

## EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETIN February 14, 1997 8:30 o'clock a.m.

EXXOR CALVEL UIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Fourth Floor Conference Room 654 G Street Anchorage, Alaska

10

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

## TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

STATE OF ALASKA -DEPARTMENT OF LAW: 13

for the Attorney General STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT MR. FRANK RUE

14 OF FISH AND GAME:

15

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR:

16

MS. DEBORAH WILLIAMS Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary

17 18

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE -

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

MR. JAMES WOLFE for MR. PHIL JANIK Regional Forester

MR. CRAIG TILLERY

Commissioner

Trustee Representative

19

20

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE - NMFS:

(Telephonically)

MR. STEVE PENNOYER Director, Alaska Region

21 22

STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:

(Telephonically)

MS. MICHELE BROWN Commissioner

23

24

25

Proceedings electronically recorded then transcribed by: Computer Matrix, 3520 Knik Ave., Anchorage, AK - 243-0668

1	TRU	STEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT:	
2	MS.	MOLLY McCAMMON	Executive Director EVOS Trustee Council
3 4	MR.	ERIC MYERS	Director of Operations EVOS Trustee Council
5	MS.	REBECCA WILLIAMS	Executive Secretary EVOS Trustee Council
6 7	MS.	VERONICA CHRISTMAN	EVOS Staff
8	MS.	SANDRA SCHUBERT	EVOS Staff
	MS.	CLAUDIA SLATER	Department of Fish and Game
9	MR.	DAN MOORE	Department of Fish and Game
10	MS.	RITA MIRAGLIA	Department of Fish and Game
11	MR.	STAN SENNER	Science Coordinator
12	MR.	BUFF BOHLEN	Chief Negotiator
13 14 15	MR.	BARRY ROTH	Attorney-Advisor Conservation & Wildlife Division Department of the Solicitor
16	MR.	JOE HUNT	EVOS Staff
17	MR.	DAN SAKURA	U.S. Department of Interior
18	MS.	CAROL FRIES	Department of Natural Resources
19	MS.	LISA THOMAS	USGS
20	MR.	ALEX SWIDERSKI	State of Alaska Department of Law
22	MR.	BUD RICE	National Park Service
23	MS.	ANN CASTELLINA	Superintendent, Kenai Fjords National Park
24	MR.	SANDY RABINOWITCH	National Park Service
25	MR.	DAVE GIBBONS	U.S. Forest Service

## TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT (Continued):

MR. BILL HAUSER

Department of Fish and Game

1	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	PAGE
2	Miranda Barrier	18/61
3	Michael Kliemann	19/29
4	Sally Kabisch	20
5	Barbara Seaman	21
6	Richard Tyler	23
7	Julie Baker	26
8	Robert Heinrich	27
9	Laura Johnson	30
10	Mark Luttrell	33
11	Eric Coufal	34
12	Beth Carlson	35
13	Rick Steiner	38
14	Rick Nelson	49
15	John Johnson	49
16	Chip Dennerlein	51
17	Lou Bencardino	56
18	Nancy Michaelson	58
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## PROCEEDINGS

Tape 1 of 3

(On record - 8:30 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I bring this -- or start this meeting. My name is Craig Tillery, I believe I'm continuing chair of this meeting which is continuing from our previous meeting in Juneau. The February 14th, 1997 Trustee Council meeting. With us we have Jim Wolfe representing the Forest Service; Frank Rue representing the Department of Fish and Game; Deborah Williams representing the Department of the Interior. And I believe in Juneau we have Michele Brown representing the Department of Environmental Conservation; and Steve Pennoyer representing NOAA, are you on line?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, we are.

MS. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. What we'll do first is we can look at the agenda, is there a motion....

MS. D. WILLIAMS: So moved to approve the agenda as written.

MR. WOLFE: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motion has been moved and seconded by Jim Wolfe; is there any dissent?

(No dissenting responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. It is approved. The next item would be the meeting notes from December 6th meeting;

do I hear a motion on that?

MR. PENNOYER: I so move.

MR. RUE: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any discussion or

objection?

(No dissenting responses)

approved. What we'll do -- and this meeting is scheduled to adjourn at 1:30, I believe, some of our people here in Anchorage will be trying to catch a flight back to Juneau, so we're certainly going to try to be prompt. We're going to move along pretty quickly. There is a public comment period scheduled for 9:00 a.m., we will certainly anticipate starting that on time and maybe perhaps start it a little early if we get there. So with that admonition or something, Ms. McCammon, you can move into the Executive Director's report.

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think one thing that we do have to be careful of because of the type of teleconference system that we have, if there's any paper rustling up here at the main desk it kind of cuts out for those folks in Juneau, so we do have to be real careful of that.

MR. RUE: Shouldn't give us so much paper.

MS. McCAMMON: One of the first items I did want to bring to your attention as you probably noticed is that

we're meeting for the first time up in the 4th floor conference room and that's because we have vacated the space downstairs as of January 1st. And this is part of our overall effort to reduce administrative costs. And it's actually saving us quite a bit by giving up that space. So I think we'll have this remodeled a little bit to accommodate the meeting and I think it'll work fine for the next few years.

In addition we have moved the office in Juneau also to a smaller location and we'll probably be moving that office once again, quite possibly in the next few months just in an effort to reduce the size of the space and reduce our costs there too.

I wanted to bring to your attention a few things in your packet, the first -- you were handed out to you today, the quarterly project status report and this goes through the status of the report from prior year projects. And then also the status of the FY97 projects, kind of what's currently going on. And if you have any questions about this report over the next few weeks or whatever just be sure to give me a call or Sandra Schubert a call.

You also have a copy of the financial report as of December 31st. I do have from Traci Cramer, the Director of Administration, a report as of January 31st and as of January 31st the total estimated funds available that are uncommitted is 335,000,000 for the next five years.

MR. PENNOYER: Molly, this is Pennoyer.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: The project status report, I'd be very interested in that, but we did not receive it, so I presume you'll fax it down here?

MS. McCAMMON: Well, it's actually about 20 pages long and there are a number of reports that we have here, Steve, we'll probably just send them down with folks going back tonight and have them delivered next week.

MR. PENNOYER: That's fine, thank you very much.

MS. McCAMMON: But we will make sure that you get copies of all of these.

As most of you know we do have an audit currently underway for the FY96 work plan. That is in the final stages of being completed right now. I believe all of the agencies now have seen a draft of it and should be preparing comments and responses to it that will be included in the final audit. We hope to have that completed by March 1st.

There were a couple of comments that the auditors made about the program in general and we've prepared a draft response to those general comments and that's being circulated today, I believe, so the agencies will all have a chance to comment on that and modify it if they like to.

Overall I would say that the audit indicated that,

based on their recommendations last year, the agencies and the Trustee Council responded very well and things seem to be in pretty good order. There don't seem to be any major problems.

One of the other items that the Juneau folks will be getting that's been distributed here is the FY98 invitation, it has a yellow cover this year and this went out this week, a little bit earlier this week. Proposals are due on April 15th, the same day the reports are due from the prior year project. And last year I think we received over 150 project proposals and we anticipate this year probably about the same number. So, again, if you have any questions about that or anything in the next few weeks just give me a call or any of the staff here.

The preparation of this invitation started with our workshop in January, it was held here in Anchorage, we had more than 250 people attend it. There was a three day session, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, which from the comments that we've received back from the public was -- seemed to be an overwhelming success. We had a very dynamic keynote speaker, Dr. Kai Lee, who is head of the Environmental Studies Program at Williams College and in your packet is a copy of the speech that he delivered to the assembled folks there.

It was very thought provoking, I think he raised challenges to the Trustee Council and to the Trustee Council process and I really encourage all of you to read it, I think

it was -- it was definitely a highlight for me and, I think, most of the people there.

1.5

We also had an excellent panel on the three ecosystem projects and then followed that with a panel by a number of agency managers talking about how you apply those kinds of things to ecosystem management on a more practical level. That also was very beneficial.

And then finally as an experiment this year we tried something new and on the last day, on Saturday afternoon, we held a public session that was advertised in the paper, specifically geared towards the public. And it started out with a slide show, just about the overall Restoration Program, habitat acquisition, the research. And then we had eight researcher who talked about their research projects and described them. And for those of you who were able to attend it was excellent, the folks who participated were interesting, they brought tape recordings of bird sounds.

The marbled murrelet researcher brought her assistant, showed how you climbed trees to get to murrelet nests. I brought my kids there and they were fascinated by it. They particularly liked the harlequin duck researcher who had a radio transmitter that demonstrated how the sound of a live bird was dit, dit, dit, dit. And the sound of a dead bird is dit-dit-dit-dit-dit and they thought that was amazing, they were impressed.

