program was put in place, the manuals, it was
15 -- you know, researched, a program was designed, the next year was
16 then to implement, and we're still trying to implement it. It
17 wasn't funded through the oil spill, but we continued to work with
18 communities in our areas where we have land management and these
19 groups or communities have -- have worked with us trying to get
20 something started, so they're up, ready to go, have the support,
21 and we think also have the greatest potential then to within three
22 years find a way to do it on their own without the support of the
23 Trustees. But, that does not mean that other communities in the
24 area think, and saying, well we hope to be the success, right, and
25 we would like to try that in our community, which they may come
26 through the oil spill, or we might be able to have other

1 suggestions how they can get something started through various
2 partnership. So, we really think that it needs to be tried, it's
3 really -- we think going to be one of the more successful long-term
4 ways to approach it, and the communities chosen for this one --
5 very modest project is those -- are those that have something
6 already started.

7 MR. McCORKLE: How about questions? Martha.

8 MS. VLASOFF: Where are they?

9 MR. McCORKLE: Secrets.

10 MS. BITTNER: Kachemak Bay, Ugashik Bay, Uyak Bay and
11 Chignik area. And, then we've been working with either DNR or Fish
12 and Wildlife Service.

13 MR. McCORKLE: Yes, Tom -- Totemoff -- Chuck, sorry.

14 MR. TOTEMOFF: First project here, it says, 96007A, this
15 has been around for awhile. I keep seeing this thing -- there's a
16 need to continue consultations with Native groups, and the other
17 one says, as required by law. Well, what does that mean? I know
18 there's some federal law -- and there may be some state law that
19 provides consultation, but I've never heard of any consultation, at
20 least not through my corporation.

21 MS. BITTNER: I think when the ...

22 MS. REGER: Okay, under some of the federal
23 regulations on a project, not specifically 07A, but like the data
24 collection project that the Forest Service is doing, where there is
25 an effect -- any kind of an effect on that site, the federal
26 regulations require that appropriate Native groups be consulted on

1 that for their comments. And, for 007A, there hasn't been any
2 effect other than monitoring these sites, and so there hasn't been
3 much in the way of consultation -- no.

4 MS. BITTNER: It's -- when there's an effect, you know,
5 that the site is going to be excavated or disturbed or data
6 recovery through the section 106 of the National Start Preservation
7 Act, then once there is an effect, then that consultation is -- is
8 required there. And, with the -- because the site -- sometimes
9 there's a site with no close -- village close at hand, it's going
10 -- at looking at state sites on state land in some -- in some
11 respect, with just going out there and checking to see if any --
12 any damage has been done, or not damage been done, and that's the
13 extent of the -- that I think would be -- would be -- because the
14 early sites, I think that was -- can't remember it was the Chenega
15 or Tatitlek, there was a land manager that went out with one of the
16 sites as we monitored some of the early sites. So, it depends on
17 which year and which site.

18 MR. REGER: Okay, that was -- that was under damage
19 assessment phase, it wasn't administration, but yes, one of the, I
20 believe board of directors for the Chenega Corporation went out and
21 accompanied us when we were out assessing the damage on a site that
22 was adjacent to their uplands.

23 MR. McCORKLE: Molly.

24 MS. McCAMMON: Chuck, is this something you would like to
25 see as a requirement whether it's required by law or not?

26 MR. TOTEMOFF: Well, there's a lot of things that are

1 required by law, but not necessarily being used. You know, there's
2 -- I think there are some provisions in ANILCA that were, you know,
3 if your conducting projects within an area that's on or adjacent to
4 Native corporation lands, you know, you're supposed to utilize not
5 only the local resources, but you're supposed to work with the
6 corporation as much as possible, and that -- that extends all the
7 way to contracting.

8 MS. McCAMMON: If this ...

9 MR. TOTEMOFF: This is a bigger issue than probably just
10 little projects here, but, you know, I am aware of those laws.

11 MS. McCAMMON: Right.

12 MR. TOTEMOFF: And, this is something that I've tried to
13 impress upon the Trustee Council since day one, but haven't met
14 with very much success, so ...

15 MS. McCAMMON: So, is this something though that you
16 would like to see this kind of a idea strengthened in the
17 recommendations?

18 MR. TOTEMOFF: Absolutely. It's law.

19 MS. McCAMMON: So, just to say that the proposals will
20 continue consultation with Native groups, is that sufficient, or
21 would you like to see that language changed and strengthened there
22 at the end?

23 MR. TOTEMOFF: No, I guess we've got an attorney in the
24 room, and we can all of this intent of the law implemented, but,
25 you know, I just get a little frustrated sometimes, you know. What
26 I'd like to talk about a little bit is this other project.

1 MS. VLASOFF: Molly, could I just say something before
2 we go further, is, you know, I notice that right off too, you know,
3 the consultation with the Native groups, and that's all well and
4 good as a recommendation, and we've been working together with Doug
5 and Judy, but I was kind of disappointed that, you know, for how
6 ever long you've planned this presentation here to the PAG, we
7 never were informed that you were going to present, or, you know,
8 you didn't get our input on what -- what our concerns were in
9 regards to these projects. So, you know, we just need to push
10 that, you know, to really -- to really work in a cooperative
11 manner, you know, and I think that's ...

12 MS. McCAMMON: Actually, Martha, Jim Senett was also
13 invited to attend the -- to come up here and discuss the projects
14 too, and I'm not sure what happened, but ...

15 MS. VLASOFF: He is presently at a Chugach Board of
16 Directors meeting in Port Graham, and he is -- he is working on the
17 letters of authorization that you asked for, so.

18 MS. McCAMMON: Apparently, we had a miscommunication on
19 his concerns, said he was going to be here (indiscernible)

20 MR. McCORKLE: Molly or Judy, do I understand, one of the
21 notes I've written down here from your presentation, is that
22 communities have expressed the idea of the stewardship approach,
23 and from that I took to mean that these projects which are in the
24 Executive Director's recommendations, do represent projects which
25 came from communities, or the state of federal agencies that are
26 nearby or next to court, so to speak, and as I read the language

1 here, it says there is a need to continue -- continue -- and then
2 the other one says, there -- that these needs are done by law. Is
3 that your intentions to follow through on those? Or, because what,
4 I think what Chuck is concerned about is that maybe that hasn't
5 been done in the past, but what we seem to see -- what got my
6 attention here was that it was expressed in the staff report, that
7 this will be done, and is that sort of what we mean?

8 MS. CHRISTMAN: I'm not ...

9 MS. BITTNER: A peer reviewer -- the peer reviewer

10 MS. CHRISTMAN: ... recommended -- made this point, but it
11 was not ...

12 MS. BITTNER: If any laws that were -- that were out
13 there to be complied with and as far as I know, all the laws are
14 being complied with, and some is the required consultation true
15 existing processes, such as the National Start Preservation Act,
16 section 106, in certain circumstances where something is being
17 affected such as an excavation, other is -- true to the protocol
18 and a guideline through agencies working with -- with -- on their
19 lands with their staff and others are kind of with the
20 Archeological Resources Protection Act. So, it depends on who --
21 then he mentioned ANILCA, so it really depends on -- in a case
22 specific of what kind of consultation, what is required by law,
23 what is by, you know, kind of guidelines and protocol, and as far
24 as I know, there is no non-compliance with any laws at this point.
25 You know, if the attorneys tell us such, then, you know, fine, but
26 I'm not aware of any -- any illegal actions.

1 MR. McCORKLE: Let me ask another friendly question. If
2 these projects sprang from hometown, so to speak, or home village,
3 how does it come that these village leaders we have here didn't
4 know about these until today? I mean, that's just a friendly
5 question, I mean, is there a process that is in place, is there a
6 way that they could be informed ahead of time?

7 MS. BITTNER: I think these, the projects in the areas
8 here are not in the Prince William Sound, one is in the Homer area,
9 and the other is in the Kodiak area. I think the two people here
10 are from the Prince William Sound, and it is through our -- our
11 project with the site protection plan, we did go around and visit
12 and actually worked with Martha and others in going to the various
13 communities, or interviewing people from the communities about the
14 various programs, the stewardship programs or repository programs,
15 what they had going, what was already existing, and what their
16 plans and needs were. The report, the banana report, summarizes
17 some of those discussions and discussion of those. Reports -- and
18 actually I think there is another project that incorporates the
19 stewardship program in one of the other proposals that it's a much
20 broader program of which stewardship is just a part. So, it's --
21 it is, you know, through the early work and through the years, it's
22 something that we have discussed with various members of the
23 communities and corporations in the Prince William Sound as well as
24 the whole impact area.

25 MR. McCORKLE: Molly is going to speak in a minute, but
26 Martha, could I ask, well what -- what suggestions might you give

1 us as to how this process could be more appropriate?

2 MS. VLASOFF: Well, it's my -- it's my mistake because
3 I didn't realize that Jim Senett had been invited to work with them
4 on this particular presentation, but I -- what I'd like to see is
5 like a cultural revitalization, you know, the ongoing real
6 awakening of the Native people to -- there's been so many things
7 happen to the Native people in the State of Alaska, the different
8 tribes, as far as colonization, Russians, you know, the Russian
9 explorers, all the explorers, all the diseases, a lot of things
10 have happened over the years, and, you know, one of Judy's comments
11 of, you know, we'd like to get an education program for people to
12 actually care about the archeological, you know, resources. I
13 don't think there is any doubt that the people care, you know,
14 because, you know, it's -- it's like coming from it from a
15 different cultural way of thinking, I think, you know. It's not
16 like we had to -- we have to go out there and identify those, and,
17 you know, it's somewhat different. We care about them, and, you
18 know, and, of course we care because -- because that's our
19 ancestors, you know, and -- and -- but it's coming from an oral
20 tradition instead of a written or western tradition, you know, of
21 documentation. That's -- that's basically why Native people have
22 always lost out in the end because it's oral tradition. It's not
23 like I have a deed to this land, and, you know, and you cannot take
24 it away from me, it's oral tradition, we go there and we use the
25 resources. When the resources have gone, we move on, you know, it
26 wasn't -- it wasn't that kind of same base, that philosophy of

1 owning something, but -- but I think that as this revitalization of
2 our culture, you know, so many things have happened to try to
3 destroy this way of life, you know, the cultururation into whether
4 other like into the Russians or the American lifestyle. It's to
5 the point now where people are just beginning to wake up that this
6 is a wonderful tradition that we have -- these are -- these are
7 wonderful -- this is the best way of life for the Native people of
8 the Prince William Sound. And, as that happens, you know, whether
9 it's funded by EVOS money, or not funded by anybody, you know, it's
10 just something that is a living, breathing thing, as I see it, and
11 I -- it's going to be ongoing. All I'd like to see, basically, is
12 that the work that -- that DNR and Doug and Judy and like even the
13 spirit camp that was funded through DCRA all -- all work together,
14 and I think we can work towards increasing communications, you
15 know, between -- between what the Native people are doing and, like
16 you said -- with the planning grant that we have proposed we can
17 actually work closer with the University of Alaska, with the -- the
18 artifacts that have already been found, and then with the
19 Smithsonian, as far as the training for the people out in the
20 communities for -- for these repositories that will -- will be
21 built eventually, and just to put this whole team together is what
22 we're going to be working on over the next year, and hope to work
23 closer with all the people involved, so.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you very much. Molly, you asked to
25 be next.

26 MS. McCAMMON: Well, I guess what I was driving at in my

1 questions to Chuck is that, what -- I'm not sure what the
2 requirements are under federal law, and whether the level of
3 consultation is, you know, at this level, or at this level, and I
4 -- I don't know if I really care necessarily what the federal law
5 says, because I think the consultation should be at this level no
6 matter if the federal law requires it, or not. And, I guess what
7 I was asking is there a way of strengthening that, that we can say
8 in here that it's absolutely required as part of this project that
9 a certain, you know, an X amount of level of consultation that this
10 be incorporated into the project and be so integrated into the
11 project that this project cannot go forward without it, and if
12 that's something that you think is -- would be of value?

13 MR. TOTEMOFF: Okay, it's been a few years since I've
14 brushed up on my laws, federal and state laws, you know, as far as
15 the government's are obligated to, you know, I've done this early
16 on when the Trustee Council first started, tried to explain to the
17 previous Council. Apparently, they didn't understand it. But,
18 we've got four proposals here now in -- for consideration in FY
19 '96. This is our answer of trying to tell the Council again what
20 we think ought to happen. You'll see in 96152 there's site
21 stewardship among some of the other objectives. There's something
22 else happening, and it would be archeology stewardship. We don't
23 know what that means, you know, what -- they're going to get some
24 volunteers in some areas, you know. In our project we were going
25 to actively train these people and actually utilize them on our
26 sites. It's the -- it goes on and on with the other three

1 projects, you know. We've got a plan here, you know, that we think
2 works. Now, I understand after some discussion about knocking
3 three projects and going with one project, 96154, for some amount
4 that's to be determined or modified later. Is that right?

