

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT TRUSTEE COUNCIL



RESTORATION OFFICE Simpson Building 645 G Street Anchorage, Alaska

TRUSTEE COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Trustee Council Teleconference Meeting

VOLUME III

(Continuation of April 28, 1994 teleconference) (Pages 34 through 55, inclusive)

> May 3, 1994 11:00 a.m.

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS in attendance:

State of Alaska

MR. CRAIG TILLERY
Alternate for Bruce Botelho,
Attorney General, Alaska
Department of Law

State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

MR. JOHN SANDOR, Commissioner, and MR. MARK BRODERSON, Alternate

United States Department of the Interior

MS. DEBORAH WILLIAMS, Alternate for GEORGE FRAMPTON, Assistant Secretary

State Department of Fish and Game

MR. CARL ROSIER Commissioner

United States Department of Agriculture - Forest Service

MR. JAMES WOLFE, Alternate for MR. MIKE BARTON, Regional Forester

United States Department of Commerce - NOAA

MR. STEVE PENNOYER
Director, Alaska Region

TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF

MR. JIM AYERS Executive Director, Trustees Council

MS. MOLLY MCCAMMON Director of Operations

MS. L.J. EVANS Public Information Officer

MR. ERIC MYERS Project Coordinator

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE in Anchorage/via teleconference

MR. DAN SAKURA, Special Assistant to Secretary of U.S. Department of the Interior

CORDOVA LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

VALDEZ LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

KODIAK LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION OFFICE

MR. RICK STEINER

MR. ART WIENER, Alaska Department of Natural Resources

MR. JAMIE LINXWILER, Guess & Rudd, attorney for Eyak Corporation and Sherstone Corporation

MR. TOM GERLACH, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

MR. JOE PERKINS, Guess & Rudd

PROCEEDINGS

(On Record at 11:10 a.m.)

MR. PENNOYER: This is Steve Pennoyer in Juneau, and here with Jim Wolfe and John Sandor and Jim Ayers and staff. This is a continuation of the meeting we recessed yesterday evening, while discussing habitat protection and Eyak lands. I assume that's the only item we have on the agenda for today, Mr. Ayers, is that correct?

MR. AYERS: Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: So, in fact, when we left the meeting last night we had conceptually agreed to some of the aspects of the resolution to send to Eyak regarding the possible sale of lands by Eyak to the Trustee Council. And staff went off, and I understand industriously worked on that last night and this morning, and I guess the appropriate procedure now would be for staff to present us with what they've come up with, and, Mr. Ayers, do you want to lead us through that?

MR. AYERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and just before I do that I would like to verify that everyone of the Council members on line do have a copy of the resolution that was faxed this morning.

MR. TILLERY: Yes.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we do in Anchorage, Jim.

MR. AYERS: Okay.

MR. PENNOYER: Anchorage, you got it okay?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we do.

MR. PENNOYER: Craiq?

MR. TILLERY: Yes, we have a copy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. PENNOYER: Okay, fine, thank you.

Eh, Mr. Chairman, per your direction last MR. AYERS: night, a variety of professional wordsmithers worked over night and early this morning to accommodate the various aspects of the resolution that embody the proposed draft before you for your consideration. Section 1 establishes the specific identification, which we have as approximately two thousand and fifty-two acres, and identified it as a sub-parcel of the Orca Narrows. Narrows sub-parcel is within the spill area, as identified in Section 3, a substantial portion of the Orca Narrows Section 2. area, including the Orca Narrows sub-parcel, is threatened with imminent clear-cutting logging, and the second part of that paragraph establishes that the majority of the commercial timber in the Orca Narrows area is slated for harvest by clear-cutting over Section 4 identifies that the Orca Narrows the next two years. area does include important habitat for several species of wildlife, including those for which significant injury resulted in the oil spill. Section 5 is the language that identifies the particular related laws and regulations that are identified for the protection of various species and identifies that, in fact, restoration, replacement, enhancement measures, in addition to those, are requisite in order to provide adequate protection. Section 6 identifies that there has been widespread public support for the protection of the Orca Narrows, with emphasis on the specific view-shed portion of that and the habitat areas. Section