But I think this is something we're going to try doing again in the future because it was very popular, we actually -- we had -- the room was crowded, a real nice addition.

The other thing that is part of the invitation and review process is that we're continuing with our reviews, more specific reviews of the various aspects of the program. There was a killer whale review in the fall. The annual workshop was followed by an intensive review of the MVP Project and next week we have scheduled a review of the SEA herring program and also the APEX project. And then following that the week after with the harlequin duck review.

So each year we choose certain elements of the program that need more intensive review than we can achieve from the annual workshop and we bring in special peer reviewers for those sessions and it's really an opportunity to get into detail on those specific projects. And the peer reviews are open to the public, we don't advertise them but they are open to anyone who wishes to attend them.

And finally our last effort that we've been working on is still preparing for the 10 anniversary. We do have the Egan Convention Center rented and are planning a major international symposium at that time. We would anticipate over 1,000 people attending. And we're having additional meetings next week on the first day, a public session and then that would be followed by three or four days of more intensive scientific reports.

So that's kind of a summary, I think, of the major aspects of the Restoration Program in the last two months. Oh, one other item, first fees update. Last week -- this week, earlier this week, getting my weeks mixed up. Earlier this week I flew back to Washington D.C. with Craig Tillery from the Department of Law. We met with the Department of Justice and the court system to talk about the reimbursement of the fees that are charged by the court registry investment system and a waiver of future fees.

If you'll recall, Department of Justice had petitioned Judge Holland to reimburse the tax fees and to waive all future fees. He, in a ruling in January, laid out some information, asked for some additional information in return and basically encouraged the parties to go talk to the court system and see what their thinking was about it. We had a very fruitful meeting, the court system seems very open to the idea of waiving future fees and also seeing about ways to reimburse the past years' fees. So it was a very positive meeting, we're very hopeful that we should hear, by today, the results of that meeting.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there any questions from any of the Council members? Mr. Rue.

MR. RUE: Quick question. Why not advertise the review of the different programs? At least let the public who might be interested know what's going on.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, we actually never considered it. These are very technical reviews. I've personally attended a few of them and after about a half an hour I'm gone, you know, it's way beyond me. They're advertised to the Public Advisory Group, they know about that and often the Public Advisory Group attends. I'm not sure what major interest it would be to the general public for something like that, that would warrant advertising them. But I'd consider it if you think it's a good idea.

MR. RUE: I'm not sure.

MS. McCAMMON: One of the things we have considered is because of the success of the public presentation at the workshop here in January is trying to do a smaller session in some of the area in the spill area. For example, fishermen in Kodiak have invited us to come next year during their com-fish -- I don't know if it's a festival or what exactly it is, commercial fisheries week which is held, I believe, in March or April. But to come next year and do like a day presentation summarizing the results of all of the research studies.

We've been talking with the Science Center in Cordova and with the SEA project about doing something in Cordova.

They do a presentation there about the results of the SEA project but people in Cordova don't have the benefit of hearing about what's happening with the other aspects of the research

program, so we've been talking about that. And I think that has a lot of merit in teaching.

MR. RUE: I think that's a great idea because some of these projects will lead to an understanding of what's going on out in the Gulf that right now is, you know, really interesting to people.

MS. McCAMMON: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. So if there are any members of the public who think that would be -- something that the public would be interested in, they could suggest something like that at the public comment period.

Are there any other questions from Anchorage?
Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: Just to follow up on what Frank was talking about. All the information that's discussed in reviews, that is available to the public, is it not, so if they chose to have the information?

MS. McCAMMON: That's correct, but it's -usually what people are talking about are draft results of data
and lots of technical slides and things of that nature and
they're talking in detail about methodology and results and
kind of where to go. How the project might be modified in the
future, whether it's on track. So the information is provided
publicly, the best way to get it is just the annual reports
from the project.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, there is one area of inquiry that I personally, and I believe the Department of Interior in general, would be interested in seeing either reflected in the 1998 invitation or reflected in discussion about that, and that is the incidental take or potential incidental take of marbled and kittlitz's and murrelets. I'm sure Mr. Pennoyer, in particular, and others are aware in the Bering Sea and other places there's some very creative and productive thinking about how to reduce incidental take of birds and marine mammals. And given that several of these species have not fully recovered, I think it's a very fruitful thing for us to ask for proposals on how to reduce -- first of all to determine whether incidental take is something that is hampering recovery and, if so, how incidental take might be reduced productively and economically.

So I would just like to speak in favor of having that be an issue that -- I would be enthusiastic about proposals coming in for the '98 invitation and work plan.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there any other comments from Anchorage? Are there comments or questions from Juneau?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, this is Steve Pennoyer, I'd like to ask Deborah a question.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess I've concluded your concern, all of our current efforts have been centered around albatrosses and large birds that look for bait on long lines. Most of what you're taking about is probably more gillnet and other fisheries incidents, I'm not sure where you're going to get these proposals from.

2.2

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Well, candidly, Steve, Fish and Wild -- this is a concern that Fish and Wildlife Service has targeted and I think they believe that other people have ideas on this issue. My bringing this up at this time is just to solicit potential proposals or ideas. I do not know precisely what those would look like at this time, but just to see if there is, you know, good, productive thinking on this topic that might be helpful for recovery.

But I agree with you so far in the Bering Sea, in particular, it has been on albatross and other species that are either endangered or potentially endangered. It is possible there could be productive work on this with the species that we're concerned about recovering. And I would just be interested in seeing if there were any proposals that might address this issue productively.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, again, I agree with that, I'm not sure in my mind how (phone cut out) but I think asking would be productive. Her idea was a good idea, so I agree with you.

<b>T</b>	CHAIRMAN TIBERT: THANK YOU. Other comments
2	or questions from Michele or Steve?
3	MS. BROWN: No, thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is that it?
5	MS. McCAMMON: That concludes my report,
6	Mr. Chairman.
7	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. At this time it's
8	about five minutes till 9:00 and I would suggest we go ahead
9	and move into the public comment period. Who do we have on
10	line?
11	MS. McCAMMON: We have the Juneau LIO, do we
12	have Seward?
13	MS. R. WILLIAMS: I don't know.
14	MS. McCAMMON: Is Seward on line?
15	(Pause)
16	MS. McCAMMON: Not yet.
17	SEWARD LIO OPERATOR: Yes, Seward is on line.
18	MS. McCAMMON: Okay. So that's Seward and
19	Juneau.
20	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there any other
21	sites, besides Seward and Juneau on line?
22	HOMER LIO OPERATOR: Homer's on line and one
23	lady that said she wanted to testify (indiscernible - phone cut
24	out)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That's Homer?

1	HOMER LIO OPERATOR: Homer.
2	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is Soldotna on line? I
3	understood there was somebody who was going to be there?
4	(No response)
5	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there anybody
6	besides
7	CORDOVA LIO OPERATOR: Cordova's on line.
8	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I'm sorry who was that
9	again?
LO	CORDOVA LIO OPERATOR: Cordova.
11	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Cordova. Okay. Anyone
12	besides Juneau, Seward, Homer and Cordova?
L3	(No response)
14	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. If any other site
15	if there is anybody out there and we skipped over you, please
16	speak up at some point. Why don't we go ahead and begin with
17	Juneau. Is there anyone in Juneau who wishes to comment?
18	MR. MEACHAM: This is Chuck Meacham, at this
19	point I'm the only one that's here and I don't have anything to
20	say at this point.
21.	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. What
22	about in Seward?
23	SEWARD LIO OPERATOR: Mr. Chairman, we have
24	Miranda Barrier here, she'd like to testify.
25	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. If you would please

be sure that you state your name and spell the last name for the benefit of the person who's transcribing the meeting. 2 MS. BARRIER: Miranda Barrier, B-a-r-r-i-e-r, 3 and I'm an environmental health consultant for the local tribe 4 Outekcak, Outekcak Native Tribe, and I'm testifying for the 5 purchase of English Bay area, we want you to buy it. And that's it, that's the message from us. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much. 8 Are there any question from any Council members in Anchorage? Ms. Williams. 10 11 MS. D. WILLIAMS: I don't have a question, but I just want to thank you Ms. Barrier for testifying today. 12 13 MS. BARRIER: You're welcome. 14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any questions or comments from Council members in Juneau? 15 MS. BROWN: No. Thank you for the testimony 16 though. 17 18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anyone else in Seward who would like to testify? 19 SEWARD LIO OPERATOR: Not at this time. 20 21 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone in Homer who has a comment? 22 23 MR. KLIEMANN: Yes, my name is Michael Kliemann, I'm a resident of Fritz Creek near Homer, I'd like to 24

testify, please.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. Will you 1 please spell your last name? 2 MR. KLIEMANN: Yes, it's spelled 3 K-1-i-e-m-a-n-n. 4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you, go ahead. 5 MR. KLIEMANN: I would like to testify in 6 support of the Trustee Council purchasing the English Bay 7 properties in the Kenai Fjords National Park. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Do you want to give 9 10 us any detail on that or just simply a statement of support? MR. KLIEMANN: Yes, I will expand on that a 11 little bit. I've never been there and (indiscernible - phone 12 cut out) boat and I probably never will get out to the outer 13 14 coast. However, I like to think that any purchases of those inholding (indiscernible - phone cut out) develop into a 15 national park, I think that's (indiscernible - phone cut 16 out) . . . . . 17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there any 18 questions from Council members in Anchorage or comments? 19 (No responses) 20 21 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any questions or comments from Council members in Juneau? 22 23 MS. BROWN: No, but thank you very much for the testimony. 24

CHAIRMAN TILLERY:

Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Kliemann. Is there anyone else in Homer who would like to speak at this time?