5 MS. McCAMMON: That's the preliminary recommendation of
6 the -- on the repository issue is just to continue further planning
7 on it and refine.

8 MR. TOTEMOFF: Yeah, I can see a lot of work has -- a lot
9 of work and thought has been gone to these proposals. This is
10 probably an accumulation for the last several years. It's finally
11 gotten to a point where we're getting it down on paper. Now, we
12 may not have it to a point of where it's perfect and to the point
13 of where the U.S. would like to see it, and it's, you know, and how
14 it fits into the restoration language, but I think the basic
15 concepts are there. You know, I'd encourage you to continue
16 working on it, possibly, you know. I don't know if a \$125,000 is
17 going to be enough to accomplish that.

18 MS. McCAMMON: Right, and I think in the recommendation
19 that we have here that we said that, that we'll review and see if
20 that is (indiscernible - simultaneous talking).

21 MR. TOTEMOFF: I think you're going find that these
22 projects, when you get done with your planning project there, are
23 going to be the ones that we're going to continue to push, and
24 whether they happen with entirely Trustee Council monies or other
25 monies, you know, that remains to be seen, but I think it's all
26 going to fall in place here. You know, it -- these proposals

1 aren't something we just dreamed up, you know, it's been done with
2 consultation with the entire region, and their leaders.

3 MS. McCAMMON: Right, and I think the Trustee Council, I
4 think all of the Trustees respect that position also.

5 MR. McCORKLE: Martha.

6 MS. VLASOFF: Especially as it relates to increasing the
7 public access, or you know, recreational access to Prince William
8 Sound. It just makes sense to -- to have local monitors, you know,
9 out there, you know, the people that live out there go ahead and
10 have them trained to watch these sites, because as they -- I know
11 Prince William Sound tourism is on the rise, and we'll have more
12 and more people coming into this area, and as that number of people
13 increases, then the, you know, there's a possibility for more
14 vandalism or looting, you know, also, and I -- I would really like
15 to see more training in our communities. You know, there is -- you
16 know, even from the submission of these proposals, you can tell
17 there is major concern in the communities on these issues, you
18 know, and we look forward to working with the Trustees in
19 developing all these concepts.

20 (Dave Cobb and Nancy Lethcoe arrive - 2:25 p.m.)

21 MR. McCORKLE: Yes, Judy.

22 MS. BITTNER: Just to note on the monitoring that
23 although it's the Department of Natural Resources that has
24 submitted -- it's the lead agency on this proposal, that the actual
25 implementation of the monitoring is carried out by a number of
26 agencies, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the

1 National Park Service and Department of Natural Resources, and so
2 although we personally might be knowledgeable about how we carry
3 out those, the Department of Natural Resources, each agency carries
4 out those programs in their areas for those sites on their lands
5 that their responsible for, and have some ongoing relationships
6 with the -- with the communities in their area, and the
7 consultation, which I can't really speak to, although I know in
8 terms of the -- kind of the compliance that should be taken care
9 of, but I know each agency has ongoing relationships with the
10 communities in their areas, and I know like the Forest Service in
11 the Prince William Sound, and I think some of this is incorporated
12 in kind of some broader consultations, as well as some very
13 specific consultation, as well. And, so we can -- well, whatever
14 they pass on, we can pass on as well to the agencies, and as the
15 lead agency make sure that is reflected in the implementation as
16 well as in the reports.

17 MR. MCCORKLE: We may need to assure that lead agencies
18 find a way to take cognizance of local leaders, wherever they may
19 be, to make sure that that communication takes place. We've been
20 speaking about communication a lot of times today, and in a lot of
21 ways, this seems to be another area where we might try and sharpen
22 our communications skills a bit, if we could. I'd like to take
23 just a brief note to welcome to our group two people who I guess
24 have come through the -- the smogs and fogs and all kinds of
25 problems coming up from the south land, Dave Cobb and Nancy Lethcoe
26 are here and we're very delighted to have you. We were afraid that

1 we might have to go without you. We're glad to have you here.
2 We're on page 2 of the agenda, somewhere there after lunch. We
3 have passed through the public comment period, and we're now
4 discussing with Veronica Christman and her cohorts, Judy Bittner
5 and I've forgotten your name -- Doug Reger. The topic of -- of
6 archeology issues. Chip.

7 MR. DENNERLEIN: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, I
8 think that one of the truest statements made is Molly's statement
9 earlier about how this raises a number of questions, and I think
10 they're all good questions to wrestle with and a number of very
11 valuable goals. I would -- I think that the -- I think it's
12 appropriate for the Council to participate in, without a doubt the
13 restoration and protection of archeological resources. Perhaps in
14 a partnership or seed money way in -- in kicking off things that
15 can be sustained. I think there is an element here of, you know,
16 restoration and protection; there is an element here of cultural
17 pride, which is I think very important; there is education
18 elements. What -- I could say both that I'm confused and I
19 understand the situation. By saying I'm confused, it's difficult
20 for me to understand correct, without reading each of these
21 proposals in absolute detail, just exactly what happens. We're
22 throwing here around the terms of training and monitoring, and you
23 know, a pilot project, and a very reasonable -- and it's only three
24 communities, and many good points are being made. I mean, Martha's
25 point that, you know, we don't see the sites the same we do, we
26 don't see this -- so our -- when someone said training, are they

1 training -- who is training -- what human being takes this \$74,000,
2 who trains who? I mean, are -- do we train somebody to handle
3 resource according to a federal regulation? Do we train, when
4 Chuck talks about training somebody to go out on site and be a
5 caretaker or monitor? You know, Martha pointed out and sometimes
6 we don't speak the same language. I -- I think that we're talking
7 about a number of different programs using the same word that means
8 many different things, and I guess I'd only say that, while I don't
9 know that he was a great senator, Ed Hayahacwa (ph), had said once,
10 which I liked for myself, he said, "when someone says it's just a
11 problem of semantics. It means son, you've got a problem." And,
12 I think to be creative about -- I mean to be positive about it, I
13 am convinced that what I'm not confused about is the need for the
14 planning project to be funded, because I think there is a need to
15 really sit down and pull this program together and to -- as to what
16 it means and its different components. I agree completely with
17 Molly, in terms of consultation. Yes, there's absolute legal
18 consultation for being on somebody's land. There's stronger in
19 recent years, repatriation in in-graves act, the repatriation
20 requirement sustains. If you go to an archeological site, you
21 encounter certain kinds of resources. There's a law that kicks in.
22 But, all of that, you know, all of that is to just keep people from
23 doing something horrible, it doesn't make them do something good,
24 the way they should be behaving and I think what we want to set is
25 a standard of, not the basic of the law to prevent damage, but a
26 higher standard of -- of progress and working relationship, so I

1 think we need we need to strengthen the cultural interpretation.
2 I'd like to get an understanding through this planning. For
3 example, how the agencies go -- would they continue this program.
4 Can they work through community, community-based reps, visitor
5 centers out in, you know, the people are talking about cooperative
6 visitor centers in a project I'm involved in -- in Bristol Bay and
7 Naknek in the Alaska Peninsula. What about -- how's that going to
8 be done in Kodiak, and what opportunities are there in -- whether
9 it's Seward, through the Park Service in Cordova, and the Forest
10 Service, because we are in a world where, while this sounds great
11 the transition projects, the truth of the matter is the most
12 popular visitor center in the State Park System is Eagle River, and
13 it would be closed if it wasn't for few volunteers. Because that's
14 the government world we're in. There were fourteen rangers in
15 Chugach State Park ten years ago, there's four. So, we don't have
16 to wait for the new government, it's here, and so, in light of
17 that, you know, reduction, how do we plan a partnership that, you
18 know, that can be ongoing and sustained, and what elements of this
19 are for study and public, and what elements for a community
20 repository, and what, you know, what scale should that be. Should
21 there be something in partnership with the schools, that there is
22 some person trained as a part of a school library, at a local
23 level, or something, which is mostly not for tourists, but for
24 students and the culture. Those are the kinds of things, I think,
25 that I see bringing these together, and we could define the most
26 likely chances for success, and that probably would point us to

1 good sources of funding. I mean as I -- as I mentioned before in
2 the spirit camp that I'm going to go out to in mid-July, I mean,
3 that's funded by, you know Audubon, the Association of Village
4 Council Presidents, the Fish and Wildlife Service, Fish and Game,
5 Calista, and it's a -- more than a stone soup, everybody does
6 pieces of what's appropriate, and it's found its way to continue,
7 and I think out of this planning process we could probably
8 identify, you know, likely ways for these things to continue. I'm
9 very, I've heard enough I think, I'm very interested in hearing a
10 lot a more this afternoon, but I've heard enough to convince me
11 already that we're going to frustrate people, including whether
12 it's me or Chuck or Martha, whatever, because I'm not even sure
13 that when we use the same word we mean the same thing, and I think
14 that's where really getting a project to pull these together will
15 help us define just what it is that we mean. I think that's what
16 I've heard so far, that's probably the most important thing, if
17 we're going to do an incredible job through the Council playing a
18 role in archeological protection and cultural environments.

19 MS. CHRISTMAN: I -- Mr. Chairman.

20 MR. McCORKLE: Yes, Veronica.

21 MS. CHRISTMAN: I'd love to respond to Chip, if I may.

22 MR. McCORKLE: Please, we seldom have such eloquence, it
23 deserves a response.

24 MS. CHRISTMAN: You're absolutely right, that in this
25 discussion we did use shorthand terms, but the two projects that
26 address training dealt with it in very different ways. They were

1 totally different projects. The one area of overlap was site
2 stewardship. So, that was probably why we confused things. The
3 one project that is recommended to proceed, recommended for funding
4 from the Trustee Council, deals strictly with a site stewardship
5 program in three particular areas. The nature of the training is
6 strictly to train volunteers to monitor specific sites on public
7 land over a three year period, at which point there would be a hard
8 and fast commitment to transfer this to management by either
9 private sources or within the individual agency program. But,
10 that's what that project is about, that's 149. The other reference
11 to training, all refer to a formal comprehensive training program,
12 much broader, over -- Martha, as I remember it was a four year
13 period of time. It also involved a partnership with a number of
14 different entities. Site stewardship was only one aspect of the
15 training. It also included training for museum workers, and also
16 resource co-management, as I remember. So, it was much broader in
17 scope. One of the concerns, one of the questions we need to deal
18 with, is whether it is wise to invest in training of this sort
19 prior to Council support of that -- the purpose for which the
20 training is to be directed. If the Trustee Council chooses not to
21 fund 96149, and that may occur regardless of Molly's
22 recommendation, if that's the case, then you would have neither a
23 site stewardship program nor training. They're connected together,
24 logistic support and training. On the other hand is the training
25 project, 152 as I remember, were to proceed prior to a commitment
26 to an archeological repository in a particular area of a certain

1 sort, or whether it be travel exhibit or a school program, then it
2 becomes much more challenging to figure out what it is people are
3 being trained for and what in fact the benefit would be to a
4 restoration. So, the reason there was a difference, I believe, in
5 terminology was that we use training for both concepts. They both
6 involve training, but for much different purposes. So, it is a
7 very complicated issue, right.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Molly.

9 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I -- this is one of those
10 issues that I think we could spend all day and all day tomorrow
11 grappling with these issues, and it's something that we identified
12 this as a major issue in the raspberry book because we said this is
13 something that needs to be addressed this year, and what we've
14 identified here is that the communities have responded back through
15 the proposal process and said, this is very important to us.
16 Here's some ideas and suggestions that we have, but we want you to
17 know this is important to us, hear us, this is important. I think
18 our next step is to take that message and continue on and figure
19 out exactly where we're going with it, and I would suggest if there
20 were a couple of PAG members who want to participate in that effort
21 in the next couple of months, that would be very welcome.

22 MR. McCORKLE: I also would like to hitchhike on that,
23 but I'll come over to Ms. Bittner. Generally speaking these
24 summaries which we get here, have to leave out a lot of the nuances
25 and the important parts and significant aspects of proposals, and
26 so, when shorthand has to be used in the name of space, and also,

1 we have asked don't load us up with a report when we can have a
2 summary, it doesn't mean that the report isn't upstairs and can't
3 be seen, and those of who really would like to should go read
4 those, and we have an open invitation here to participate a little
5 bit more fully. I'm sure there would be many of us who would like
6 to accept that invitation. So, these meetings of necessity can
7 only take ten or twelve hours over a couple days, for a staff, as
8 you've heard probably say today, five people are reviewing certain
9 things, and fifteen more do other things. So, we really do need to
10 dig into some of the details of the projects that are important to
11 each of us, and together, if I do two or three and somebody else
12 does two, three or four, we can come together and bring back
13 things, and it's important that we sort of state that today so we
14 don't overlook the fact that while we do have summaries here, the
15 detail of the project is here, except of those where there are
16 comments that say, I'm sorry but there was no detailed submitted or
17 not of sufficient of great detail, and we've said before many
18 times, don't bring us a half baked pie. You know, if you've got a
19 program, try and put everything in. The fact that it doesn't come
20 doesn't necessarily mean that the proposer has slipped up some way.
21 Maybe the proposal was made before all the facts could be
22 presented. But, the point is we really should do as much reading
23 as possible for those things that are important to us, and I think
24 that those folks that are concerned about the level of
25 communication between landowners and corporations and a special
26 interest, really should help us understand how we can address that,

1 and sort of lead us. Judy.