7 identifies the purchase of the commercial timber rights to the Orca Narrows sub-parcel is an appropriate means of restoration. (Indecipherable) down at the bottom of page 3, again, identifies the legal description of the sub-parcel which is before you today. On page 4, we then begin the subsection of the resolution. identifies that the commercial timber rights are being purchased in perpetuity; (b), that the appraised value will be established by a certified appraiser to be determined and selected by the Trustee Council and, in fact, will be through the Forest Services contract. It also establishes -- establish the appraised value will be determined as of May 1st, 1994. It also provides, per your direction, that we consider the Rainier market cost information prepared in their '94 operations plan on the sub-parcel, and we have been in contact with Rainier. Section (c) -- subsection (c) -- a satisfactory title search and hazardous substance survey will be completed; (d), that there will be compliance with NEPA; (e) that a final purchase agreement will be signed within fifteen days from today. Let me point out -- note, that the Eyak board is anxious to accomplish it as soon as possible and strongly urge that it be accomplished before fifteen days. They are still deeply concerned that they not be left hanging and urged me last night to represent that with regard to this subsection, and I've had a very positive and very supportive response from the Forest Service that they will be working with Eyak to complete that as soon as possible. Section (f), says sellers will be paid fair market value, determined as I mentioned above and subsection (b) that by

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

May -- establish a May 1st value; subsection (a) is identification of your direction as regards to a moratorium consideration -- no commercial timber harvest shall occur in the subject lands noted in our April 28th -- that is an eight -- twoeight -- 1994 -- as a result of this commitment, and that we will pay to Sherstone Corporation dollars for this particular moratorium, and then there is the provision that establishes that if the fair market value of the commercial timber for one thousand board feet exceeds one hundred and sixty dollars that the Council would only pay -- that which is paid would be reduced by one hundred dollars for each one cent over the one hundred sixty dollar The title to the Orca Narrows sub-parcel value -- about. commercial timber rights shall be conveyed to the United States, subject to the following conditions, on page 5, (h) -- there will be no commercial timber harvest on these lands; (i), that once these commercial timber rights have been conveyed that they will remain for that -- the purchase, irrespective of what transpires, and it talks about the title to these commercial rights shall go to the State of Alaska in the event there is a proposal to have them conveyed for other (inaudible). The State of Alaska Department of Law and the United States Department of Justice are requested in the closing -- next to the last paragraph on the bottom of 5, top of 6 -- to immediately, at your request and order and direction last night, to petition the United States District Court to release the trust funds in the amount of two million dollars for the acquisition of said sub-parcel. The last paragraph, at your

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

direction, is the language of the motion made yesterday afternoon, that the Trustee Council stipulate -- sorry -- expresses -- that the Trustee Council views this agreement to purchase as a first step in acquiring the protection for the natural resources that are present on the sellers land, and further appreciates and endorses the view presented in the sellers' letter that they do intend to move quickly on a more comprehensive approach. Accordingly, it identifies that this offer presumes the receipt of a more detailed offer addressing these concerns within the next fifteen days, and I have been assured that that is the case. MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Ayers. Can I have a motion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

and perhaps some discussion?

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I . . .

MR. SANDOR: I move acceptance of the -- resolution as opening the door to (inaudible -- poor teleconference quality).

> MR. PENNOYER: Is there -- second.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: Is discussion questions? there or Commissioner Sandor?

> MR. SANDOR: It's on the table.

Okay. I think that's appropriate at this MR. PENNOYER: time.

I want to commend the (inaudible -- poor MR. SANDOR: teleconference quality) and others who worked on this through the night --

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, we're having difficulty

hearing the Commissioner in Anchorage.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. PENNOYER: How's our speaker phone working? Can you hear Commissioner Sandor?

MS. WILLIAMS: Barely.

MR. ROSIER: I lost John entirely there, Steve.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay, we're move it down and -- no, we won't move it down because it's caught on the table. Why can't we move Commissioner Sandor to the speaker phone.

MR. SANDOR: Yeah.

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can you hear it?