2.1

MS. KABISHCH: Yeah, this is Sally Kabishch,
I'm a resident of Homer and I wanted to follow up on the
comments of Michael here and say that I strongly support these
acquisitions in Kenai Fjords National Park. And I have visited
a lot of these areas and it's a wonderful accomplishment and I
congratulate the Trustee Council and the English Bay
Corporation for reaching agreement on settlement here. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you for your

comments. Are there questions or comment from Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any questions or comments from Council members in Juneau?

MS. BROWN: No, but thank you very much for your testimony.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you,

Ms. Kabisch. Is there anyone else in Homer who would like to
speak?

MS. SEAMAN: Yes, my name is Barbara Seaman,
I'm Executive Director of the Katchemak Heritage Land Trust.
First of all I would like to thank you very much for taking all of this effort to preserve and protect Alaska's special lands.
My primary purpose today in speaking to you is to take advantage of a unique opportunity to protect exceptional

intertidal habitats by considering and also approving the purchase of some sensitive lands on the Homer Spit and in Beluga Slough.

2.

I believe each of you has in your possession today an update and the core of an application package requesting acquisition of some very important lands in those two locations. Since the Spit and the Slough are well known as recreational areas, as well as providing unusual rich intertidal habitat for several spill injured species. Although this proposal is new to you I would like you to keep it in mind as you assess future projects. I'd also encourage approval of the English Bay Corporation lands in Kenai Fjords National Park. And as always the Land Trust will encourage you to keep considering and looking towards a positive conclusion to acquisition of Overlook Park (indiscernible - bad tape).

Thanks very much for your attention and Katchemak Heritage Land Trust wishes you well.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions or comments from Anchorage Council members?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any comments or questions from Juneau?

MS. BROWN: No questions. Thank you for the testimony.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. About how

many more people in Homer are there who wish to testify?

HOMER LIO OPERATOR: One more.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Why don't you go ahead. And be sure to spell your last name for us.

MR. TYLER: Am I on?

HOMER LIO OPERATOR: Yes.

MR. TYLER: My name is Richard Tyler and I also live here in Homer and I want to commend you on all these different projects you're doing and I'm very enthusiastic about every one of them, I particularly want you to try to come to some resolution of the problem of the Overlook Park. As you probably know the highway up there is now being redone and the plan to redo the pullouts there and that is probably one of the most famous views in all of Alaska and I think it's very important to get that Overlook Park area and the foregrounds preserved. Thank you.

HOMER LIO OPERATOR: Spell your last name. They wanted you to spell your last name.

MR. TYLER: Oh, my last name is spelled Tyler, T-y-l-e-r.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Mr. Tyler. Are there any comments from Anchorage? Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: I actually have a question for Ms. McCammon. Can you bring the Trustee Council up to speed on where we are on Overlook Park?

1	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Overlook	
2	Park appraisal was reviewed and approved by the government	
3	appraisers and given to the land owner. They had some concerns	
4	about and have submitted some additional information to the	
5	appraiser. In the meantime the appraisal expired, it was over	
6	a year old and so we do have an update on that appraisal	
7	currently under way.	
8	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Other questions from	
9	Anchorage? Mr. Rue.	
10	MR. RUE: What's the timing on the appraisal	
11	coming back? Do you have any idea?	
12	MS. McCAMMON: Ask Carol Fries from the	
13	Department of Natural Resources, she might have a better idea	
14	of the update of the Overlook.	
15	MS. FRIES: (Indiscernible - away from	
16	microphone)	
17	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Could the people on the	
18	teleconference hear that response?	
19	MS. McCAMMON: Probably not.	
20	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Carol, could you maybe	
21	MR. PENNOYER: No, we didn't.	
22	CHAIRMAN TILLERY:come up here, maybe,	
23	and speak.	
24	MS. FRIES: Where?	
25	MS. McCAMMON: Just sit right there.	

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Right there.

Carol.

MR. FRIES: Oh, okay. The updated appraisal has been completed by the appraiser, it wasn't (indiscernible -bad tape) review appraiser, there were some questions that were reflected back to the appraiser and we're waiting for a response from him. He was unable to get to it until the end of January, so I would assume his response would be due very shortly. And then I think probably most of those issues will be resolved.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much,

MS. FRIES: Sure.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Does that answer your question, Frank?

MR. RUE: That's fine, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any questions or

comments from the Juneau Council members?

MS. BROWN: No, thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. And, Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: I just want to thank the people from Homer for their testimony.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. And did that last response engender any more additional comments from Homer?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Let's move on then to

Cordova. Is there anyone in Cordova that wishes to comment?

CORDOVA LIO OPERATOR: Yes. Hold on a second.

MS. BAKER: Yes, this is Julie Baker in Cordova and I just wanted to add a couple of comments to what Molly said about the last annual meeting in January. I, too, and many of the fishermen that were there in Anchorage found the format very interesting. I'm particularly interested in panel exchange (indiscernible - bad tape) resource managers and their resource needs or their management needs. (Indiscernible - bad tape) answered by some of the research that is coming out. A lot of us found that very enlightening as well as very exciting.

I also wanted to suggest that in terms of getting more of these research results opportunities or reveiws out to the public, I think -- some suggestions that were made to me was you can maybe put some of those videotapes of some of those presentations on the Rural Television Network. I know there has been some work on some of the bio sampling that we've seen here as well as other programs and it was suggested to me that some of those lectures that were given in Anchorage could maybe, possibly, if possible, put out on the Rural Television station.

Again, we just wanted to (indiscernible - bad tape)
work that was presented in Anchorage, it was very enlightening
and we just continue the efforts on the Trustee (indiscernible

- bad tape) Trustee staff to continue that kind of outreach.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: All right, thank you,

Ms. Baker. Are there questions or comments from Anchorage

Council members?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or comments from Juneau Council members?

MS. BROWN: No questions. Thank you for your comments.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. Are there additional people in Cordova who wish to comment and, if so, could you let me know how many.

MR. HEINRICH: Bob Heinrich, I'm on line here.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, Bob, why don't you go ahead.

MR. HEINRICH: Yeah, okay. I'm mainly talking about the artifacts repositories and I'm President of the Native Village of Eyak Traditional Council. I'd like to see those artifacts that, you know, were removed from Prince William Sound during the oil spill (indiscernible - bad tape) protected, I'd like to see them returned to the tribes because they were artifacts from our culture.

And our tribe supports scenario one where the artifact (indiscernible - bad tape) repository in every village. We

don't support any (indiscernible - bad tape) repositories if they're -- it means there will not be repositories. And that's about all I got to say this morning and it's raining down here.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much.

Are there questions or comments from Anchorage Council members?