2 MS. BITTNER: Thank you. Along those same lines is the
3 bigger picture and the specific projects, and I feel it kind of
4 shifting back and forth between kind of comments on the big
5 picture, which we really aren't address here. I think,
6 particularly my comments, and what our understanding here was
7 addressing specific projects which have evolved, you know, over a
8 number of years to come to this specific project, and in relation
9 to the site stewardship project, like looking at the comments of
10 this particular, very small, very modest project, the planning for
11 the site stewardship project was done several years ago. It is a
12 project that has been planned, it is ready to go, and try in a very
13 modest way. I think some earlier projects were much more ambition
14 in comprehensive, and through working with the Council, they said
15 no, no, no, you know, ratchet it down, ratchet it down, and I think
16 what the specific project here on the stewardship is, does not
17 reflect it's full potential, and the full potential in the plan
18 that has been developed, but one that was do-able, affordable and
19 let us -- give us a shot at it, and there may be some things that
20 we can learn that will be useful in the planning in the broader
21 area, and that's kind of where -- the background for that
22 particular project, but might be useful since there are a number of
23 new members on the PAG is a discussion, or possibly with a smaller
24 group, of the bigger picture, because we do enhance that year after
25 year, kind of discussing the bigger picture, and you distill it
26 down with all the various parameters and requirements, down to some

1 very specific projects, then you lose the bigger picture in it, and
2 some of the bigger purpose, but you don't have time to devote to
3 this one particular topic in the big public forum to be able to get
4 into that. For those that have, or just now, you know. stepping
5 into that discussion, and we do like those discussions, and would
6 like to participate those in that with a smaller group and that
7 group might, I think, you know, come back to the broader Public
8 Advisory Group to understand that, because I think looking at the
9 bigger picture with the archeology, which is a difficult one. It
10 makes more difficult, kind of injured resource and how it's -- how
11 it is injured and how you restore something like that. It's been
12 something that we've been wrestling with as a group, not just the
13 agencies, but how do you deal with from the beginning of the oil
14 spill. All those affected in some way have been wrestling with
15 this and continue to do so, and then look at the constraints within
16 the -- the Trustee process, then you end up with -- with some
17 various projects here.

18 MR. McCORKLE: Veronica, may I inquire before we take the
19 next question, how much additional time you'd like to have for your
20 presentation. The only reason I ask is the need to know if you're
21 in the mid-point, or approaching the end, or if you're just getting
22 started, so we can ...

23 MS. CHRISTMAN: We're just responding to questions.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, so we have the bulk of -- what's
25 Reger doing here, is he going to speak at all? Or, he's just a
26 support.

1 MR. REGER: I'm the one that wrote the proposal, and
2 I'm here for technical answer or whatever.

3 MR. McCORKLE: That was really -- I was just teasing, I'm
4 sorry. So, we will continue with questions, and I think Chip and
5 then Martha, and then Gordon.

6 MR. DENNERLEIN: And, this is just a follow up, and I
7 agree, I'd certainly be prepared to move on, but a couple of things
8 I think ...

9 MR. McCORKLE: Very well.

10 MR. DENNERLEIN: ... are important. One, I do think
11 this is a modest project, I think it's directly related to
12 protection and restoration, and I think it's a good one. I think
13 the director's recommendation to fund is a good one. I think it
14 also falls in the category of a -- a good public policy
15 expenditure, to see, your comment to learn from, it's worthwhile
16 being modest, it might expand, there might be other interests, and
17 if you can find some cost effective workable model to encourage and
18 work with stewardship, it has ramifications on -- on public and
19 Native lands across Alaska as tourism grows for archeological
20 resources, I think. For a little bit of money to test a -- the
21 workings of a stewardship volunteer program is a great expense --
22 a good expenditure. I think that the planning is very good, and
23 I'm just going to say that I completely agree with the Executive
24 Director's recommendation there, and I would just add the third
25 point on that, I would roll into that recommendation the added
26 consultation, the standard of consultation and going forward with

1 that, that planning effort really be a sort of round-table planning
2 effort where the agencies, the Native communities, the people in
3 the area get together, as part of that, maybe a little adjunct,
4 this little PAG group can help thing about this that Molly
5 suggested, I think that, that is a good suggestion. What I don't
6 want to see, and I'll be very specific, is that we go forward with
7 recommendations where everybody's pretty happy except Martha and
8 Chuck. I mean, I think that's the wrong answer. Personally, I'm
9 not afraid to say, I think the wrong answer is to go spend several
10 million dollars to build a museum. We don't know operations, we
11 don't know how it fits in, and Chuck's response, I think, was very
12 good and very forthright, which was maybe this isn't all of a PAG
13 project. Well, before we put Chuck in a position, or us in a
14 position, or the Council in a position where we create unhappiness,
15 in which, you know, here we have the people in the region unhappy
16 and everybody else feels like they can't fund it. The time is now
17 to sit down and do that planning, and do it with that higher
18 standard of consultation. If, we did that, I think that is exactly
19 the right way to go forward, and not a moment too soon and it's
20 time to do it, and I think -- that's all I would say, so I do agree
21 with the recommendations there with an added level of consultation,
22 that's being expressed here.

23 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Martha.

24 MS. VLASOFF: I just want to say that's actually kind of
25 been hashed out a little bit. When we did go through the review of
26 each one of these proposals, I fought pretty hard to have 152 and

1 153 deferred, so that we could bring in a team to answer all the
2 questions that were raised by the Chief Scientist, and I guess
3 we're still going forward with a presentation on June 23rd in
4 regards to those questions, and then, as far as 154, the planning
5 project, I made a recommendation that the -- the dollar figure be
6 \$190,000 on that to cover all the -- all of the added components
7 that are going to be involved, and we did get in a verbal assurance
8 on, you know, looking again at this total low budget -- budget
9 number, so, you know, we're going forward with it.

10 MR. McCORKLE: To quote a leading authority, Dr. -- who
11 has, I think, probably was caustically, Chip, who said a program
12 that was not worthy of expanding, is not worthy of beginning. Did
13 you say that, sometime, Chip?

14 MR. DENNERLEIN: No, but I will. (Laughter) I say
15 enough things that don't make sense, I'll take credit
16 (indiscernible - laughter).

17 MR. McCORKLE: Who was next, there was another question,
18 Gordon.

19 MR. ZERBETZ: This may be a more in the nature of a
20 threshold question, but I'm curious with respect to the sites that
21 have been selected for study and, quote, monitoring. Are these all
22 on state lands, federal lands, private lands, and is there any
23 blank -- is there a blanket legal coverage of disturbing -- of
24 artifacts regardless of the ownership of the land?

25 MR. McCORKLE: That's a pretty easy question, I think,
26 can you get that Judy?

1 MS. BITTNER: These are all on public lands as required
2 by the Trustee Council, and there are various agencies, National
3 Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service in state
4 lands, and there are laws protecting those on public lands. The
5 protection on private lands are those dealing with private lands,
6 disturbance of private, as there is no universal protection of
7 archeological sites per se on any land.

8 MR. McCORKLE: And then too, oftentimes the proposer as
9 listed here in the outlines, gives a hint as to where the lands may
10 be, or at least to who has jurisdiction, at that point.

11 MS. BITTNER: And, all these -- all these sites have
12 been demonstrated to have been oiled or damaged in some way through
13 the damage assessment process.

14 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. Yes, Kim.

15 MS. BENTON: I had a question that I know can't be
16 answered today. (Laughter)

17 MR. McCORKLE: Hey, where it (indiscernible - laughter).

18 MR. DENNERLEIN: That's either the microphone or do
19 you see inside of Kim's brain? (Laughter)

20 MR. McCORKLE: Kim is really with it today.

21 MS. BITTNER: Are you AM or FM? (Laughter)

22 MS. BENTON: Yeah, I fell into this.

23 MR. DENNERLEIN: Do you do subconscious
24 (indiscernible).

25 MS. BENTON: My questions, I asked this at the
26 symposium in January, I'm still a little fuzzy on it. I know we're

1 not going to get an answer today, and I don't want to call in legal
2 staff to do, but a some point when you're in a planning process,
3 and you're talking about where monies can be spent and how they can
4 be spent, I'm a little fuzzy on the legal side of it. It was
5 originally my understanding that you could -- the funds, EVOS funds
6 could not be spent on private lands and artifacts that are on
7 private land, and so when you talk about site stewardship and those
8 kind of programs, I think it's real important that we get a clear
9 definition of the legal parameters before, you know, we get this
10 work group and everybody comes up with great ideas, and at the very
11 Eleventh Hour, the lawyers go, well, guess what, it doesn't fit.

12 MS. McCAMMON: I can give you a few of the parameters,
13 and this is one of those areas that's a little fuzzy, but what the
14 lawyers have told me is that the focus has to be on public
15 resources on public lands. However, you can have side benefits, or
16 if it's a small part of a larger project that can have an impact on
17 private resources on private lands. But, the main focus has to be
18 public resources on public lands. But, it can kind of trickle over
19 a little bit to the idea of private, but it can't be the major part
20 of the project.

21 MS. BENTON: So, say a specific site stewardship
22 project on privately held Native lands, would not be allowable
23 under this?

24 MS. McCAMMON: That's my understanding, but if you had a
25 larger type project that maybe was doing a number of sites, and yet
26 there were a few that were also on private lands, and that would

1 probably be more acceptable.

2 MS. BENTON: This could be an added feature benefit,
3 couldn't it?

4 MR. McCORKLE: Is that clear?

5 MS. BENTON: It's real clear.

6 MS. BITTNER: May I answer ...

7 MR. McCORKLE: All right, then Chris. Judy.

8 MS. BITTNER: That the project proposed with the DNR and
9 the Fish and Wildlife Service do target public sites on public
10 lands, in cooperation with the adjacent villages.

11 MR. McCORKLE: Chris.

12 MR. BECK: A related question, kind of sideboards of
13 what's possible, I think repositories may be real valuable to all,
14 I'm curious, you said that was one of your four issues that you
15 were kind of wrestling with. I was curious, I guess, what kind of
16 direction do you feel like is starting to emerge based on your
17 internal conversations, and then specifically, how the Alutiiq
18 Center sort of fits in or sets a precedent for what might be
19 possible in future? Sorry --

20 MR. McCORKLE: We will write you a report, next year.

21 (Laughter)

22 MS. McCAMMON: Well, I think the fact that the Alutiiq
23 Museum was funded and approved by all six Trustees and the
24 Department of Justice, indicates that a repository of that nature
25 is eligible for civil funding. Then you have to go back to what is
26 the purpose. There were -- what is the injured resource, and we're

1 attempting to use a repository as a restoration tool, and what is
2 the scope and the scale of that injury, and what restoration need
3 is still being met. And, I think there is -- in my general
4 discussion with the Trustees and with the attorneys, there is a
5 general feeling that there probably is need for some other kind of
6 a regional facility in another portion of the spill area. The
7 question of local repository is an issue that I think needs further
8 work on how that fits into an overall restoration effort.

9 MR. McCORKLE: So, a regional project may be able to be
10 considered a little more concretely than a strictly local one, and
11 does this in any way come -- qualify in the respects of replacing
12 a resource that cannot be -- that has been permanent lost?

13 MS. McCAMMON: Well, see the justification for the
14 Alutiig Museum was to protect and store resources that were
15 discovered during the spill and the clean-up, and it wasn't
16 considered as a replacement type of project.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, so, but-for the spill we would not
18 have built the Alutiig Museum.

19 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

20 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. Dr. Dennerlein. (Laughter)
21 Are there further comments?

22 MS. McCAMMON: Well, actually they were (indiscernible)

23 MR. McCORKLE: Yeah, it's the late hour, and I think
24 there's probably a need for a little more oxygen in the room. Are
25 there any further questions for this panel before we take a brief
26 recess and move on to ...

1 MS. McCAMMON: How about volunteers?

2 MR. McCORKLE: Volunteers. Would you state the program
3 again?

4 MS. McCAMMON: To assist us in ...

5 MR. McCORKLE: Because, in fact they've only got
6 volunteers.

7 MS. McCAMMON: ... as we move forward in the next month
8 or two months on developing a revised project description for the
9 planning on archeology. Martha.

10 MR. McCORKLE: Martha, you're going to -- it's Martha and
11 Chris, okay.

12 MS. McCAMMON: Chip.

13 MR. McCORKLE: And Chip ...

14 MR. DENNERLEIN: I have a tight scheduled but I could,
15 you know, arrange with phone calls or stop and buy.

16 MR. McCORKLE: You'll try and pop in? Okay. We have
17 three, that doesn't mean that we couldn't have four or five if some
18 of you would like to join in, I'm sure. How do we get
19 communication on this as to how this group might meet. You're
20 going to form a little group sometime between today and tomorrow
21 ...