I wanted to commend individuals who MR. SANDOR: Yes. worked on this resolution. I have just a couple of minor questions and points, and with regard to paragraph one, and I would say -actually hope to strike out "extensive" and after -- so that it would read "We, the undersigned, duly authorized members of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, after review consideration of the views of the public, find as follows." Maybe everybody else had an extensive, but I did not, and I was somewhat embarrassed, you know, by the short amount of time, but the -that's a minor point. But, the question that I had is really on item 7 on page 3: "Purchase of the commercial timber rights for the Orca Narrows sub-parcel is an appropriate means to restore a portion of the injured resources and the services they provide in the spill area." I would like to add another sentence, which would read: "This restoration action will be much more effective if the

restoration measures on other portions of sellers' lands, as identified in 4/28/94 Trustee Council letter to the sellers, are also implemented." I just do not believe that, Mr. Chairman, that this protection of this -- package in and of itself literally does much. So, I would formally move that we add that sentence. Again, "this restoration action will be much more effective if the restoration measures on other portions of sellers' lands, as identified in the 4/28/94 Trustee Council's letter to the seller, are also implemented."

MR. PENNOYER: Do I have a second for that amendment?

MR. ROSIER: I'll second the motion.

MR. PENNOYER: Is there further discussion or -- did everybody hear it? I think this sort of reemphasizes what we tried to put in the final paragraph, and I don't -- unless the lawyers see some (extraneous noise) some big change, it reemphasizes our direction in there. Is there any objection to this amendment? (Pause -- no audible response) The -- John, I just want to comment on your -- I don't know if you wanted to change this first paragraph?

MR. SANDOR: I was uncomfortable when I read that "extensive review," and I said, how long have I had this, and I know there's been extensive review of the whole issue over time, but it's really been only after (inaudible -- extraneous noise on teleconference) a trustee hasn't really had extensive review, but that was the reaction. If nobody else is troubled with that, forget it.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess I wasn't troubled by it because the whole issue has had extensive -- extensive -- we saw extensive (inaudible -- extraneous interference on teleconference), but I haven't actually reviewed each piece of it. Particularly, the appraisal and the concept, I think, has been (inaudible) about as much time as we (inaudible -- extraneous interference on teleconference). Are there other amendments?

MR. ROSIER: Steve?

MR. PENNOYER: Carl?

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure, and it was not a subject, I guess, that we discussed yesterday on this, but I don't see within this resolution anything pertaining to the continuation of public access to these lands. Was that discussed by the working group at all or . . .?

MR. PENNOYER: I have no idea. We're buying commercial timber rights in here, not any other easement concepts, so we haven't dealt with other things, a portion of itself.

MR. ROSIER: Is this -- well, I guess my question, Mr. Chairman, is -- is, you know, is this the place? Is this part of the larger agreement or . . .

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROSIER: Or how -- how do they deal with this public access question?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman, Carl, you make a good -- I guess, in our haste to move forward on the imminent threat parcel,

we had not dealt with the public access at this point in time. I was discussed and our intent that this be a part of the larger — that we eventually — with Eyak Corporation. I guess, given the lateness of the hour, I would like to propose that we defer public access on this until we get to the more comprehensive.

MR. ROSIER: Yeah, we --

MR. PENNOYER: Carl? (Pause) Are there other comments on the resolution or on this item?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman? Hello?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: I think, as Jim Wolfe pointed out, that Commissioner Rosier's point as well -- if you can sort of reiterate the lack of the extensive review of this proposal. I wonder if we couldn't mention the fact in that paragraph -- it wouldn't hurt, I guess, and what I hear you say, Carl, that we ought to at least have the word "public access" somewhere?

MR. ROSIER: In -- in paragraph 4, we talk about, you know, we talk about recreational values and tourism and so forth as part of this area on this, and it seems to me that -- that at least some -- a sentence there that references, you know, the need for maintaining, you know, access perhaps to this -- to this -- to the larger parcel that may be considered down the road, and is -- I think we need to flag it there. I with Pennoyer that -- that we kind of looking at purchasing commercial timber rights here, but -- reference it in item 4, but we don't really speak to what rights we're -- we might be retaining there.

MR. PENNOYER: Let me ask you a question. In our April 28th letter, how did we deal with it?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROSIER: I don't have the April 28th letter in front of me here.

MR. PENNOYER: (Aside comments -- simultaneous talking)

If it's in the April 28th letter, it could -- saying something like

"including issues of public access to purchased lands," eh,

highlighted, the -- an expression of your intent.