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Bob, this is Deborah

Williams. I have a question about option one, how much do you think it will cost to maintain artifacts in the repository if there were a repository in Cordova and who do you think should

pay for that and if it's the tribe, is that something that you

(indiscernible - bad tape)

MR. HEINRICH: I understand the artifacts that were taken, as I've explained, they're from our culture, I think they should be returned and if somebody is going to (indiscernible - bad tape) maintained to a certain standard then I feel (indiscernible - bad tape) and I believe that we can (indiscernible - bad tape) be ongoing maintenance once we get something put up. I understand there's a court case in Arizona as to who owns the artifacts, you know, on Indian lands, the local cultures, and if that -- depends on how that goes, you know, it'll come out to where that if they win then the artifacts (indiscernible - bad tape) so....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there additional questions or comments from Anchorage Council members?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there comments or 1 questions from Council members in Juneau? 2 MS. BROWN: No, thank you. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you, Bob. 4 there anyone else in Cordova who wishes to make a statement? 5 (No responses) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: All right. Is there anyone 7 8 from any site that's joined us since we started? (No responses) 9 10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there anyone at any of the sites who has come in or as a result of previous testimony 11 would like to make a comment. Please identify where you're 12 from. 1.3 14 (No responses) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. We'll come to 15 Anchorage and then we'll come back at the very end and check 16 17 around one more time. I'm sorry, who was speaking? Please go ahead. 18 HOMER LIO OPERATOR: This is Homer, we have 19 20 another person waiting. 21 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. If they could go ahead and state their name, spelling their last name. 22 23 This is Michael Kliemann again, MR. KLIEMANN: K-l-i-e-m-a-n-n, I'll make it short. I'm from Fritz Creek in 24

Homer. I would also like to support the purchase of the so

called Overlook Park near Homer. (Indiscernible - bad tape)
February, continue along those lines and bring that project to an end.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Kliemann. Here in Anchorage, I believe the first person
that we have signed up is Laura Johnson.

MS. JOHNSON: Up there?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes, just come up here and have a seat and state your name and spell your last name, that would be great.

MS. JOHNSON: My name is Laura Johnson, I am currently employed at Chugach (indiscernible - bad tape) which is the Chugach Region. I hope everyone is familiar with that because that (indiscernible - bad tape) community plan which is on the agenda here. I'll keep this very brief because I know you got a full schedule.

Basically I would just like to urge the Trustees to consider (indiscernible - bad tape) plan, this is a scenario that we debated a lot within our region, there's been a lot of talk and a lot of work in this over the last few years and especially the last year to try to come up with something that would work for the Chugach communities as whole. And we were able to reach an agreement among the communities that this was something that we think can work and this involves a regional repository organization (indiscernible - bad tape) and all of

this is outlined in the plan.

So basically I would just like to (indiscernible - bad tape) I know that there has been a resolution that has been sent in by a number of communities and Chugach Native (indiscernible - bad tape) has a resolution of support for it which I can leave off, I'm not sure if it ever made it over here. (Indiscernible - bad tape) regional organization as well. To help facilitate this I also suggest that -- I know that a number of communities have suggested also that there be additional planning effort involved (indiscernible - bad tape) details in terms of the operation, there's a lot of questions and all of this is outlined in the last few paragraphs -- pages in the report, go through a lot of the steps that are really needed.

(Indiscernible - bad tape) very involved in this process to really make sure we (indiscernible - bad tape) community and that Chugach, and I know we'd be willing to take on this type of (indiscernible - bad tape) and that we continue along those steps.

And if there's any questions on anything related to it, I'm more than happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Wait just a second.

Are there any Council members in Anchorage who have a question or a comment?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any Council members in Juneau that have a question or comment?

(No responses)

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: I wonder (indiscernible - bad tape) operations maintenance cost and other issues would take? MS. JOHNSON: I think we could actually (indiscernible - bad tape) what it is, is we've gone through just kind of a general plan. There's really nothing (indiscernible - bad tape) some support from the Trustees that we continue (indiscernible - bad tape) and so what we're looking at is going back to each community and getting a real detailed (indiscernible - bad tape) what it's going to look like in Seward, that sort of thing. (Indiscernible - bad tape) between four and 10,000,000, that basically that kind of the small (indiscernible - bad tape) this also includes Homer (indiscernible - bad tape) for the Chugach Region it would be about 3.5 million for those (indiscernible - bad tape) up and running basically.

We're also looking into other (indiscernible - bad tape) in all of this, so we're not asking the Trustee Council for everything, we're just really (indiscernible - bad tape) these further details need to be worked out in each community because (indiscernible - bad tape) facilities, other may be

renovating. And I think we just need to get (indiscernible -1 bad tape) And in terms of your question to Bob Heinrich about 2 the operational maintenance (indiscernible - bad tape) and it's 3 like how can this work. I support his view in terms of (indiscernible - bad tape) but I also would like to see these 5 facilities really flourishing, particularly for the 6 communities. I think it's also an excellent opportunity for this archaeological (indiscernible - bad tape), not just 8 artifacts but helping to set up a whole program, you might say, throughout the regional communities. 10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. Any other 11 comments or questions from Anchorage? 12 (No responses) 13 14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Can the Council members in 15 Juneau hear the public testimony here 16 (No responses) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any Council 17 members in Juneau? 18 MS. BROWN: Can you hear us? 19 20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: (Indiscernible - bad tape) MS. BROWN: Yeah, we can hear. Thank you for 21 22 commenting. The last speaker was a little bit (indiscernible bad tape). 23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: 24 Okay. Thank you,

Ms. Johnson. The next person is Mark Luttrell from Seward.

MR. LUTTRELL: My name is Mark Luttrell, that's spelled L-u-t-t-r-e-l-l and I'm the Director of the (indiscernible - bad tape) Kenai Peninsula Environmental Action. Our 150 members are very much in support of the acquisition of (indiscernible - bad tape) and I thank you all for allowing me to speak today.

(Tape malfunction)

Tape 2 of 3

MS. D. WILLIAMS: ....wouldn't mind passing your 100 letters across the Council table here.

MR. LUTTRELL: Sure. Thank you.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Luttrell. Eric Coufal (pronunciation).

MR. COUFAL: Coufal (pronunciation).

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Coufal, sorry.

MR. COUFAL: My name is Eric Coufal, spelled C-o-u-f-a-l, and I'm from Seward. And I, too, am here to express my hopes and desires that you folks will come up with some money to buy back the English Bay properties. I'm a small business owner in Seward, I own a sea kayak expedition company, so my motivations are many. One is that's the area that I make my living and it's a very important piece of property for the state of Alaska, not just because I make my living at it, but it's a crown jewel for coastal Alaska, as well as a crown jewel

for the national park system. And I think we're on the verge of having a pretty big victory in getting some property back for this park and I would be in full support of that. So anything that you folks can do to get that property back into the park's hands, I'm expressing my hopes and desires for.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Mr. Coufal. Are there questions or comments from Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or comments from Juneau?

MS. BROWN: No questions, thank you for the comments.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much.
Beth Carlson.

MS. CARLSON: Good morning, my name is Beth Carlson, it's C-a-r-l-s-o-n and I live in Eagle River. I'm a member of the Alaska Chapter of the Sierra Club and today I'm speaking on their behalf. I'm also making remarks today on behalf of the Sierra Club's Alaska Task Force which is chaired by Dr. Ed Rayburn. First of all I would like to thank you all for completing the acquisition of the Chenega lands, protection of this extraordinary beautiful land and the viable wildlife habitat at the heart of the Nellie Juan Wilderness Study Area has been a high priority of the Alaska Rain Forest Campaign. The Sierra Club and the Alaska Task Force also believe that the

agreement offers the possibility of a very bright economic future for the village of Chenega.

And at this point I would also like to add my own personal thank you for that particular purchase. As someone who spent two weeks last summer kayaking in the area from Port Nellie Juan down to Icy Bay and doing a little bushwhacking on the side on layover days, I have seen how spectacular this area is and I really do appreciate the fact that you realized how spectacular and wonderful that area is as well.

Another high priority for conservationists in Alaska and throughout the country is the coastline of Kenai Fjords National Park. Both the Sierra Club and the Alaska Task Force look forward to the possibility of an offer from the Trustee Council to the English Bay Corporation for the acquisition of approximately 32,000 acres of English Bay Corporation land for Kenai Fjords National Park. Both the Sierra Club and the Alaska Task Force fully support such an acquisition.

The Sierra Club considered this acquisition critical to the integrity of the national park which is very pristine and quite a rugged area. The remote close to the park is wild country filled with glacier carved valleys, waterfalls and hanging glaciers. Kenai Fjords coast lands and marine waters is again, as I'm sure you know, provide habitat for a wide variety of marine mammals, fish and sea birds. And because of this Kenai Fjords has grown into one of Alaska's most

frequently visited national parks. Yet private Native corporations still own 60 percent of the coast, including almost all of the accessible flat land in that area.

1.8

Acquisition of the English Bay Corporation lands will provide additional habitat for many of the species injured by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill which reside in the waters and on these lands. For example, the old growth forest of James Lagoon is home to marbled murrelets and bald eagles, pigeon gullamets\*\* colonies exists on these lands and an abundance of sea otters can be found in the lagoon.

In addition, acquisition of the English Bay Corporation lands will provide increased recreational opportunities for sport fishing, kayaking, which is one of my favorite activities, camping and other outdoor activities. The acquisition will permanently protect access to the Park Service North Arm Nuka Bay public use cabin, which is one of the gems of the entire public use cabin system. Adding these lands to the national park is the first and most important step to making Kenai Fjords whole as a national park. Acquisition will ensure the wild coastline of one of America's premier national parks will be available for future generations.