22 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, we'll contact people, yeah, when we
23 get together.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, thank you very much. Anything
25 further? Then let's give our thanks to this panel, Veronica and
26 Judy and what's-his-name, Doug Reger, for coming along for moral

1 support. Thank you, very much. We'll have a recess for ten
2 minutes, we'll come back at five past three.

3 (Off Record 2:55 p.m.)

4 (On Record 3:10 p.m.)

5 MR. McCORKLE: We'd like to start, we're a couple of
6 minutes already. Okay, folks, let's make a beginning. Those of
7 you who are out in the lobby are invited to rejoin us. Those of
8 you who are in the upstairs, downstairs, or in the ladies chamber
9 are also invited. Dr. Dennerlein is invited to sit down and shut
10 up. Didn't even hear me, bless his heart. (Laughter) Okay, let's
11 get serious, shall we. We're going to begin, not with the
12 discussion of the oiling issues because we have an issue left over
13 from earlier today, that -- showed at 12:30 and Molly was in
14 another meeting at that time, so she is going to begin a discussion
15 of subsistence issues, and we'll insert that on the agenda before
16 the discussion of oiling issues, which may very well be held over
17 to tomorrow. So, be prepared for a discussion of oiling issues
18 either toward the end of day or first thing in the morning. In the
19 meantime, I give you now, your friend and mine, Molly McCammon.

20 MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The subsistence
21 projects that were submitted, there were a number of them, and I
22 can't remember the exact total, but there were about 20 or so. The
23 first priority for restoration and subsistence resources is to
24 focus on the resources themselves, and so, the Trustee Council
25 believes that all of the projects that they are funding for pink
26 salmon, harbor seals, herring, in particular, are subsistence

1 projects, that they have subsistence benefits, because those are
2 resources that are very important to subsistence users. And, I
3 think as we go through the public review process, it would be very
4 valuable to hear from subsistence users and see if they agree on
5 how some of the objectives and efforts that are being planned on
6 those various resources, and the level of funding for them, if they
7 feel that's appropriate. The projects that are specifically
8 classified as subsistence projects fall into roughly three
9 categories, and they aren't organized this way, they're organized
10 numerically as they fall in here, but I think there are three major
11 issues that we really saw a lot of in this cluster. The first one
12 was the issue of harbor seals. There are four projects in here
13 that deal with harbor seal restoration. Harbor seals is an
14 extremely important subsistence resource. There were a number of
15 various ideas on how to approach their restoration that involved
16 community people. One of them was the idea, a proposal submitted
17 by Tatitlek to do a video about subsistence use of harbor seals,
18 and use it as an educational and restoration tool in subsistence
19 communities. Another approach was to have local people to --
20 establish a community-based biological sampling program. Another
21 -- that was two -- a third effort was to continue the kind of
22 cooperation between the agencies and harbor seal hunters,
23 subsistence hunters that was started by the Department of Fish and
24 Game in their cooperative assistance project. And, then the fourth
25 proposal that came in was to support the newly formed Alaska Native
26 Harbor Seal Commission, which was created as a result of that

1 cooperative relationship that has been developed between the agency
2 people and subsistence users. So, we have four harbor seal
3 projects. Another major category within the subsistence cluster,
4 is some form of fish enhancement, a number of fish enhancement-type
5 projects, and these range from the Chenega and Tatitlek remote
6 releases to a number of feasibility studies for possible sockeye
7 enhancement on Kodiak Island to a project in Port Graham, a pink
8 salmon subsistence project, and a clam restoration project. So,
9 there are a number of fish/shellfish enhancement-type projects for
10 subsistence purposes. And, then the third kind of category that
11 there were a number of projects submitted was in the idea of -- on
12 the idea of community involvement planning, and there were a number
13 of proposals there. There were two separate proposals for
14 community knowledge and use -- community involvement and use of
15 traditional knowledge. There was a planning project for Kodiak
16 subsistence resource restoration, a continuation of the subsistence
17 planning that was started two years ago, Prince William Sound youth
18 area watch, which is a local involvement of area youth into
19 research projects, kind of that category. So, that -- there were
20 definitely, when you looked at the subsistence cluster and what was
21 submitted, there was some obvious trends, or, you know, groupings
22 within those projects. If you look at the harbor seals projects,
23 the four efforts, there were a number of really good ideas that
24 were submitted -- we're doing specific tasks, that would be
25 hopefully leading toward eventual restoration of harbor seals.
26 There was -- there was concern about the possibility of directly

1 funding operations of the Harbor Seal Commission, and it was
2 believed that funding operations of a group like that was probably
3 not appropriate for the civil trust funds. However, it was very
4 appropriate to contract out with this organization to do certain
5 functions, and the recommendation that we have in here is to
6 contract out with the Harbor Seal Commission to -- to consolidate
7 the projects and to contract out with the Harbor Seal Commission to
8 do some of the tasks, such as running the community-based
9 biological sampling program and doing -- assisting in the
10 cooperatives, development of the cooperative relationship between
11 hunters and agencies.

12 MR. ANDREWS: Harbor seals extends a considerable range
13 around Alaska. Would this Native Harbor Seal Commission extend
14 like into Southeast Alaska, or we just talking about the oil spill
15 area?

16 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, the commission itself is
17 meant -- is intended to be a statewide commission, but the kind of
18 tasks that the Trustee Council would be funding would be focused on
19 restoration of harbor seals within the spill area. So, it would be
20 very focused, the kinds of things the Council would be funding
21 would be very focused. It's my understanding that the full -- that
22 the commission will be seeking funding elsewhere to do other things
23 in other regions of the state, but the Trustees would not be
24 funding other activities.

25 MR. ANDREWS: Would it take state legislation to
26 establish this Commission?

1 MS. McCAMMON: No, it would not. It's a non-profit
2 that's established as a 501(c)(3) organization.

3 MR. ANDREWS: They're strictly advisory?

4 MS. McCAMMON: Correct.

5 MR. McCORKLE: Pam, pardon me, I was carry on with
6 (indiscernible).

7 MS. BRODIE: I think the problem with harbor seals is
8 the population is crashing, and that we don't yet have a completely
9 clear idea of why, and so it's not clear to me what these harbor
10 seal projects are designed to accomplish with this biological
11 sampling, one, is that designed to try to determine why seal
12 populations are crashing, or is it doing something else, and what
13 about the others?

14 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not a harbor seal
15 expert.

16 MR. McCORKLE: Oh, yes, you are, no.

17 MS. McCAMMON: However, we do have some experts here.
18 Martha, I'm sure you might be able to answer that question, Martha.

19 MS. VLASOFF: Well, what I'd like to say is, if you'll
20 look at Kathy Frost's research proposal in the '96 work plan, she
21 recommends the -- and commends the seal -- the Harbor Seal
22 Commission as a really good community involvement project that the
23 Trustees actually asked for, all kinds of community involvement,
24 and asked the PI's to identify where the proposals would use such
25 community involvement and she identifies the work that she is doing
26 with the Harbor Seal Commission as an excellent tool for her to

1 understand what is happening to the populations of harbor seals.
2 Also, another real interesting thing that I noticed at the work
3 session was -- see the scientists have to take a biopsy or a --
4 they have to take some kind of a sample on a live seal, and -- and
5 all the blood tests and everything they do is on the live seal, and
6 ...

7 MS. BRODIE: So, they don't kill seals?

8 MS. VLASOFF: No, they don't kill the seal.

9 MS. McCAMMON: They capture it.

10 MS. VLASOFF: But, it - it limits what data they can
11 actually have from the -- in understanding why this crash is
12 happening, and the Native hunters are able to take the seal and do,
13 I mean, you know, it's one of the staples of the diet. You know,
14 I understand that there is -- you know, Kathy in the -- the
15 conferences they had with the hunters through subsistence division,
16 they have determined that -- that it would be better to work in
17 cooperation with the hunters on those -- obtaining those samples,
18 I mean, we're already going out there and hunting the seals, so it
19 just -- it makes sense, you know.

20 MS. BRODIE: That makes a lot of sense.

21 MS. VLASOFF: And then if you had them doing -- trained
22 in bio-sampling, you're even further ahead, so it's a cooperative
23 effort, and it really makes a lot of sense.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Martha.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, we do have some people also
26 from the Department of Fish and Game, the Oil Spill Division,

1 Restoration Division, and Subsistence Division, who also are
2 available to answer questions as we go through on some of these
3 specific projects too. There's Joe Sullivan, Dee Hughes, Rita
4 Miraglia, and I'm not sure if that's -- so, if they could either
5 come up here and sit, and then if there's any questions direct it
6 to them specifically, too.

7 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you.

8 MS. McCAMMON: So, the recommendation overall in harbor
9 seals is to consolidate the project and really target -- rewrite
10 them with a very targeted focus on what the tasks would be
11 accomplished under each one. Then, the second kind of suite of
12 projects was the idea of some form of fish or shellfish enhancement
13 for subsistence users, and there are a number of projects here that
14 are continuations of projects the Council started in the past, such
15 as Tatitlek coho salmon release and the Chenega chinook release.
16 These are two remote releases the Council is funding. The clam
17 restoration project which was started as a pilot effort last year,
18 and the recommendation here is to wait until the results of this
19 field season are completed before making a final recommendation
20 because the funding request for this year is quite a significant
21 step up in terms of financial commitment over the long-term. And,
22 then there are a number of new proposals that were included in
23 here, especially in Kodiak, and there were a lot of questions that
24 were raised by these. There was one in particular, the Old Harbor
25 Lagoon project which seemed to have the most promise that follow up
26 -- more follow up will happen on that one. And they will have

1 questions about the Port Graham pink salmon project and I know
2 discussions between the proposer and our staff here are continuing
3 on that, and that's project 225. So, there continues to be effort
4 in the form of -- some form of fish or shellfish enhancement that's
5 very localized for specific communities, specific purpose, as they
6 supplement replacement resources for subsistence user. And, then
7 the third major suite of projects is the idea of community
8 involvement in planning, and this -- the Council had a couple of
9 projects funded the past two years, the past year, for planning
10 with subsistence communities, and was starting an effort to involve
11 communities more in -- in research projects and to take advantage
12 of local traditional knowledge which has the benefit not only of
13 being there year round, but also having generations and thousands
14 of years of past knowledge to build upon. The project that we
15 started this year was a pilot effort. It's gotten underway fairly
16 late in the year, due to a number of circumstances, primarily of
17 finding a way to contract out and hire people in the community. A
18 community group -- Chugach Oil Spill Regional Communities have
19 submitted a competing proposal. The tentative recommendation is to
20 get the parties together and to redraft the project proposals, to
21 really sit down and figure out what the objectives of the projects
22 are, so that they're actually measurable, so we can see -- instead
23 of just go out involve people that we actually have tasks that are
24 really defined and objectives that are clearly defined, and roll
25 into this is the concept of continuing planning and outreach to the
26 communities. And, I would estimate we -- we put kind of a plus

1 number of \$250,000, but I think that's a real fuzzy number until we
2 get something further developed. So, this effort I think is an
3 acknowledgement that this concept is really important and valuable
4 to the communities. The communities want to be -- have a stronger
5 role in this, which I think is very proper and appropriate, and
6 we'll be working with them to develop that in the next few months.
7 So, those are the major overarching issues.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Did you -- when you began, did you say
9 there were four overarching categories, I heard three. Okay, so
10 there were three (indiscernible).

11 MS. McCAMMON: Well, the fourth was that we believe the
12 whole program is actually designed to benefit subsistence users and
13 subsistence resources. All of the efforts on pink salmon, herring,
14 harbor seals in particular.

15 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Martha you have a question.

16 MS. VLASOFF: Well, at the review, we -- we mentioned a
17 couple of -- I mentioned a couple of times that a couple of the
18 sockeye projects might be put in the subsistence category that was
19 proposed 96256 and 96257 because they're identified as increasing
20 the amount of sockeye, and these are both lakes that are by our
21 villages of Chenega and Tatitlek, so I ...

22 MS. McCAMMON: Right, those are being reviewed right now.
23 These are two proposals that were submitted by the Forest Service,
24 South Lake and Columbia Lake, and they're being reviewed now --
25 some additional information is being provided and that very well --
26 has been identified as primarily benefitting subsistence users,

1 then that's what will go into subsistence category.

2 MR. McCORKLE: Yes, Brenda.

3 MS. SCHWANTES: Thank you. I would like to agree with you
4 that all the research projects that are dealing with herring and
5 pink salmon and sockeye are related to subsistence. I would also
6 like to encourage the Trustee Council to look at the PSP project
7 because I know that the people around Kodiak feel that because of
8 the spill, PSP levels have never been so high, and all of sudden
9 they are, and they really feel like its a result of the oil spill,
10 or something has happened after the oil spill. So, I'd like to
11 encourage the Council to look real hard at that project. I think
12 it would -- it would be a lot for a lot of the people who depend on
13 those resources, clams, mussels, and so forth. It might give them
14 some good indicators of what causes PSP, it would -- I think it
15 would enlighten and educate people about PSP and its harmful
16 effects. I think more importantly, it would probably ease their
17 minds or give them some sort of sense of security about the
18 resource and the ability to -- it's on page 28.