MR. ROSIER: Yeah, that -- that would perhaps work, but I don't remember the wording out of the -- out of the -- we're running down a copy of that letter at the present time. Jim, do you have a copy of it handy there? Can you answer the question that Steve has raised?

MR. PENNOYER: He's handed it to me, and I'm trying to find it.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. AYERS: Perhaps, I would suggest that -- eh, I have some information. There was a lengthy (inaudible -- teleconference interference) -- with the Eyak president and with the president of Sherstone on Friday at a board meeting of shareholders. They have specific public access language and provision in their comprehensive (inaudible -- teleconference interference) that they're going to provide. (Inaudible -- teleconference interference interference) recommend that we add that -- would either go in -- in paragraph 4 on page 4, page 6, or on both, that

simply states that it isn't the intention of the Trustee Council (pause) (telephonic interference).

MR. PENNOYER: The April 28th letter does say "the Council requests Eyak (inaudible -- teleconference interference) public access to all lands and plus the fee title interest in the United States" (inaudible -- teleconference interference) in more detail. So, perhaps, we're reference the letter -- will be sufficient (inaudible -- teleconference interference) final to apply that particular issue.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fine.

MR. PENNOYER: In essence, take what we had in the April 28, 1994, letter and say in our April 28th letter, including the (inaudible -- teleconference interference). Carl, you raised the issue?

MR. ROSIER: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Probably.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes.

MR. WOLFE: I make a motion we add sentence to reference the access issue per the April 28th memo to emphasize our continuing -- our public access on those areas where we do buy even less than (inaudible -- teleconference interference).

MR. ROSIER: Jim, you're breaking up. I got the first part of your motion there on that, but I couldn't hear -- I couldn't hear your . . .

MR. WOLFE: I just elaborated on the April 28th memo.

1	MR. ROSIER: I see.
2	MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman?
3	MR. PENNOYER: Yes?
4	MR. TILLERY: Oh, okay. Sorry. We've been trying to
5	talk to you for a while. I guess our other speaker is not working.
6	MR. PENNOYER: Should we complete this issue? Do I have
7	a second on the motion?
8	MR. ROSIER: Second the motion.
9	MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion of adding a phrase at
10	the end in that last reference to (inaudible teleconference
11	interference) letter the similar statement as that letter
12	regarding the need for public access on lands (inaudible).
13	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I didn't know if Anchorage
14	wanted to talk about that issue or not. If they don't
15	MR. PENNOYER: I'm asking, is there further comment on
16	this issue? Do you wish to comment on this?
17	MR. TILLERY: No.
18	MR. PENNOYER: Dr. Ayers?
19	MR. AYERS: I don't know you see, there have been
20	considerable discussions with the corporation about this issue.
21	(Inaudible teleconference inference) are going to add in that
22	(inaudible interference) paragraph, including the public access,
23	(interference) ask that we consider adding the (interference)
24	regulation by the landowner.

The April 28th memo has a statement to

MR. PENNOYER: Yes. Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE:

25

that effect, and I would agree that we need to acknowledge the provisions -- right to reasonably regulate their (interference).

MR. PENNOYER: Is that acceptable to the second? Carl?

MR. ROSIER: Yes, it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion of this one amendment? Is there any (inaudible -- interference) to this one amendment? Anchorage, you said you've been trying to talk for awhile unsuccessfully, do you want to make some other statements now?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, could you tell me what the amendment is.

Yes, the amendment simply is in the last MR. PENNOYER: (inaudible -- interference) of the resolution, where it says, says in the final paragraph of sellers' letter of May 2nd in this regard, prepared to move quickly to the more comprehensive approach outlined in our letter of April 28th -- including the need to address the granting of public access to all lands in which less than fee title interests are acquired by the United States, acknowledging Eyak Corporation's need to reasonably regulate uses There's a re-emphasis and/or added this part of -on its lands. re-emphasis of what Commissioner Sandor further added to the earlier paragraph. It goes into the detailed (interference) and then further emphasizes the need for public access. (Pause) That's not a requirement of this resolution measure. This indicates our interest in receiving a comprehensive package, including to address public access.