Sierra Club and the Task Force would like to thank you for your leadership and your perseverance in obtaining this goal. Sierra Club would also like to honor the commitment and the foresight of the English Bay Corporatation for its

willingness to ensure the protection of these lands.

And finally, the Sierra Club and many other conservationalists are delighted that negotiations are progressing once again with Eyak, we look forward to a comprehensive agreement in the future. We are quite pleased with the progress of the Trustee Council in making protection of fish and wildlife habitat in the oil spill area. We do have some concern about the slow pace of the Afognak joint venture project, however, we hope that that will get back on track very soon, despite the delays and other things that have gone on.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Are there questions or comments from Anchorage Council members?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or comments from Juneau Council members?

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much, we appreciate it.

MS. CARLSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Our next person who's signed up is Rick Steiner.

MR. STEINER: Good morning, I'm Rick Steiner, S-t-e-i-n-e-r. I just wanted to briefly make a couple of comments and then ask a question of the general Council. First

of all, thank you for the Chenega acquisition, I think it's by far and away the most significant thing the Trustee Council has accomplished to date, with all respect to the Department of Interior, thank you, Forest Service or State, whoever pulled this one off.

I'd also encourage you to continue in closing the Tatitlek deal and, of course, the Eyak deal it would be nice to have an offer approved on Eyak by the anniversary, that's this anniversary not the 10th anniversary by the way.

And finally -- oh, not finally, the Chugach Corporation lands on Knight Island, I would ask that you either continue or reopen discussions with the Chugach Corporation concerning protection of the Bay of Isles area. That would give pretty much the entire western part of Prince William Sound some degree of protection and I think, as that was clearly the most damaged area, that would be appropriate.

Next, I would ask the Trustee Council become a strong advocate for the excusing of tax liability for these monies that are paid to the Native corporations by the Congress. The Federal government itself has already made 5-600, maybe \$700,000,000.00 off of this oil spill just in personal and corporate income taxes paid by people who worked on the \$2,000,000,000 clean up. And I shudder to think of this Congress getting the notion that oil spills are good for deficit reduction. But certainly the Native corporations

should be excused from any tax liability from these monies that are paid. If the Federal government is asserting they want fee title to the Native corporation lands, then the Federal government should not assert a tax liability of a third or more of these monies that are just paid. There are ways to do that and it would be wonderful if the Council itself would either initiate the process in Congress or at least advocate it once it comes up.

Lastly, I would like to ask -- there's been a number of people who brought concerns to me over the past few months concerning the Trustee Council official position on fee title acquisition and its relationship to conservation easements. I know this has been discussed for years by the Council, previous councils, and even this Council so I would just appreciate a somewhat -- if it's possible, a precise clarification of this Council's position on fee acquisition and why?

Thank you. If possible.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. Are there questions or comments from Anchorage? Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Steiner, or anyone in the room, Council members or Molly, the tax issues, obviously, is a very compelling one. Does anyone know what has happened to date in terms of that.

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. Ms. Williams,
Mr. Chairman, some of the land owners, the attorneys that

represent them have drafted legislation that would have an exemption for the tax liabilities for the trust funds that are established from the funds that the corporations receive. And I think they hope to get that introduced and work through the Congressional session this year, so that is underway.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Just a follow-up.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: I would recommend,

Ms. McCammon, Mr. Chair, that we do have our staffs look at that and be prepared to discuss that at the next meeting.

MS. McCAMMON: About whether to take an official position on it?

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Right.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Mr. Rue.

MR. RUE: I was just going to say the same

thing.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. One comment. I believe I noticed that you had at least sent a letter on some of the ongoing projects, I believe it was on the Whittier Road, suggesting that people look at some of the Council data. Now, I think that's a very important point, I think we have an awful lot of data out there and I think that when any of those major projects are going in this area that it would be well for the Council to start thinking on how we can facilitate getting our information to government agencies in making management

decisions, that is something that I believe is in the Restoration Plan and it's perhaps something that maybe we ought to think about taking it a further step to encourage use of the Council generated information.

Mr. Rue.

2.3

MR. RUE: Mr. Chairman, what sort of thing are you talking about? Can you describe something to me? Like having DOT use information that our scientists have developed when they develop an EIS or design the road?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Well, Rick, maybe you can elaborate on the point that you had made.

MR. STEINER: Well, in their EIS for the Whittier Road they did not -- there was just a casual mention of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill and as you know, they're required to conduct some assessment of a potential accumulative impact of a proposed action. I personally feel that the EIS didn't even approach that sort of comprehensive assessment. They didn't look at any of the information, the several hundred million dollars worth of information generated by the Trustee Council on western Prince William Sound, it would be nice if they had.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Without, you know, making any kind of.....

MR. STEINER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: This one, one way or the

other, when there's going to be a lease sale or something like that. When there is a major project like that it would seem that our data is pretty significant, I mean, it's really what's out there right now and we should perhaps take a role in getting that to government agencies and others, who are undertaking major projects.

Mr. Rue.

MR. RUE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, maybe -- Molly, have you thought about how we might initiate contact, because it's probably going to be -- some of the agencies, like Forest Service, does a lot of EIS work on their own and DNR might have to do some of that, some of the Trustee agencies, but the others have you thought of how we might initiate contact and encourage this?

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, the one thing I have thought about and I have talked about this with our Science Coordinator, Stan Senner, is we have a large mission in terms of outreach and getting information out and a lot of different audiences. We have the general public outside of the state, we have the general public within the state, we have communities within the spill area, we have the Trustee agencies, we have non-Trustee government agencies and we have different kind of avenues of getting information out. The one thing we really have not targeted very well, and really thought about, we're just thinking about it now because the information

is starting to accumulate to the point is to the resource manager.

And I think we have the first kind of starting of that at the workshop in January, but I would think that this would be kind of an effort, kind of spearheaded by our science team and our communications team. So one aspect, we're pretty overloaded right now just in terms of everything we already have on the plate, but one thing would be trying either to expand that staff to an additional person to do that kind of effort or -- yeah, looking at something like that.

MR. RUE: Mr. Chairman, I would encourage that as an agency that has sort of a research group and a management group, it's always a challenge to get the two to talk to each other and so I think the more we can do to encourage that is great. Whether it's a workshop session, like you had before, or whatever, so I would just encourage us to look at ways to do that.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: One other approach which may be less labor intensive would be to draft a letter, send it to city, state, local governments reminding them of the data that we have in the spill area and telling them how, if they are embarking on any analyses or projects or any other management decisions, how they could access our data and how we would be willing to work with them or whatever we would propose in that

sense, but sometimes we forget because we are so well aware of the data we have, but other State departments, other Federal departments and local city, county governments may be less aware of the vast amount of data we have. So it might be a good idea to start out with a letter and then some recommended way they could most easily access or discuss the information we have.

1

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair, you know, I support most of what I hear, saying here, I'm not sure I support adding a new person to our staff to do some of these things. what's going through my mind though is most of the resource management agencies that we're talking about here are represented around this table and part of what Frank brought out was is having our management folks talking to research folks is very difficult at times and so I think, and Forest Service has taken an effort to include and bring a lot of our resource managers into these annual workshops and to me that is the best tool that we have available to make the management aware of the information that's going on. And a letter, I think would be appropriate, but to me I think we need to put more emphasis on bringing people outside of the oil spill from the agencies into these workshops to hear and see what's going on in this effort that we have initiated.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Mr. Wolfe. Are

there any additional questions or comments from Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any questions or comments from Juneau?

MR. PENNOYER: There are two comments. One, not everybody's mic is working apparently because some people, commissioners' testimony down here is breaking up. And the second is I think I concur with Jim, I like the idea of the information being made transparent to people who need it. I'm not sure we need an extra staff member and I think we could talk about it, but Deborah's idea about a letter out emphasizing the type of information that is available again makes sense. I don't know if need to put an extra staff member on at this time.

MS. BROWN: I would just concur with that view.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Anything else? Thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Steiner did ask a question about the Council's policy on fee acquisitions and I think this was a question that was asked at the public session of the Restoration Workshop in January and I responded to it at that time, so I would actually like to respond to it.....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Please.

 $\mbox{MS. McCAMMON:} \quad \dots \mbox{then if I'm wrong you can} \\ \mbox{tell me right now.}$ 

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Please go ahead.