19 MS. McCAMMON: It's on page 28, it's project 96212, and
20 this received a good review, an excellent review from the peer
21 reviewers on its technical merits, and I think what -- there was
22 questions as to the development of the chemical assay, and then how
23 it would transition into non-Trustee funding over the long-term,
24 and I think those are questions that are probably answerable in the
25 ... Ernie could you ...

26 MR. PIPER: Well, I just -- there are two aspects of

1 it, the only way they really test work out by killing wildlife, and
2 we like to think of some other way to do it besides killing five
3 mice for every sample.

4 MS. SCHWANTES: There is a new project -- pilot project.

5 MR. PIPER: Right, right, (indiscernible -
6 simultaneous talking).

7 MS. SCHWANTES: For both water algae -- for both ...

8 MR. PIPER: I just wanted to make sure that, Chip,
9 this was not the mice killing one we trying to figure out another
10 way to do, and that's what the project (indiscernible)

11 MS. SCHWANTES: They're trying to sample water actually
12 instead of man feeding it to a mice they're trying to use plankton
13 samples and then teach people in the village of how to actually
14 look under a microscope to see *Alexandrium* which is what causes a
15 PSP bloom, and trying -- its a pilot project that the borough and
16 the bloom are Fish Tech Center are talking about, I don't know if
17 it's related to this at all, have you talked to them, the borough
18 about that?

19 DR. SULLIVAN: No, I haven't. Actually, I would like for
20 DEC to take this one up because their ultimate responsibility is --
21 I work for Fish and Game, and there are aspects of shellfish
22 culture and farming that are important to us that -- the thing that
23 Molly was mentioning is that down the road, if this is successful,
24 DEC would have to pick it up, you know, and it really needs to be
25 geared towards that happening, so it's, you know, that's why Ernie
26 responded a little bit -- they do -- right now test commercial

1 beaches, to my knowledge the don't test any non-commercial beaches.
2 This particular project is looking for not only a new test, but
3 also you want to -- you want to feel comfortable about subsistence
4 resources, and somewhere in the future I think that DEC is going to
5 have to either commit to doing this or not. I mean, that's we are
6 ultimately heading with this project, are we not?

7 MS. McCAMMON: For the borough or the Fish Tech Center,
8 I mean, some entity yes, so, you know.

9 MR. McCORKLE: Rupert, did that answer your question?

10 MR. ANDREWS: Well, I believe that Molly answered my
11 question. PSP is caused by flagia, not by oil, and you know, it's
12 a very tricky thing. It's probably the most toxic biological
13 substance in the world, and you can pick up clams here within this
14 area, and some will have it and some won't, you know, it's really
15 tricky. You have to do a long-term sampling to actually certify a
16 beach.

17 MS. SCHWANTES: May I respond to that.

18 MR. McCORKLE: Yes, Brenda.

19 MS. SCHWANTES: In the eyes of the people who use those
20 resources and being involved in the Oil Spill Health Task Force a
21 few years ago when it was happening, a list of things -- you can
22 talk and tell people over and over and show them, you know, written
23 statements from the toxicology department that, you know, it's this
24 way or that -- it's that way, but perception is reality, and as far
25 as a lot of people are concerned, PSP never existed like it has --
26 like it is now, before the spill, and now it is.

1 MR. McCORKLE: A follow up question, Rupert?

2 MS. BRODIE: Could I ask for a compromise.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Okay, Pam.

4 MS. BRODIE: I think, it's possible, I don't know if

5 it's the case, but it's very possible that what often happens is

6 degradation of the environment makes creatures more susceptible to

7 disease. So Rupe is absolutely right as to what causes PSP, but

8 the villagers might be right that because of the oil spill the

9 clams are more susceptible to the parasite. I don't know if that's

10 true, but it's a possibility (indiscernible).

11 MS. McCAMMON: I also think that a way to restoration and

12 subsistence service here is that they were known subsistence

13 resources that were injured by the spill, and they have affected

14 subsistence consumption of those resources, and that people in the

15 communities, especial in the Kodiak region have gone more -- more

16 so to clams as a subsistence resource, and yet those are presenting

17 a risk. And, so the idea here is looking at clams as more of a --

18 trying to ensure their health and safety as a replacement resource

19 for those other resources that were directly injured by the oil

20 spill.

21 MR. McCORKLE: And then too, as Chuck has helped us

22 understand, and as Brenda just commented, perception is reality,

23 and there has been a need to reassure local populations that things

24 are the way they should be. So, that's a very strong point.

25 Martha and then Chip.

26 MS. VLASOFF: Along those lines, during the review

1 process we -- we mentioned after Ernie had told us about the
2 remediation or the lack thereof, or, you know, the -- as far as the
3 oiled beaches, how it was a real big concern to the people in
4 Chenega because there still remains the oil on those beaches, and
5 there was some discussion about having a conference of this -- of
6 the local residents to discuss these issues, you know, as far as
7 trusting the resources, and, you know, to understand what kind of
8 research has been done, and what kind of work has begun for -- in
9 trying to understand the effects of the oil at this point, or if
10 there is none, or, you know, just reassure the people in the
11 communities -- the remaining oil in the -- in the -- the safety of
12 those subsistence foods. So, I just thought I'd -- I'd bring that
13 up again that, you know, that was one of the things that we
14 discussed that would be funded by the -- I don't know, the process,
15 Molly.

16 MS. McCAMMON: I think we were going to discuss that
17 Martha during the segment on oil and -- in particular.

18 MR. VLASOFF: Okay.

19 MR. McCORKLE: Can that come up again?

20 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

21 MR. McCORKLE: Okay. I feel song coming on. Chip.

22 MR. DENNERLEIN: Well, I -- not a song, but I'm
23 curious, I'm a bi-valve consumer myself.

24 MR. McCORKLE: I noticed.

25 MR. DENNERLEIN: The question I have is, is this going
26 to be an ongoing health testing program, because we may not be able

1 to assure people that clams are safe? I mean, in fact, the other
2 thing that happened in the last four years is El Nino, which is
3 probably the -- largely responsible for -- you know, a good
4 hypothesis is that it doesn't have anything to do with oil, it has
5 to do with climate changes that are -- affect, you know, bacteria,
6 and the question is that that could happen over time, and is this
7 a program that certifies the beach? Is it -- boy, I wouldn't want
8 to go certify and say this is a great clam beach folks, and, you
9 know, three years later El Nino comes back, for now we know that
10 you say four years instead of one, and things change on beaches.
11 That -- that is what happens. And, in real true -- and it's not
12 surprising that people are encountering this more, because more and
13 more people are eating clams, so they will encounter it more. And,
14 too, there have been some climate changes. So, I guess I'm just
15 trying to -- I don't want to falsely give people confidence where
16 what you need is some real careful specific monitoring, it's a
17 health program, and certification program. I can understand it for
18 commercial beaches. But, in Southeast Alaska, for instance, where
19 we both lived, I mean real specific year-by-year local knowledge is
20 a subsistence tradition. I mean, the Tlingits took out Russians
21 from the beach right besides the village because they gave them the
22 bad clam. And, it's -- actually what subsistence is, you knew
23 beach by beach, by area, by cove, and I don't know how we can do
24 that with this kind of program. I'm trying to figure what its
25 purpose.

26 MR. McCORKLE: Well, isn't possible that what can do

1 though is just assemble fact kind of information, and the fact that
2 it might be El Nino and two inches or two degrees more warm water
3 promotes the growth of bacteria, just dissemination of that kind of
4 information could become part of the mix of information that helps
5 local people understand their particular problem a little better.

6 MS. McCAMMON: I think question that Chip raises are
7 valid questions, and that's the reason -- these were the kind of
8 questions we had about the project and that weren't answered
9 specifically in the project description, and for that reason the
10 recommendation was to defer until some of these questions could get
11 answered.

12 MR. McCORKLE: Tell us who you are again, I don't have
13 you ...

14 MS. RITA MIRAGLIA: I'm Rita Miraglia, I work for the
15 Alaska Department of Fish and Game with the Division of
16 Subsistence.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Rita.

18 MS. MIRAGLIA: One of things, I did want to point out is
19 that we are looking at continuing a clam bed restoration project
20 expanding that, and as part of that there is going to be paralytic
21 shellfish poisoning testing. And, this is the project under
22 discussion right now is -- it's a project for developing more
23 economical and simpler testing methods, and that's something that
24 might help in the future with this other project because once
25 you're putting these clams out there, you pretty much need to be
26 able to tell people whether they can eat them or not, and what Chip

1 says is right, recertification will -- it will need to be ongoing
2 thing, and that's the where the issue of future funding comes up.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Karl.

4 MR. BECKER: Yeah, that's one of my ideas. Second, is
5 that I don't see any problem with the Trustee Council funding an
6 interim program to help the people transitions, if indeed they have
7 switched to clams in preference over other subsistence resources
8 they feel that oil has somehow contaminated, but some perfectly
9 health clams elsewhere can have PSP, I think that eventually,
10 fairly quickly, it should be a DEC funded program, just as they
11 fund the program down on Knack Island in the Controller Bay area,
12 where there are monitoring commercial clam beds. I don't see any
13 reason the Trustee Council should take on that role.

14 DR. SULLIVAN: I think one bit of preference we have here
15 is that there are a number of projects that have -- the Trustee
16 Council has funded that are currently in here, but when they funded
17 those projects, such as coded-wire tagging, this is a new
18 technology or new to this area, and -- well, coded-wire tagging,
19 I'm sorry, otolith marking, I'm thinking of -- actually thinking
20 about -- but they're saying, okay, here's this new technology, it's
21 really great restoration tool probably, but ultimately if we fund
22 this, your going to have to take it up and use it as a management
23 tool, same thing as the Kenai sockeye and so forth. So, I think
24 this clam PSP project, is going -- essentially the same way. Well,
25 we'll help you develop the technology, but you have to pick it up
26 and use it later. Would you agree with that Molly, or ...

1 MS. MCCAMMON: Yeah, I agree with that -- that I think
2 that the Council has been very interested in funding either
3 development of some new technology or some new management tool that
4 is benefit in the short-term for restoration and then in the long-
5 term for other purposes. This one seems -- and when we had a
6 meeting with subsistence representatives in Kodiak, it -- people
7 would talk a little bit about fish enhancement, but then they'd,
8 they'd just kind of start talking about PSP again, and no matter
9 how you started hearing the conversation elsewhere, it always came
10 back to PSP, and it became obvious, this is a major concern of the
11 subsistence users in Kodiak. This is their big issue, and we
12 actually encouraged folks, and John French -- I'm sorry John isn't
13 here because he loves this project proposal, and I'm sure he would
14 have a lot of these answers to the questions that we have, if he
15 was here. But, it is dependent also on FDA approval of his
16 chemical assay, and, you know, how long it would take to get that
17 kind of approval, and how -- I mean what -- what is the certainty
18 that they require that -- you know if you -- that this is -- how
19 accurate this is -- I don't know, but there are just a lot of
20 questions, but we just weren't ready to make a recommendation yet.

21 MR. ANDREWS: Well, University of Alaska Marine
22 Institute had a lab in Seward for many years, they spent several
23 millions of dollars trying to find an effective, efficient chemical
24 assay, it's still done, as the gentlemen mentioned back here, mouse
25 units provide mice, and whoever finds that, it's worth a billion
26 dollars. No joke.

1 MR. DENNERLEIN: The mice will be happy too.

2 (Laughter)

3 MR. ANDREWS: It's a much more complicated situation
4 than this project indicates, that's what I'm trying to express.
5 We're talking about a major, major problem here.

6 MS. McCAMMON: It's my understanding that there is also
7 some funding that's been sought, I believe from the Scientific Algae
8 Foundation, so, I don't know if that funding is to supplement this
9 effort or if it's just if that money doesn't come through, then
10 there's some questions there.

11 MR. McCORKLE: Nancy.

12 MR. BECKER: Have to sell my stock in white mice.

13 MR. ANDREWS: No, as a matter of fact, buy more.

14 MR. McCORKLE: Nancy, did you -- you raised your hand a
15 few minutes ago and I didn't get back to you. I apologize.

16 MS. LETHCOE: The discussion has covered the point.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Discussion is covering it. Brenda and
18 Chuck, how is this discussion going with respect to how you view
19 this. What we're hearing is, in spite of almost, the perceptions
20 of local residents, there may be some things we aren't yet
21 addressing the right way, and might not be able to. It may not be
22 El Nino, it may not be the oil, it might be something else
23 altogether. Is there -- would you like to have further comment?