MR. TILLERY: That's fine.

MR. PENNOYER: Craig, you said you were trying to get in on some other items, do you have further amendments to offer?

MR. TILLERY: No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Sandor.

In that same -- to -- amend the previous MR. SANDOR: sentence in the same section, the last paragraph of the resolution, "the Council appreciates and endorses the views represented -- eh, presented -- in the final paragraph of the sellers' letter of May 2nd." Reading that last paragraph, it reads literally that however even if the Council does not accept this proposal and cutting Orca Narrows occurs in 1994, we remain very interested in pursuing the protection of all other Sherstone and Eyak lands on acceptable terms. We wish you to know how much we appreciate your continued As I said yesterday, the State's interest in this process. interest is in, insofar as this acquisition of fee title and other interests focused on the lands identified in -- in the April 28th letter -- we are not, that is, the State is not, interested in acquiring all Eyak lands. I've interpreted this to mean we remain very interested in pursuing the protection of all other Sherstone-Eyak lands on acceptable terms. I just want the record to reflect that my interpretation of this is in the broadest sense to hope that we can convey to -- to the Eyak and Sherstone that the state

MR. PENNOYER: It was in this one as well.

MR. SANDOR: . . . will supply its supply of timber that would lead to reopening of the Seward mill or these other

things, but I want to be up front about the opposition of the Department of Environmental Conservation that we will not support a proposal to acquire moratorium rights on lands other than those in the core -- in the April 28th letter. If there is some problem with that, we ought to really discuss it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR. PENNOYER: I guess since the April 28th letter was so general, I'm not sure exactly what you mean by that.

MR. SANDOR: Well. the April 28th letter says specifically the -- that are interested in the core areas, the biologically sensitive areas plus the Orca Narrow areas, and then we say that there will be no commercial timber harvesting will occur on corporation lands subsequent -- you know, in the memo itself -- I just don't want a misunderstanding that -- that the State of Alaska endorses the banning of timber harvesting on all Eyak lands, and the two things that I cited in my April 29 letter, and I've discussed this with the Office of Chief of Staff, is that the State of Alaska, particularly after criticism of its Seal Bay purchases and Kachemak purchases on the floor of the Alaska Legislature and its insensitivity to the need for timber supply and the need to harvest insect-killed timber and so on and so forth, the State does not want to be associated with the advocacy of a ban on all timber harvesting on Eyak lands.

MR. PENNOYER: So, you're disagreeing with the last paragraph on page 2 of our letter then?

MR. SANDOR: No, I -- well, I'm just wanting to say that -- if you literally read what's in the last -- the last

paragraph of the Johnson-Borer letter, it says "remain very interested in pursuing the protection of all other Sherstone and Eyak lands on acceptable terms." I don't have any problem with that if you interpret it that that protection does not include, you know, purchases of moratoriums on timber harvesting. So, I took it in the broadest sense, but I don't want to -- to leave this fuzzy.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I think to eliminate Mr. Sandor's concerns, we could cross out the words "and endorses" that would -- if Mr. Sandor believes there's ambiguity in the last paragraph, he may feel uncomfortable in endorsing that ambiguity, and I think the last sentence or the second to the last sentence of our resolution reads fine if we just say "the Council appreciates the view presented in the final paragraph."

MR. SANDOR: I would move that. I thank you, Deborah, really for clearing that up.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would call for the question.

MR. PENNOYER: Are there any further comments on the amendments then, with that one alteration we agreed to? Is there any objection to Commissioner Sandor's suggestion -- I didn't hear it? Okay. Does anybody have further amendments to offer on this resolution? And having called the question, is there any objection to this resolution as amended? (No audible response) The resolution will then be prepared and delivered forthwith to Eyak Corporation within -- when?