MS. McCAMMON: What I have told the public on the issue of fee or less than fee acquisition is that it is the Council's preference to do fee acquisitions, it is much simpler from a land manager prospective to know what the interests are, it's easier to manage. It's easier to ensure that the purposes for the acquisition are achieved if there is a fee acquisition. And so from a land manager's perspective, fee is the preferable way to go.

However, the Council has acknowledged that there are other situations and other interests that play into these negotiations and that there may be occasions where conservation easement or less than fee acquisition is appropriate and what often happens, and this is I think Chenega is a perfect example, is that in a lot of cases when you aren't dealing, you're going above appraised value and you're trying to negotiate the price at which the Council feels it is in the public's interest to do the acquisition and also get agreement from the land owner that it's a price that they're willing to sell their lands for, it's somewhat of a back and forth, and as ended up in Chenega, we ended up with a mixture of a fee acquisition and a less than fee acquisition. The same thing is true with Tatitlek and I would imagine it would probably be

similar with Eyak also.

MR. STEINER: A quick one?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Sure.

MR. STEINER: Would the Council be willing to entertain an offer that excluded the acquisition at all? In other words, a large comprehensive offer that was simply conservation easement?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Commissioner Rue.

MR. RUE: I'm not sure that I want to answer that one directly but I was going to add one comment to what Molly said, is by fee simple you guarantee a couple of things, you also guarantee that you're going to achieve the restoration objectives, which is a significant issue to us. And very often the less than fee acquisition may cost nearly as much as fee, so you have perhaps less of a guarantee in achieving your restoration objectives at perhaps the same -- or almost the same costs, so that equation has to play into it. And I'm not -- I don't know if we want to individually answer the question Mr. Steiner raised or not. I think we've shown a willingness to look at different alternatives but we have to be sure we're achieving the objectives of restoration.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Well stated.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Other comments or questions from Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Any additional comments or 1 questions from Council members in Juneau? 2 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Rick. 4 5 Johnson. MR. NELSON: John, can I.... 6 MR. JOHNSON: Sure, go ahead. 7 MR. NELSON: I don't mean to break in but I got 8 9 another meeting to go..... CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Oh, please. 10 MR. NELSON: I'm Rick Nelson from Chuqach 11 Alaska Corporation, Board of Directors. We delivered a letter 12 to Ms. McCammon and I just wanted to get it on a matter of 13 record that the regional corporation supports the villages and 14 communities within our regions in their desire to have the 15 repositories located in their localities. We have no desire to 16 pursue EVOS funds for a regional repository. 17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. 18 want to elaborate any or is that.... 19 20 MR. NELSON: No. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there Council members 21 question or comments from Anchorage? 22 (No responses) 23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Any questions or comments 24 from Juneau Council members? 25

MS. BROWN: No, thank you.

MR. NELSON: Thank you. And I apologize for breaking in.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That's fine, that's great.

MR. NELSON: Thanks, John.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, sure. Greetings. My name is John Johnson, I'm also a Board of Director for the Chugach Alaska Corporation and for the last 15 years I've been working at trying to gain land acquisitions, as the Council here has, in Prince William Sound and protecting and gaining land back under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act for historical sites, for ancient burial grounds and for ancient village locations.

I'm in support of Project 96-154, the comprehensive community planning for archaeological resources. I would like to fully support what Robert Heinrich said, the village tribal chief in Cordova or in Eyak and Dr. Laura Johnson and Rick Nelson. I think it's about time that this Council started putting money towards the people I think. Enough money has been placed for various animals and other things, I think it's time the people realize that the impact -- there is a great impact to the actual people that live out there. And I think it's very important for the presentation of our culture and heritage of the Chugach people that local repositories be funded for helping the growth of the people.

It'll be great to have all land preserved, but if the people -- the original people here, that's been here for over 6,000 years aren't protected as well then I think we're missing everything. And that is my comments.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much. Are there questions or comments from Anchorage Council members?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or comments from Council members in Juneau?

MS. BROWN: We thank you for the comments.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Chip Dennerlein.

MR. DENNERLEIN: Thank you. Members of the Council, my name is Chip Dennerlein and I would like to address briefly the acquisition of -- proposed acquisition of lands from English Bay to be included in Kenai Fjords National Park.

I am a member of the Public Advisory Group, as you know, but the seat that I hold on that group is the seat for conservation and I was appointed to that conservation seat based a lot upon the conservation land work that I do. For the Council members who don't know I would -- I mention that so you know I will speak from the reason that I was appointed onto the PAG, not for the PAG. In my main work I am the Alaska Regional Director for National Parks and Conservation Association. NPCA

is a 500,000 member citizen organization of citizens protecting America's parks.

Our board, our publications and our magazine, our membership are strongly supportive of the acquisition of lands for the inclusion in Kenai Fjords National Park. I also serve currently on the National Park System Advisory Board and the board and committees are very interested in fulfilling this possibility of acquiring the lands.

I would just ask as you consider the acquisition to consider a few perspectives. One, I think the acquisition is consistent with a long range, hoped-for policy. The U.S.

Congress established the boundaries of Kenai Fjords National Park in 1980. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act was passed in '71. The people of the United States set these boundaries with full knowledge that the lands within the boundaries were not Federal public lands, many of them would not be Federal public lands. But Congress laid the groundwork not for any kind of a hostile and contentious takeover but with the hope of some kind of consistent management and acquisition. If these lands are acquired they will become automatically part of the national park system and Congress laid the groundwork for that to happen.

Secondly, just to look at changes in tourism. That used to be one of the axioms of Alaska tourism that no ships could cross the Gulf, you couldn't possibly cross the Gulf of

Alaska, you know, you'd get sick, you couldn't bring people across the Gulf of Alaska. Last year more than 60 percent of the landings of tour ships in Alaska were tour ships that came across the Gulf. So the relationship of this park to visitors, whether tour ships or kayakers, is very important.

And the third point is that much of this coastline is rugged land, but it is cut by valleys. And any land manager knows that it's the same rule with habitat as it is with real estate, it's location, location and location. The management of 1,000 acres can compromise the quality, the habitat value, the use, accessibility of 10,000 acres. And I think that as a package the strategic pieces, as well as the habitat and rugged coastline, are important.

I understand that you will probably go into your own executive session and you will consider the issue of the prices as part of the package. I will not speak about the price here in this testimony, but I will ask -- I will speak and ask you to consider a bit of a just a framework to approach this. The first is that this, whatever the price, that this arrangement is certainly not any rush to judgment. English Bay was, as you know, one of the very first proposals for land acquisition. It was not one of the first to come before you. It has taken several years and I think that it is a mix of thoughtfulness, of good negotiations, of what contracts are, a meeting of minds and reality. So I would ask you to consider that.

I'd also ask you to consider this perspective, you are the only hope for the acquisition of these lands and the restoration of these lands in a way that is compatible and favored by the owners as well as constituent public. I hope you don't miss this opportunity.

I'll just mention I'm currently dealing with another national park, a great national park, Yellowstone. On the northwest boundary of Yellowstone is a ranch. In 1980 that ranch was offered to the United States Government. The government didn't buy that property because they couldn't agree on the appraisal. The two parties were slightly under a half a million dollars apart. The government refused to negotiate. Sixteen years later it is a cattle ranch, it is a very uneasy neighbor into the park and with a heavy snowfall of 200 percent most of the bison try to go there because it's winter range.

That National Park Service this year alone spent much more than the difference in the appraisal. What we have to show for it, however, is not the winter range habitat, but over 700 slaughtered bison. I think that shows two things. First, the agencies cannot, will not, will never make this kind of deal on their own. It may seem ironic that six Trustees would have to agree unanimously, three Federal commissioners. I served in state government, commissioners don't always agree with each other. And then there's three Federal Trustees and then they all have to agree and some how you are able to come

to conclusions because, I think, you can stand in the public eye and make a public policy decision, where appraisal information and factors inform the decision, but it's a responsible decision.

There are other examples, the United States was offered the land in Manassas Battle Field for between six and \$7,000,000.00, turned it down on the appraisal. You may recall we paid \$120,000,000.00 for it. I just was in the Southwest where we didn't take the appraisal on a three-way deal with Navaho and Hopi nation and right now not only would it have been a better deal if we had taken it, the owner of the property is digging archaeological resources adjacent to the reserve, and adjacent to petrified forest.

So in the last 15 years the property at Yellowstone had quadrupled and we have 700 dead bison. I'll just say that I'm not in the one-year business, I'm in the 100-year business and I hope you are too. And it will be the 125th anniversary of Yellowstone. Just buying land doesn't solve problems, but buying land in the right situation it is simply the absolute best tool that we have. And if we're going to fulfil a good long term relationship with the villages corporations and our neighbors and a long term security for this national park, we can, like Yellowstone, deal forever and spend money on the impacts and we can try to save a petrified forest from the problems on the boundary, but if we're really hoping to work

with the villages in the park, in this world it is simply not enough to prevent the worst, we have to bring about the best and I think that this deal is the best approach that we can envision for this area in the future.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Mr. Dennerlein.