24 MS. SCHWANTES: Just that I feel positive that the Council
25 looked at this project as a worthwhile project. I think part --
26 there are a couple unanswered questions besides who is going to

1 take it over, we don't want to just drop it, we want it to continue
2 on and be, you know, very worthwhile and immeasurable, so I think
3 that's probably the biggest thing that needs to be tackled with
4 Fish and Game, or whoever is taking the lead in this project, so I
5 feel comfortable with the project moving ahead. It's -- we can
6 take a look at that and get a hold of, figure out who is going to
7 take it over.

8 MR. McCORKLE: And right now we're voting to bring on DEC
9 as a partner.

10 DR. SULLIVAN: That's how I'd vote, but that's okay, and
11 I work for Fish and Game. (Laughter)

12 MS. McCAMMON: Good thing he is not at the table.
13 (Laughter)

14 MR. McCORKLE: Gordon, Gordon Zerbetz.

15 MR. ZERBETZ: Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse this
16 particular project if it would in anyway improve the present
17 mollusk program. I was a shellfish grower in Southeastern Alaska,
18 and had to endure the -- the present testing program, which was
19 very, very unwieldy for us to -- at that time we were shipping our
20 specimens up to Palmer to be tested. Our sea ranch was down on the
21 Canadian border, south of Ketchikan, and by the time we shipped
22 them up to Palmer, it was not a very good procedure. Since then,
23 they have changed to another lab. So, okay folks, I would say
24 thumbs down on the mollusk program and thumbs up on anything that
25 might improve it.

26 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, fellow mollusk-ateer. Are

1 there further comments? Yes, Nancy.

2 MS. LETHCOE: I'd like to even further comments on PSP
3 or further comments on subsistence.

4 MR. McCORKLE: The general topic is subsistence. We've
5 specifically focused on PSP recently, but the whole topic of
6 subsistence is open.

7 MS. LETHCOE: I have -- just a question going through
8 the pink book and the June 14th, and I was wondering if someone
9 could give me some clarification on the harbor seal on this. I
10 can't figure out from reading last year's report from this year's
11 report whether the population is declining or increasing now. And,
12 the reason I say that is that 1995 draft says that there were 51
13 percent fewer seals at oiled-changed sites than there were in 1988
14 compared to 11 percent fewer in unoiled sites, and page 59 of the
15 pink book says that harbor seal counts during pupping and molting,
16 which I assume is the same time they were taking the other, say are
17 15 to 20 percent lower in 1994 than in 1989. Is there a table that
18 spells this out, because that sounds more like the declining is
19 starting to go up, or the decline is not as much. I can't figure
20 out what these two statements mean.

21 MR. McCORKLE: Molly, we do have experts here?

22 MS. McCAMMON: As I said before, I'm not a harbor seal
23 expert.

24 MR. McCORKLE: But, you did say we had experts here.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Well, actually we don't have the major
26 harbor seal expert here, but it's my understanding Kathy Frost and

1 Mike Castellini have done -- the two major researchers on harbor
2 seals, and they're -- they're trying to figure out why our harbor
3 seal is going down like this, the overall population level is going
4 down, and so they're looking at -- their counting populations at
5 various times of the year to see, is it pupping, is there a problem
6 at birth, is there a problem with teenagers, is there a problem
7 with adults, is it food, is it oil, all these various questions.
8 And, it's my understanding that they determined it's not pupping,
9 it's not the birth process, but that seems to be healthy when
10 they've done their counts at the pupping time, that seems to fine,
11 so it seems to be later on when they're either young adults or
12 teenagers that the problems seems to be developing. So, that's
13 where you can see some of the different -- numbers.

14 MS. LETHCOE: It sounds like these are both taken at the
15 same time, it sounds like what they found in 1993 there was a 51
16 percent drop compared to 1989, and in 1994 they found a 16 percent
17 drop compared to 1989. That would say to me that the drop is much
18 less and that we're having a recovery. In the way that it's
19 worded, it may be a wording problem -- but, I mean, it's still down
20 compared to 1989, but instead of being down 57 percent, it's only
21 down 20 percent.

22 MS. McCAMMON: We have to check it out.

23 MS. LETHCOE: It just kind of struck me as ...

24 MS. McCAMMON: It's always good to have somebody read
25 those and say this doesn't sound logical.

26 MR. McCORKLE: Your comments are on the record, they will

1 get typed, and someone will look them up, I'm sure, because
2 researchers don't like to have that kind of contradiction with
3 their data, so I'm -- it's a good point you brought up. Joe, is
4 it? Yes, Joe Sullivan.

5 DR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir. My perception is that those
6 harbor seals have not recovered, however, I will get a hold of
7 Kathy Frost, get the answers and get back to you. My perception is
8 that the rate of decline is what we're talking about here, not any
9 -- not necessarily recovery in the -- in the total numbers of
10 harbor seals. I don't think that's happening, but I will check it
11 out and get back with you.

12 MS. LETHCOE: I agree with you, yes. The greatest
13 decline has -- has -- it looks to me slowed significantly, if these
14 two statements can be taken together, and ...

15 DR. SULLIVAN: Right, I think right after the oil spill
16 there was a tremendous decline. There was a rate of decline prior
17 to the oil spill as well, and so what I think we're seeing is a
18 rate of decline that is getting back to the -- similar rate of
19 decline prior to oil spill, but we're still in decline, that's what
20 my perception is.

21 MS. LETHCOE: And, is restoration then going to be -- to
22 stop the decline before the spill or stop the rate of decline that
23 was after the spill, or to try and bring them up to some level of
24 1976, or '74 or '75.

25 DR. SULLIVAN: I'm not sure that we know enough about it
26 at this point to be able to stop the rate of decline. That's an --

1 you know, as far as what is it that oil did, that's one measurable
2 impact. I hope that -- that not just through the harbor seal
3 projects, but through a SEA plan projects and another of other
4 things, we are able to get a better handle on what's causing the
5 decline of harbor seals and a number of marine birds and other
6 mammals, but, for example, one of the questions is, is it the
7 quality of food as well as the quantity of the food. There appears
8 to have been perhaps some prey switching from the high quality
9 fish, like herring for example, to a low quality fish like pollock,
10 and that -- you may have to eat more in order to be at the same
11 spot. You see what I'm saying? And when these -- I don't know
12 that we -- I hope that there will be something coming out of those
13 suite of restoration projects that may help us, and I'm not sure
14 that there will be, but -- what's am I trying to get to?

15 MR. MCCORKLE: I think you've gotten to the end.

16 MS. MCCAMMON: I think we're talking about what is the
17 recovery objectives that we're focusing on here, is it to get back
18 to the level at the time of the spill or before, and I can't
19 remember what the recovery objective we have then in the raspberry
20 book is.

21 MS. LETHCOE: Do you want me read it?

22 MR. MCCAMMON: Yeah.

23 MR. LETHCOE: It says "recovering will occur when harbor
24 seal population trends are stable or increasing," and -- I'm a
25 little bit new to this -- who set these recovery goals? Are they
26 approved by the Trustees, or the scientist?

1 MS. McCAMMON: Well, the recovery goals are reflected in
2 the restoration plan which was adopted by the Trustee Council, and
3 they were drafted by a whole suite of researchers. And, one of
4 things that we've discovered in the last eight months since the
5 restoration plan was adopted, that a lot of the recovery objectives
6 that we put in that restoration plan are pretty general, and
7 difficult to quantify. A lot of that is due to the fact not much
8 was known -- we know more about the spill area now, post 1989, than
9 we ever knew pre-1989 for most species, probably with the exception
10 of some of the commercially harvestable resources, which we have
11 some good numbers on. And, we're going to be taking a look at
12 those recovery objectives again in the next year and continually
13 try to refine them, if we can, and get some better, more specific
14 -- just focus them more.

15 MS. LETHCOE: I appreciate ...

16 MR. McCORKLE: Karl and then Pam, pardon me, go ahead,
17 carry on Nancy.

18 MS. LETHCOE: I just want to say, having -- being new to
19 this -- looking at more carefully than just a casual commentator,
20 I really think that's important, because I had a lot of trouble
21 trying to see how some of the projects meet the recovery goals, and
22 then to ask the questions, how are you ever going to determine when
23 recovery has been achieved, particularly in the harbor seals, and
24 what's restoration, and what goes back to what may be entirely
25 different problems. And, that was -- that was my real concern
26 there.

1 MR. McCORKLE: Karl.

2 MR. BECKER: Is there some measure of the effect of
3 subsistence use on harbor seal population trends?

4 MS. McCAMMON: (Indiscernible)

5 MS. MIRAGLIA: What Kathy Frost did, and repeating this
6 is that it was not her feeling that subsistence harvests were in
7 any way responsible for the decline, but the concern has come it,
8 it has been discussed as to whether -- whether the present harvest
9 level may now impede recovery because the population levels have
10 come down so much, and I don't think that they've really reached
11 any conclusion on that, but it is an issue.

12 MS. McCAMMON: Part of the cooperative harbor seal
13 subsistence project is to work really closely with the hunters to
14 ensure that all hunting practices are done to minimize lost animals
15 and to really try to minimize the effect of any hunting on
16 populations.

17 MR. BECKER: Does that then include any measure of
18 population trends and some way to answer that question as to
19 whether subsistence harvest is having a detrimental effect on the
20 recovery? And, is part and parcel of the same project? If it's
21 not, I would hopefully suggest that it be.

22 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, and that is, I think one of goals of
23 the Alaska Native Harvest Commission as well, because the users
24 have, you know, more of vesting interest in seeing those
25 populations come back than anybody else.

26 MR. McCORKLE: We had a question over here, is it Pam?

1 MS. BRODIE: I just wanted to say I think Nancy has got
2 a very good point about measuring recovery of harbor seals, and it
3 would seem to me that the decline in harbor seals in the oil spill
4 area reaches the same point of decline outside the oil spill area,
5 that we could say it's recovered for both, though damaged, even
6 though (indiscernible) population has declined, but the problem
7 with harbor seals is not the oil spill, it's exacerbating it
8 though. I just think this is an unrealistic measure of recovery
9 from the oil spill.

10 MR. McCORKLE: Well, what would you say is the reason for
11 the decline?

12 MS. BRODIE: If the decline of harbor seals in the oil
13 spill area is moderated to reach the same as the decline of harbor
14 seals outside the oil spill area than it's recovered from the oil
15 spill, and I don't mean to say this in Southeast Alaska, but in
16 southwestern Prince William Sound, nearby places with oil.

17 MR. McCORKLE: And, then what?

18 MS. BRODIE: Then you can, it's reached the recovery
19 goal of the Trustee Council.

20 MR. McCORKLE: It's reached stability?

21 MR. BRODIE: You know, it's become one of them, one of
22 the non-injured species.

23 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I think what this is --
24 raises is this the question of how -- how do you measure, what you
25 measure against, and Rita made a suggestion of measuring it against
26 the rate of decline or the population level in the unoiled area.

1 And, because with so many resources there was no data prior to 1989
2 where they're trying to measure oil spill impact now is measuring
3 at oiled sites versus unoiled sites. And, these are real questions
4 -- they try to match them so they are fairly similar because the
5 real question is to whether you're actually seeing an oil effect
6 there, or whether it's some other environmental factor at play
7 there. Whether one side is -- we know that one side of the Sound
8 is colder than the other side of the Sound, the water temperatures
9 are different. You get winds, you know, all kinds of things could
10 be affecting things. So, things that -- that we may be looking as
11 a potential oil effect, may actually not be. So, that -- some of
12 our recovery objectives are based on recovery will have been
13 achieved when population levels in the oiled side are the same as
14 the unoiled side. Well, that may not be valid. So, you know
15 like, all of this process is a continual evolution of review and
16 more thinking, and more review, and more thinking.

17 MR. McCORKLE: Nancy, you were next and then Chip.
18 Nancy.

19 MS. LETHCOE: There is one aspect of this that I haven't
20 seen mentioned before and attention paid to. I guess I would use
21 the poaching that -- not as a food resource, but as a -- target
22 practice by people out in boats or who live out in the Sound. That
23 certainly was occurring well before the spill, and I think it's
24 still a problem, in certain parts of the Sound. I'll say right
25 now, not near Native villages. And, it's something that I haven't
26 seen looked at and I really would suggest that it be a concern. It

1 may need some type of educational program, or enforcement program,
2 but I think that -- that's something that really ought to be looked
3 at as a -- at least a contributing factor in certain areas.

4 MR. McCORKLE: Could that be a (indiscernible) under the
5 general protocol that would qualify, do you think for study?

6 MS. McCAMMON: Well, I know that ...

7 MR. McCORKLE: ... sort of specialized.

8 MR. McCAMMON: But, steller sea lions, because they're on
9 the endangered list, they're going -- already. But, the National
10 Marine Fisheries Research has done a real thorough educational
11 program of informing people not to shoot or harass or shoot them.
12 And, I think it's one of those cases that too often we do these
13 kinds of educational programs -- too -- too long down the road.
14 Sometimes up front -- more education up front can be beneficial.
15 I think what would be helpful if at the next meeting in July, I
16 think we have get to the more detailed presentation on marine
17 mammals, and we should maybe try to see if Kathy Frost can be
18 available.