MR. AYERS: As soon as we can get the redraft of the

resolution and get your signatures on it. We will advise them at 1 noon today . . . 2 Procedurally then . . . 3 MR. PENNOYER: The resolution . . . 4 MR. AYERS: 5 MR. PENNOYER: Procedurally then, how do we want to handle the response to that resolution, hold another meeting to 6 7 respond? Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that you 8 MR. AYERS: 9 recess and be prepared to respond again, but it's my understanding that the signatories to the resolution provide the authority for 10 11 the United States Forest Service, which is the lead agency, and the 12 cooperating agency, which is the Department of Law, to cut a 13 purchase agreement with the owner, subject to this resolution, and 14 take that purchase agreement and then move forward with the actual 15 appraisal and back to you for the final authorization when all that 16 has been completed. 17 We would recess until that time then? MR. PENNOYER: 18 that what you mean? 19 MR. AYERS: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the reason --20 Mr. Chairman, I would recommend a recess. If I think that we would 21 want to recess until that time, but it also very well may be that 22 the Eyak board will want to communicate with the Council . . . 23 MR. PENNOYER: That's . . . 24 MR. AYERS: . . . sooner than that . . .

MR. PENNOYER: . . . what I had in mind, in case there

25

26

was a further change . . .

1	
1	MR. AYERS: Yes.
2	MR. PENNOYER: that we hadn't anticipated. Okay.
3	Is there further business then for this meeting?
4	MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would like
5	to point out is that I will be leaving for Albuquerque tomorrow, as
6	I think I've previously stated, and so I would very much like the
7	opportunity to sign this before I go. Mr. Ayers, do you need me?
8	MR. PENNOYER: Is George going to be available or
9	somebody then if we are left with a phone in Albuquerque
10	MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we can certainly talk from
11	Albuquerque, and, of course, my office will have the number at
12	which I can be reached. George will also be in Albuquerque, but I
13	was just going to ask Mr. Ayers if he thought the resolution would
14	be ready for signature today?
15	MR. AYERS: Yes, absolutely.
16	Ms. WILLIAMS: Very good.
17	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The problem is getting it to
18	her.
19	MR. AYERS: Deborah, when excuse me, Mr. Chairman?
20	MR. PENNOYER: Yes.
21	MR. AYERS: Deborah, when will you be leaving?
22	MS. WILLIAMS: 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.
23	MR. AYERS: Eh
24	MR. BRODERSON: I will be arriving in Anchorage, probably
25	about 8:15, perhaps we could meet at the airport between flights.

MS. WILLIAMS: Excellent. Let's plan on -- I'll be --

1 well, we can discuss details but . . . (Simultaneous talking) 2 Mr. Chairman, Deborah, what I'd like to do 3 MR. AYERS: is get maybe you and Mark and Walt Sheridan together. Walt will be 4 up there tonight. We'll just figure out a schedule. We'll call 5 you later, Deborah. 6 7 MS. WILLIAMS: Very good, thank you. further business 8 MR. PENNOYER: there for this Is 9 meeting? 10 One thing, Mr. Chairman -- I know this MR. AYERS: 11 belabors it in some way -- I do want to thank people that continue 12 to wordsmith these things. This is a very difficult thing, and 13 people that Maria and the Department of Law and Craiq and Walt and 14 Mark all do an excellent job, and it's no easy task using the 15 English language to construct an arrangement of this sort. 16 MR. PENNOYER: I don't think you're belaboring it. 17 think we owe everybody a set of thanks who have worked on this, and 18 hopefully it is coming to the stage that we're actually going to 19 fly with this and . . . 20 MR. ROSIER: A very excellent piece of work in my view. 21 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, I would like to chime in too. I 22 think the drafters did a splendid job. 23 MR. PENNOYER: Anything further? This meeting will be 24 recessed until it's called again. Thank you. All right? 25 MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Off Record at 11:45 p.m.) (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

CERTIFICATE

STATE	OF	ALASKA	1)	ı
)	SS
THIRD	JUD	ICIAL	DISTRICT)	ı

I, Linda J. Durr, a notary public in and for the State of Alaska and a Certified Professional Legal Secretary, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing pages numbered 36 through 54 contain a full, true, and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustees Council meeting taken electronically by me on the 3rd day of May, 1994, commencing at the hour of 11:00 a.m. at the Restoration Office, 645 G Street, Anchorage, Alaska;

That the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability from that electronic recording.

That I am not an employee, attorney or party interested in any way in the proceedings.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 9th day of May, 1994.

Mada J. Wew.
Linda J. Durr, Certified PLS
Notary Public for Alaska

My commission expires: 10/19/97