Keeping in mind our need to move on, are there any questions or comments from Anchorage Council members?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any questions or comments from Council members in Juneau?

MS. BROWN: No questions. Thank you very much for your comments.

of people who have signed up, are there additional people?

There are two additional here in Anchorage and I'll get to the people on the network later. There are three, at least, additional in Anchorage. We do need to move along so if you could try to keep your comments down to three minutes or whatever that would be helpful.

MR. BENCARDINO: Thank you. My name is Lou Bencardino, I'm Mayor of Seward.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Can you spell your last name for us?

MR. BENCARDINO: Bencardino is

B-e-n-c-a-r-d-i-n-o.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you.

MR. BENCARDINO: I know probably I make a few people nervous coming up here because normally I'm for building the gas pipeline, a sewer or doing some logging or something of that sort. But today I'm here because I think we have a good project, or you do, to look at. The city of Seward feels that these lands do belong to the Park Service and we hope that your organization will go forward with the acquisition and get the land into the park where it can be managed properly. As you know, we are becoming a big tourist area and it is something that the people from all over the Unites States and all over the world come to our area to look at, this type of facilities and lands we have in our area.

I feel that the best thing we can do is what I hope you're going to do, is to buy these lands from the English Bay Corporation and that it will be something that we can talk about -- well, I don't know if I'll be around in 100 years, I doubt that, but our children can talk about and feel proud of what we have done today or right here in the near future.

So we support this project and, the city does, and I do too. Like I say, normally I'm on the other side of the fence, but this here project is a good one and I support it 100 percent and so does the city. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much. Are

there questions or comments from Anchorage? Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: I just want to thank you very much, Mayor, for coming to testify and we really appreciate the excellent relationship between the city and park now.

MR. BENCARDINO: I would also thank you for supporting our SeaLife Science Center.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Any questions or comments from Council members in Juneau?

MS. BROWN: No questions. Thank you very much for your comments.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. We had a couple of more hands raised. Ma'am.

Michaelson, that's spelled M-i-c-h-a-e-l-s-o-n. I live outside Palmer and although currently I'm employed at a conservation organization here in Anchorage at the time of the oil spill in 1989 I was at home with my children. And I decided that I would go down to Valdez at the first call of some friends of mine who said there had been an oil spill and there had been some impacted wildlife and there was going to be a wildlife rehabilitation effort. And after making some arrangements with my husband, who had a lot of time that he could take off, I went down to Valdez and ended up doing wildlife rehabilitation for five and a half months.

I started out on the 10th day of the spill washing

otters for 22 hours and after I became employed by Exxon to be on their staff at the Valdez Otter Rescue Center, I also volunteered many hours a day washing birds and tube feeding birds. I was - then after the otters that I worked with in Valdez, I ended up working with the otters after the first part of the spill and the otters came from dying in the halls when they were first let off the helicopters to working with the otters that were held in the holding pens, first down in the harbor, then out by the fishery -- I mean by the cannery, the octagon.

After the otters I was caring for down in the harbor were released, I was with the healthier otters at that time, I went down to Seward and at that point I was -- I just kind of transferred down to Seward and worked there until the last healthy adult otters were released. In Seward I worked 12 hours a day with the otters waiting to be released, I was mainly with healthy otters.

And so I come to speak to you today from my interest in wildlife rehabilitation. I am currently am with the International Wildlife Research, IWR, which is headed by Dr. Terry Williams and Dr. Randy -- I always forget Randy's name. I'm sorry, I'm nervous. Anyway, and also Dr. Pam Tuomi here in town. I have received continuing ongoing training with them for wildlife rehabilitation. In the event of another spill such as Exxon Valdez I would be one of the persons who

would be employed through them and with Alyeska, whom I also work with on IWR.

I just wanted to let you know that I strongly support the acquisition of the lands within Kenai Fjords National Park. Many of the otters that I worked with came from bays either in the park or just south of the park and so it's very interesting because although I have traveled in those bays in my kayak, have flown over them and now have actually gotten fur out of some of the otters who also use the park, I just really think this would be a wonderful acquisition. I'm very proud of the English Bay Corporation for being a willing seller. I'm proud of you for all the work that you've done in acquiring the Chenega lands and the other acquisitions you have made. And I really appreciate the efforts that you've gone through in your negotiations for these lands.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much. Are there questions or comments from Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or comments from Council members in Juneau?

MR. PENNOYER: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. There was at least one other person in Anchorage that indicated a desire to testify, I believe.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it was that was (indiscernible - no microphone)....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Oh, okay. It looks like there's no one else in Anchorage. Is there anyone in any of the sites -- well, let me just go down the list real quick. Is there anyone else in Juneau who wishes to testify?

MR. MEACHAM: Nobody else in Juneau.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Seward.

SEWARD LIO OPERATOR: Yes, I have a person who would like to speak again.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. How many people do you have there that would like to speak?

SEWARD LIO OPERATOR: Just one person right now.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. If they could go ahead and speak and we are running a little bit behind so if you could -- the comments could be succinct but clear that would be great.

MS. BARRIER: I Miranda Barrier am also in support of Chugach -- it was dealing with the artifacts in each of the villages and the repository, whatever. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much for those comments. Are there any questions or comments from the Council members in Anchorage?

(No responses)

- 1	
1	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: In Juneau?
2	(No responses)
3	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anyone else
4	in Homer that would like to say anything?
5	HOMER LIO OPERATOR: No, there's just
6	(indiscernible - phone cut out).
7	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anyone else
8	in Cordova who would like to say anything?
9	(No response)
10	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there any sites -
11	I'm sorry, go ahead.
12	CORDOVA LIO OPERATOR: No, no one in Cordova.
13	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there any site
14	that has joined us since we started in addition to Juneau,
15	Seward, Homer and Cordova?
16	(No response)
17	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. I believe that will
18	then end the public comment period. Thank you all very much
19	for your comments. I believe the next thing on the agenda is
20	status report on the archaeological planning effort.
21	Ms. McCammon.
22	MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Maybe

we should try to put a time frame on this discussion, too, so

that we can -- with a goal to get into executive session by

11:00 and we still have the work plan.

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That is correct and data policy.

MS. McCAMMON: So maybe a discussion, half hour maximum.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, I figure what the data policy, take about 10 minutes?

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And the work plan take about

10 minutes?

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, about that.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: So if you could.....

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Mr. Chairman, last night, and, Rebecca, there are additional copies if you can make them available if anybody in the audience desires. But I did send out a memo to the Trustee Council last night kind of outlining the status of our planning effort for archaeological resource restoration. And the one thing you don't have in Juneau are the attachments and these are the compilations of the testimony of the various public hearings, and those are on their way to you either last night or today, so you will be getting those next week at the very latest. But I hope all of you did get the copy of the memo, but I'd like to walk you through it because it's already been described to me as brilliant but

completely not understandable.

So I'll take this chance to walk you through it. At the December 6th meeting you asked me to follow up and conduct a review of the final report for Project 96154, which is the Comprehensive Community Plan for Restoration of Archaeological Resources in Prince William Sound and Lower Cook Inlet. And as such I directed Veronica Christman, on my staff, to spearhead that effort, and Veronica is at the table here and will be chiming in as we go through this.

The review process itself is still not complete, but I think we have retained enough additional information and comment to hopefully start moving this parcel forward. In December we sent out over a 100 copies of the final report to the Public Advisory Group, the community involvement facilitators, local governments, local museums, village councils and any other interested party who expressed an interest in the process. We requested comments by February 15th. So far the office has received comments from the National Park Service, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and two letters from the Native Village of Eyak. Although we have started to receive resolutions from various councils, the Qutekcak Native Council.....

MS. CHRISTMAN: Tatitlek.

MS. McCAMMON: .....Tatitlek Council supporting Scenario One in the report.

In January the office held two workshops, the first one was a briefing for the public, an informal briefing for the Public Advisory Group by teleconference on the final report, and starting to lay out some of the issues and getting them thinking about this process. Our second meeting was held on January 22nd and this was -- the results of that meeting are in Attachment A.

On January 22nd we held a joint workshop with the Public Advisory Group and the community facilitator and invited a number of experts in from the museum/repository field to provide their input into the process. And in Attachment B is a description of that meeting.

We then laid out a series of public meetings between January 28th and February 10th. Unfortunately a number of those meetings had to be postponed for a variety of reasons. The only two meetings that were actually held were in Seward and Cordova. And the results of those meetings are in Attachment C.