19 MS. MIRAGLIA: Kathy Frost is already scheduled for that
20 meeting, pending -- pending some question about a field trip. So,
21 that we're -- so that they're -- she's already been asked by the
22 staff.

23 MS. McCAMMON: But she is like the state expert on harbor
24 seals and she's great, and she would know if you needed answers to
25 all these questions.

26 MR. McCORKLE: Well, bring her on.

1 MR. McCAMMON: She's really good.

2 MR. McCORKLE: Jim King, you're next.

3 MR. KING: Well, the subject of continuing invalid
4 programs hasn't come up yet today, but ...

5 MR. McCORKLE: It's that a subsistence issue.

6 (Indiscernible - simultaneous talking).

7 MR. KING: If you fund a open-ended program, on
8 seals, through some endowed program, you don't have to decide at
9 what point you phase from recovery into enhancement, and you escape
10 this whole problem.

11 MR. McCORKLE: You are so splendid at weaving the dollar
12 back into whatever discussion is taking place. Congratulations.
13 Just a splendid stroke. Thank you, very much. The floor is still
14 open for discussion, the general topic is subsistence issues. Are
15 there questions for Rita or for Joe? If not, we thank you very
16 much for coming to be with us today, and hope that you will hang
17 around maybe for the next day or so, while we continue on. And, I
18 guess ...

19 MS. LETHCOE: Could I ask another question?

20 MR. McCORKLE: Yes, certainly, while we have them here,
21 let's take full advantage.

22 MS. LETHCOE: You're doing the fatty acid studies,
23 aren't you? How proven is that technique?

24 DR. SULLIVAN: How proven is it? I guess, once again it
25 would better to have Kathy here, but I think that -- how to say --
26 that as a measure of general health of the animals, I think it's

1 quite proven not just for harbor seals, but for a number of
2 different as condition factor is the very useful for many different
3 kinds of animals. So, I think on the bullet question, for example,
4 I think what Kathy would tell you is that -- is that in my
5 perception I think the poaching element is probably less than it
6 has been in the past. So, I think she does take that into
7 consideration, but, lipid analysis will say if this animal is
8 eating well or not, is this a problem, and, you know, as Molly
9 said, there are different life stages here where your ability to
10 get to obtain food might be -- you're going to have bottleneck, or
11 you're just not quite big enough or fast enough to catch the right
12 kind of fish. You know, or if -- perhaps its mother seal doesn't
13 have enough high quality, high lipid fish to eat, she may not be
14 able to produce high quality milk. Now, there are a number of
15 different points in there. I think that is -- lipid analysis is
16 very important to help you determine the general (indiscernible -
17 simultaneous talking)

18 MS. LETHCOE: So, you're looking at just for general
19 health not for what should be done, but where (indiscernible)
20 specific food items that ...

21 DR. SULLIVAN: I don't think they're looking at -- for
22 example, they're looking at whiskers of harbor seals to help you
23 determine what trophic level their eating at. As seal whiskers
24 grow -- well as you progress to the year, that seal might be eating
25 different kinds of food. By looking at different parts of the
26 whiskers, you will be able to tell in some manner, what the animal

1 has actually been eating, and it will give you -- it will give you
2 a better fine concept of where the exist on the trophic scale.

3 MR. McCORKLE: Pardon us for the side-by discussion here.
4 There all kinds of opportunities that we could have for meeting on
5 into the night, but we thought perhaps we'd rather not do that.
6 We'll excuse our panel that is here with our thanks. We will take
7 up the meeting, the discussion of the oiled -- the oiling issues
8 tomorrow which will begin with a telephonic report from Bob Spies
9 in California. It's been a hard -- getting that teleconference up
10 technically today, but we hope to have those things solved tonight,
11 so what we can do is go to the next part of the agenda which was at
12 the request of Karl Becker, to talk about future PAG meeting dates,
13 and we might -- we might review that, and then adjourn for the --
14 recess for the afternoon to take up again tomorrow -- remember
15 tomorrow starts at 8:30, does it not? At 8:30 tomorrow so we can
16 get done by noon, we hope. So, Karl let's turn the floor over you
17 to for a little introduction -- oh, pardon me, before we do that,
18 we'll hear from Pam.

19 MR. BRODIE: We do have everyone but John right now, so
20 we might as well the vote before today, too.

21 MR. McCORKLE: Would that -- what ever the wish of the
22 group may be. Chip.

23 MR. DENNERLEIN: (Indiscernible) involved in so
24 everybody, I just feel a little bad about that, and I would be --
25 we put off the vote several times while John was here, and he has
26 made about -- he has about the best attendance record of everybody,

1 he's one of the candidates, and the one meeting he got fogged in ..
2 MR. McCORKLE: Look out, vote him out. (Laughter)
3 MR. DENNERLEIN: And, I guess, it just doesn't feel
4 right to do that, so I just -- for what it's worth, I put that on
5 the table.
6 MR. McCORKLE: Molly.
7 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, may I just suggest, maybe we
8 ought to have a -- two vice-chairs.
9 MR. McCORKLE: What?
10 MR. McCAMMON: Two vice-chairs.
11 MR. McCORKLE: We could draw straws and all be vice-
12 chairs.
13 MR. McCAMMON: For a first vice-chair and a second vice-
14 chair, I don't know.
15 MR. DENNERLEIN: No, I think that is a (indiscernible)
16 MS. McCAMMON: Well, the whole point of a vice-chair is
17 if the Chair is absent, and if John French has a great attendance
18 record, I think it only exceeded by Vern McCorkle, so the chances
19 of a vice-chair ever going to be needed, are fairly remote.
20 MR. DENNERLEIN: I so move.
21 MR. McCORKLE: The motion before us is what?
22 MS. McCAMMON: To have both Martha Vlasoff and John
23 French as vice-chairs.
24 MR. ANDREWS: I ask for unanimous consent.
25 MR. McCORKLE: Unanimous consent has been asked, all in
26 favor say aye?

1 ALL PAG MEMBERS: Aye

2 MR. McCORKLE: Opposed (no response). Opposed, no (no
3 opposition). We have two vice-chairs and they are alphabetically
4 French and Vlasoff. Congratulations to all. Thank you very much.
5 I think this disposes with that rather judiciously. Let us move
6 on, now to the point of future PAG meetings, and Karl you had some
7 ideas.

8 MR. BECKER: I'm afraid to bring it up after that
9 (indiscernible - laughing). No, I just wanted to apologize for not
10 having attended the last two meetings. I certainly aspired to the
11 same record of participation that Vern and John have, but
12 unfortunately, the way the PAG schedule occurs, and I don't know,
13 I may be somewhat a unique situation, but the two meetings that I
14 missed were right in the middle of a field season, and I -- another
15 meeting in July, which is the middle of fishing season, and for
16 residents of the oil spill area, starting in April, the summer
17 begins at a rather fast roller coaster ride that makes it very
18 difficult to pull away from the area to come to meetings like this,
19 and I -- I'd like some sense of the group as to whether or not it
20 would be possible to structure the meeting schedule where it's more
21 favorable to people in the oil spill area, i.e. myself, and
22 possibly others may feel that way. And the other question I had,
23 was whether or not people would feel comfortable doing some weekend
24 meetings. I think that that would be a lot better in terms of
25 employment situation. I've had to take time off that I hope to
26 make up, but nonetheless, maybe that would work better for other

1 people as well, I mean, I'd give up evenings for meetings, I could
2 give up a weekend or two here and there in the course of year,
3 particularly in the summer time.

4 MR. McCORKLE: We certainly would like to have a
5 discussion on it, and I think that your point is -- I was trying to
6 make the meeting times at that accommodate as much as possible the
7 people who live in the oil spill area who have the best viewpoints
8 on things that are going on in their neighborhood, certainly should
9 be considered. So, I -- thank you for bringing that point forward.
10 Can we have some discussion from the group, please? I see. Yes,
11 Brenda.

12 MR. SCHWANTES: I think the only possible way we can
13 restructure the meeting is by changing the proposal date, since it
14 all revolves around that, and going over the proposal, and
15 reviewing and meeting, it all happens during the summer months.
16 You know, it seems like the only way that the date could be changed
17 is by changing the date of the proposal coming. I sympathize with
18 you, I feel comfortable with the way it is right now. I don't know
19 how everybody else feels.

20 MR. McCORKLE: That's a very salient point. Our calendar
21 is so set by when things happen on the master calendar. Other
22 comments? Have you an alternative, an alternate I mean, an
23 alternate person? Would that likely ...

24 Mr. BECKER: I've -- I've tried to get a person in
25 Anchorage and several people in Cordova, and so far, I haven't had
26 any luck on that. I think it's because -- at least in Cordova

1 people wind up in the same situation.

2 MR. McCORKLE: We were there last week and tried to have
3 a meeting.

4 MS. SCHWANTES: Right before a fishing opening.

5 MR. McCORKLE: He would have said, oops, one o'clock, got
6 to go, opening.

7 MR. BECKER: Is there any need to have a PAG meeting
8 say between May and end of August.

9 MS. McCAMMON: As long as the Council is scheduled to
10 take action on the work plan in late August, if the PAG wants to
11 have -- involved in that process. Now, you know, one thing that's
12 different about this year is that -- well, there are two things
13 that are different, and the second plays into it. One, is the PAG
14 wasn't -- this PAG wasn't created until -- the old PAG expired in
15 mid-October, the new PAG didn't come on board until -- what, late
16 March. So, there was a big gap in there where there was no PAG.
17 So, I mean, the PAG have put a lot of focus on a short period of
18 time, where it's normally meetings would be more spread out. So,
19 that's one thing. But, I don't think we can get away from a summer
20 meeting focusing on the work plan. However, the big difference
21 this year is that we really are looking at a long-term commitment,
22 and I think what -- the kind of review we'll be doing next year,
23 there's not going to be a whole lot of extra money to do a lot of
24 new things next year, so we really are focusing on what are we
25 deciding to do for the next three years, and there -- there will be
26 some modification next year, but pretty much the big review is this

1 year. So next year, it will be -- let's see what we started last
2 year and the year before, is it on track, is it still going, trying
3 to meet its objectives, do we need any mid-force collections. If
4 there are some new things that are kind of the result of the
5 planning efforts, those will probably be coming forward, and then
6 we'll always, as part of our invitation say, you know, is there
7 something we're missing, is there, you know, a great idea out there
8 that we've really over looked, so there will still be opportunities
9 for that. But, I think a major part of the effort is now, and we
10 are trying to do a lot more of it, kind of mini-review sessions and
11 planning sessions throughout the winter when people have more time
12 to focus on those, and I think that would be great to have the PAG
13 involved in those kinds of efforts, so ...

14 MR. McCORKLE: Martha.

15 MS. VLASOFF: If Karl wasn't able to come to the --
16 could he participate by teleconference?

17 MR. McCORKLE: Karl, respond?

18 MR. BECKER: Yeah, that was a question I was going ask
19 next was, I don't know what a teleconference call costs, but if you
20 factor in my airfare and my hotel bills, and you -- wouldn't be
21 that ...

22 MR. McCORKLE: That's -- we're paying those? (Laughter)

23 MR. BECKER: ... and meals. That might facilitate
24 either myself or somebody from the community to participate more
25 easily than they would if they had to actually take a day off,
26 actually two days off to do that.

1 MR. MCCORKLE: How would we do that? Would we put like
2 a phone in the middle of the room, and -- or would we all meet
3 upstairs, or -- did the -- the mechanics of that are a little bit
4 sticky.

5 (Aside comments)

6 MS. McCAMMON: Right, you could do a teleconference over
7 here, if possible I need to place the teleconference call -- a
8 conference call. (Indiscernible - simultaneous talking)
9 Legislative Information Office which is possibly up to pay for
10 that. So, it's an additional expense. I think with all these
11 encouraged people to be present just because face-to-face meetings
12 are more effective than teleconferences, but I think that's a
13 really valid point about the problems in the summer season, getting
14 very good participation from (indiscernible).

15 (Indiscernible - simultaneous talking)

16 MS. McCAMMON: If that's something that would improve or
17 assist in that, then that's (indiscernible) I think we should look
18 at it especially for the summer.

19 MR. MCCORKLE: What if say, three or four locations
20 would want to participate in that way, would that then get away
21 from what we ran into last time which was you either have an
22 alternate here or you don't get to vote because of being in person.
23 Doug, you haven't said a word today, this is -- you're on.

24 MR. MUTTER: I'm here to be seen and not heard.
25 (Laughter) As I recall in the operating guidelines that
26 teleconference counts as attendance.

1 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you.

2 MR. BECK: Well, I just had to say that an organization as
3 a page on the world-wide web ought to be able to figure out some
4 way to electronically connect human bodies to conference like that.
5 I mean, if it (indiscernible).

6 MR. McCORKLE: Chip.

7 MR. DENNERLEIN: I think it's been -- if there is a
8 member with a specific problem in time and travels with a crunch in
9 meetings this summer, we ought to try -- we try looking into
10 accommodating. I -- that person -- I think that (indiscernible) I
11 think that face-to-face there is a real benefit, I think exchange
12 is very beneficial and I -- I -- this is tough problem because
13 we're all appointed because in one way or another, we're involved
14 in natural resources, this is summer in Alaska, so -- I mean I --
15 it just a luck of the draw. It's almost a joke, Karl, but I find
16 that I make almost every one of these meetings. The minute we
17 start -- the minute we start selling them out, I figured out, oh-
18 oh, here we go, I'm on another thing, give no chance, and I can
19 appreciate your situation. So, I think -- we could -- I'd like to
20 see or suggest a teleconference be more of an exception than a rule
21 for the crunch time of packing and double meetings during the
22 summer -- this time, but the face-to-face PAG participation is what
23 we really ought to state.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Rupert.

25 MR. ANDREWS: Could we do a combination -- that is --
26 you know for those times and those individual just hook them up to

1 a teleconference to this regular meeting?

2 MR. McCORKLE: Well, I think it's been pointed out --
3 first of all we have the mechanical facilities to do that, at least
4 for few calls. I don't know if we could do for six or eight,
5 but...

6 MR. McCAMMON: Why don't we go ahead and try doing that
7 for the July 27th, 28th meeting, doing that by teleconference.

8 MR. McCORKLE: And, we just need -- apparently we've
9 thought about this before because it's in the policy of procedure
10 so we can do it. And, we accept the philosophy that we want to
11 make it as possible -- or as much as possible we want to have
12 people from the spill area involved, so I think we've got a
13 parameter there, and Dr. Dennerlein has said again that we'd like
14 this the exception rather than the rule, and deal with it later if
15 it becomes a problem, let's just do in the summer while we need to,
16 with the caveat that we really do want to see each of your smiling
17 faces here, if it's possible to do. Do we need any further action?
18 Molly.

19 MS. McCAMMON: MR. Chairman, I don't think we need any
20 further action, we'll just put that into effect. If you want to
21 put on note of warning, we really need a -- we have this kind of --
22 I guess it's kind of a creative tension -- I could describe it as
23 that -- we want to give you the most up-to-date material as
24 possible, which means often you don't get the material until closer
25 to the meeting, so, if you're not here physically, sometimes it
26 means we're going to have materials here that you won't have. If

1 you don't have fax available, we may not be able to get it to you
2 in a timely way. Even if you have a fax available, if it's a 50
3 page document, we may not be able -- there's some of those kinds of
4 downsides to -- you know, there are trade-offs, but it's better to
5 have you listening and participating than not. I mean that
6 certainly the value.

7 MR. BECKER: I appreciate the effort made to
8 accommodate a situation like my own, and I certainly -- what's
9 that?

10 MR. McCORKLE: We want you.

11 MR. BECKER: I certainly don't envision this being any
12 habitual process, it's some kind of expedite that hopefully other
13 people can take advantage of and make this group more effective,
14 because I'm sure I'm not -- I guess if I was the only one here
15 feeling this way, I'd probably would have tabled it.

16 MS. McCAMMON: Dr. Seuss is going to be on channel 16 on
17 the marine radio -- was that?

18 MR. BECKER: I expect to make a marine operator call on
19 the July (Laughter)

20 MR. McCORKLE: Now, that's a way to involve the public.
21 (Indiscernible -- simultaneous talking). You're right we can have
22 a call in show.

23 MS. McCAMMON: Do you think they would really tune it or
24 would they rather hear the radio (indiscernible - simultaneous
25 talking).

26 MR. McCORKLE: They'd rather hear KHMS, being the founder

1 of that radio station. All right, have we dealt with that to you
2 satisfaction Mr. B?

3 MR. BECKER: Absolutely?

4 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you very much. The floor is still
5 open, we have more minutes, and I would like to say that this is a
6 time when I wish we could build this into the agenda in the future,
7 Molly, (indiscernible), like to have a little time on the future
8 agenda where we can just rap with each other, not rap music, but
9 where we can just talk a little bit on general kinds of things
10 that, maybe things we want to have on upcoming agendas, just sort
11 of around the table, (indiscernible), so we've got eight minutes
12 open to us now, so let's just not let them go by, let's do some
13 talking.

14 MS. McCAMMON: Never one to avoid a void --

15 MR. McCORKLE: Write that down.

16 MS. McCAMMON: One of my tasks in the last meeting in
17 April was to work with various members to develop to -- a cost
18 effective agenda -- program for the September meeting, and that, I
19 would just like to report back that, I've not completed that.
20 We've done just -- chats with the (indiscernible) and then the
21 Trustee Council meeting in Cordova, so we will be working with Dave
22 Cobb and with others in the next month and we'll bring that back to
23 you at the July meeting.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you very much. That's a -- probably
25 a part that belongs here. Chip.

26 MR. DENNERLEIN: A comment to Molly, and I guess it's

1 just an observation and maybe not a really big thing, but I want
2 to, one, thank you for passing out this systems development thing.
3 And, secondly, I guess I have to say, it points out one thing that
4 -- and maybe I'm the only one it irks me, but it irks me, it's a
5 \$325 deal, and you know, all the governments going to go and
6 there's going to be everybody in that room that has the bill paid
7 for them, and the public members who are invited to give up their
8 own time for two years are allowed to pay \$325 out of their pocket
9 and come and take time off of work. In some -- it's one of the
10 things -- I mean, inside and outside of government that's always
11 bothered me ...

12 MR. McCORKLE: Full fare.

13 MR. DENNERLEIN: And, that I'd just like to say.

14 MR. McCORKLE: Are there any follow up comments?

15 MR. BECKER: Yeah, I'd like to say, Chip, that you're
16 certainly not alone, and I recall a state agency in this state that
17 I asked for a -- a public participation group to be involved in a
18 particular EIS, sent to me a very similar brochure and suggested
19 that I enroll in one of these seminars to become -- I don't know
20 what the verb would be -- informed consent -- that I develop
21 informed consent or learn how to do so, and I would certainly hope
22 that anybody attending this seminar, whether they do it on their
23 buck or somebody else's, not come away with the idea that this is
24 the way to push forward agency or personal agendas that otherwise
25 would be somewhat difficult in an other -- in a sort of mussy
26 democratic process. I'm afraid that -- that it's got certain

1 earmarks that -- I don't know, maybe I've been through the process,
2 but I appreciate you pointed it out as an opportunity for people to
3 learn something about public participation and whatnot, but until
4 I read the front cover of that, it's directed at agency personnel
5 who have pet projects and are having difficulty getting consent on
6 those projects, and they may not be the kind of projects that need
7 consent. I've said enough.

8 MR. McCORKLE: Oh, but you've just begun the fight.
9 (Indiscernible - simultaneous talking) Well, I think it's an
10 important point too. Looking at it from the years I was in
11 government, I always went to the conferences, it was always paid,
12 so was my council members. The public, however, had to pay, and
13 they got left out, unless we could find a little grant for people
14 along the way, so, your point is extremely well taken, and I think
15 others referred to it this morning when they said the only folks
16 that participate at a certain level of the -- the agency grantee
17 program are the agencies, and I believe that's another aspect that
18 we have to deal with all the time. So, we do need to find a way to
19 do this, and those of you are -- more of a few of us here -- have
20 heard me yell forever, saying don't reduce our budget, expand it.
21 Let's travel more, let's do more, let's send PAG members out to see
22 things and do things. And, of course I was a long ways in the
23 wilderness on that, that didn't get anywhere at all. So, I'm glad
24 to have one more voice here, that's helpful to support the fact
25 that, if we have this much money to spend and we have this many
26 people putting forth an effort for a Public Advisory Group, I don't

1 begrudge a dollar here or there to either have appropriate staff to
2 help us, appropriate tools, or to go and see what we're doing in
3 places. That's a -- that's a minority point. Nancy, you were
4 next.

5 MS. LETHCOE: I was under the impression, did you want
6 to continue on that one first, I don't know. I'm not sure that the
7 Public Advisory Group can do anything about it, but I know that
8 there are apparently going to be two projects on killer whales in
9 Prince William this summer. Both of them will be taking samples
10 from killer whales, one that is funded by the Trustees and one that
11 is going to come out of reappropriating money from the Marine
12 Mammal Lab for the (indiscernible) pictures -- will have somebody
13 up here to also take samples from killer whales, and instead of
14 cooperating and having only one boat going out and taking samples
15 and disturbing the killer whales at one time, these two are not
16 working together, and I understand that the NOAA one was -- had
17 some scientific problems with it, and I'm wondering if there is any
18 way that the Public Advisory Group can -- say something to the
19 Trustees, maybe directly to the NOAA Tustee that certainly there is
20 unhappiness in the tourism industry, that killer whales are being
21 unnecessarily harassed for scientific purposes. We support some of
22 this research, but we don't support duplication and programs that
23 may not be scientifically justifiable.

24 MR. McCORKLE: Do you think Mr. Pennoyer may have a
25 comment?

26 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chair, I think it's very appropriate

1 for the Public Advisory Group to request that this is an issue of
2 concern and they'd like a report back on that, and I'd be happy to
3 do that.

4 MS. LETHCOE: I would very much appreciate it.

5 MS. McCORKLE: We'll just move forward on that on sort of
6 a consensual matter then, if Molly can get sort of get us a little
7 (indiscernible) there. Let's have just a couple of more comments.
8 We'll go to Martha and then to Kim and then to recess.

9 MS. VLASOFF: Actually, mine was on the same lines, I
10 mean, your -- we should get away from addressing the remaining, you
11 know, the resource out there, and I think -- I think that's really
12 an important subject to bring up.

13 MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. Kim, you get the last word.

14 MS. BENTON: Okay, I'm going to back to the seminar.
15 I just have some questions. Being self-employed, these things are
16 a little beyond my reach, but what I'm more concerned about is if
17 you earn \$25, to pay is nothing compared to what the salary of
18 three and one-half days of state personnel and federal personnel is
19 going to be. Is the agency personnel salaries coming from EVOS
20 funds, are those EVOS funded things? I mean, this could really
21 become a big budget item that (indiscernible).

22 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, all we've done is --
23 resource has given several of these training sessions up here, and
24 that happens if there is a sponsoring agency, and they make it
25 known to a group of agencies, and then those folks take advantage
26 of it through whatever source of funding they have as science work

1 training, and always done -- (indiscernible) know to the various
2 Trustee Council agencies, and this could people that are related to
3 oil spill or not related to oil spill, and I don't know
4 specifically, you know, in the specific budget that we have, I
5 don't think there's money specifically identified for training, so
6 I'm not really sure how many oil spill people are participating.

7 MS. VLASOFF: Maybe we could ask how many people would
8 be interested, then if there was a number, you could ask who would
9 be interested in going and then, you know, there might be a number
10 you could work with on that.

11 MS. MCCAMMON: From the Public Advisory Group?

12 MR. MCCORKLE: Perhaps we can put the answer to that
13 question over until tomorrow. And, tomorrow we'll open up at 8:30
14 with Dr. Spies, Loeffler and Ms. McCammon on the bill.

15 MS. MCCAMMON: So, it -- I think there are two issues
16 here. I mean, the first issue seems to be that the question of
17 price and that there may be a number of PAG members who would be
18 interested in participating, but it's a question of the cost, and
19 whether that cost is either subsidized, I mean, it's either paid
20 for here whether it's appropriate or whether it could be done at a
21 reduced level. And, then I think there is a second issue of what
22 Karl brought up is that, I mean, if there is going to be some kind
23 of training in this, is this the one you want to spend money on.
24 I mean, if there's going to be a question about this particular
25 training. Everything I've heard about this particular training is
26 really good, and, you know, as I've said this is a sounding board

1 and sometimes it would be easier if we didn't give you some time.

2 (Laughter)

3 MR. McCORKLE: We are in recess.

4 (Indiscernible -- laughter -- simultaneous talking)

5 MS. BENTON: But, my question wasn't answered by you.

6 (Indiscernible) pales in comparison to three and a half days of
7 EVOS salary funded time. If you've got ten people who are EVOS
8 funded staff who are attending a program for three and a half days,
9 and those salaries are being paid by EVOS money, only twenty-five
10 bucks for the seminar is nothing compared to three and a half days
11 of staff pay and overtime -- well, I guess, I think if that's an
12 item it needs to be budgeted item like all the other workshops that
13 we ever do. We have a budget for it. This should be something
14 that (indiscernible)

15 MR. McCORKLE: Personnel hours are what you're talking
16 about.

17 MS. BRODIE: Yeah.

18 MR. McCORKLE: Shall I try again (indiscernible -
19 simultaneous talking). Recess until tomorrow at 8:30. Thank you
20 all, those of you here remained. See you then. Bob, be ready.

21 (Off Record 4:32 p.m., June 13, 1995)

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///