So that is, so far as the status of our outreach and discussion with the community and with other folks interested in this process. As you'll recall the green document that was produced under contract for the Trustee Council describes Scenario One as the alternative preferred by the eight communities in the project area. And these are the Eyak/Cordova area, Valdez, Tatitlek, Chenega Bay,

Qutekcak/Seward, Port Graham, Nanwalek and Seldovia. Under this scenario the oil spill related artifacts that are presently stored in Anchorage or Juneau or at the University of Alaska Museum in Fairbanks would be transferred to eight local repositories that would be constructed or renovated with support from the Trustee Council, but then that would then be operated and maintained using other funds.

The proposal would have a regional repository organization that would provide the curatorial and technical support that is required for public artifacts to be displayed in other areas.

There was a strong expression in all of these meetings by members of the communities that Native artifacts be returned to the villages. This was almost a unanimous view expressed by everyone. When we had further discussion about what it meant to have a repository, a lot of the requirements that were described in the green document for those requirements, it turned out when we talked to individual agencies it appeared that there was actually more flexibility in some of those requirements than was apparent at first. That in many case climate control was not required for these artifacts. And in many cases the types of curatorial assistance was not quite as extreme as we originally thought. So there's a lot of flexibility there in terms of making arrangements with communities, tailoring them to local needs and interests.

The other kind of effort that came out though this session is that Chugach Alaska has won a competitive bid on the railroad depot immediately adjacent to the SeaLife Center and are planning a major cultural facility at this building. They view this as their prime cultural facility, this is the only one they intend to put money into. They intend for it to be a money making operation and that the funds generated by this facility will go to support other cultural activities in the communities and in the region, including long term support of the spirit camps at Nuchek Island that were originally funded by the state criminal funds.

So this kind of came up into the picture just recently in the last month or so and we actually had a meeting with Chugach Alaska earlier this week to further discuss their plans with them. We have received a letter from Chugach Alaska today that they are not interested in serving as a regional repository for the Chugach Region, that they support Scenario One, individual facilities in the communities.

So this is kind of a summary of where the discussion had led us to and we had a lot of discussion in-house here on how we take this information and put it into a framework for you to make some kind of a judgment or decision on.

And with that I would like to propose for you to consider a couple of things. One of the proposals that was suggested by the National Park Service, which I believe has a

lot of merit, is putting together an exhibit quality catalogue of the artifacts that have been recovered as a result of the oil spill and that would enable the Council to share this information with a broad audience. I think this is especially important if the collections end up getting divided among a number of communities. This would be a high quality publication with photographs and interpretive information in it about the significance of these artifacts. So I think this kind of an effort has a lot of merit.

Secondly, I would suggest that the Council consider issuing an invitation for proposals for community based archaeological restoration projects and that this go out to the communities inviting them to submit individual proposals that could either implement Scenario One, the individual community aspect or if there is further reflection and discussion among the region, some kind of a regional repository.

And as part of those proposals and as a major element of the invitation we would have a number of aspects or conditions, requirements attached to it. One would be, what type of project. And in this case some of the communities have expressed an interest in a repository in a larger facility, others are interested more in just a display area only. So I think there is individual needs in the different communities, they're not all the same. So I think we could either look at something as a repository or as a display area.

The third aspect would be asking for additional projects for other kinds of things, like stewardship programs, the development of displays, things like that. Although the Chugach Region has been very clear that they're interested primarily in facilities because there is very little alternative funding for facilities. They believe they have easy, fairly easy access to other funding for things like programs, traveling displays, interpretive materials and things of that nature. So they're actually not seeking money from the Trustee Council for these kinds of efforts. They have committed that if the Council were to pursue the facility that they would commit to doing those other efforts through other funding sources.

The second aspect of the invitation would be to specify the artifact collection to be transferred. The artifacts right now are stored in boxes in various government agencies' offices and in the museum. They primarily come from the Chenega area, Nanwalek area and Port Graham area. And there are a number of other artifacts that are considered regional, but the majority of them were obtained on the western side of Prince William Sound.

The Chugach Region has proposed that they take those artifacts and work individually with communities and take those sites and develop what they call steward zones. So, for example, the village of Tatitlek would be responsible for

certain sites and kind of have oversight stewardship of those sites. This is something that's in a very preliminary stage. How it would actually work since the majority of the sites are either on the western side of Prince William Sound or on Lower Cook Inlet, I'm not really sure, but that's kind of their thinking. And this might also play into the fact that some might be repositories and others might only be display type facilities.

The third element would be the amount of funding. In Dr. Johnson's report it contained a low estimate of 340,000 for a local display facility and 512,000 for a local repository for a total somewhere of 2.7 to 4.1 million for the eight facilities.

Another possibility is limiting the amount to the award -- something similar to the award for construction of the Alutiiq Museum which would be something around 225,000 per community, so there is that element there of whether the Council is interested in setting some kind of a funding cap in this invitation.

The next element is timing. The communities have told us that some of them are ready to go. We know that Chenega is, they have the architectural plans drawn up, they're ready to go with their facility. Other communities are just in the very beginning stages of talking to other groups in their community, they would like to have a window in which to pull their

proposal together. And what I would recommend is that we consider something like a three-year period of time in which proposals could be coming in. Although we would like a letter of intent from those communities who are interested in that so we knew which ones were actually going to follow through.

The next element is financial responsibility and this has been a major concern of the Trustee Council, it was a major concern of the Public Advisory Group. We believe that it's imperative that the proposers be able to demonstrate how these facilities would be operated and maintained in the future and that their proposals for doing such would have to be independently reviewed. So that would be another aspect of the proposals as they came in.

And then finally the last aspect is the issue of TAPLA funds. Chugach Alaska, Chenega Corporation, Port Graham Corporation and English Bay were all awarded Trans Alaska Pipeline Liability Act funds to compensate them for reasonable excavation and curations costs on archaeological sites that received physical impact from the discharges of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill.

I would recommend that proposals from any of these corporations or communities should describe how these funds would be used to supplement or complement the proposal.

So I know this is a lot of material and I'm not sure the Council is -- if the Council will be prepared to go forward

at this time. The Public Advisory Group is meeting March 4th and 5th, this will be on their agenda. And what I would like to do, with your concurrence, is to take this to them at that time and get some final action from the Public Advisory Group.

2.

1.5

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are you asking for a motion to -- for you to put this plan into effect; is that....

MS. McCAMMON: I am asking for your concurrence to take this, at least, one other step, which is to go further and actually go to the Public Advisory Group with this. But I would like some sense from the Council that we are going down the right alley here.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: But you're not asking for sort of approval to go out with an invitation?

MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Questions from Council members in Anchorage? Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: Just a little additional clarification. What we're proposing to go forward to the PAG is with an alternative such as what you've proposed here or with what's developed as part of the archaeological project at this point in time and get their feedback on recommendations for it? I'm not clear.

MS. McCAMMON: We have already gotten their feedback on the overall plan and based on their feedback, based on the feedback from the community facilitators, based on the

feedback from local museums, this is our first cut at a draft recommendation. So what I would like to do now is to take it to them, but there's been a lot of concern from the communities, they would like some indication from the Council to whether there's even a remote possibility of this or if there's not, they'd like to hear it pretty quickly.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Commissioner Rue.

MR. RUE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I guess the question that arises in my mind first is the idea of putting any kind of a number on what we might spend on these things so that -- I don't want to give people -- I don't want to necessarily give the idea that we're ready to spend \$400,000.00 on a building or something when they might have a community building already that could house these kinds of things very well. I was just in Akutan, for instance, and they have a community library and half of it is some displays of various archaeological pieces and it was neat, it was wonderful, and it was actually very nice that it was right in the library because it's the kind of place that a lot of kids and people use and it was kind of a nice complement to an existing facility.

So I'm a little concerned -- I've seen in the past when we put a number out for whatever reason, that suddenly becomes a floor and starts guiding people in directions that they might not otherwise, so I'm a little reluctant to say any kind of figure and perhaps just say we're interested in looking at

these and the more creative you are the better, the more efficient you are the better, or something like that. That was the one bit of hesitation I had was the number, you know, which drives an expectation and perhaps stifles creativity.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Anyone else? Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Ms. McCammon, can you remind the Trustee Council members who may not have been involved in the debate on the Alutiiq Museum how that debate, in essence, evolved and resolved and came with this, you know, this contribution recommendation?

MS. McCAMMON: I think when you look back the record is a little bit incomplete, but one of the experts actually that we had our workshop was Rick Connect \*\* who was on the Public Advisory Group at the time the Council took its action and was the primary advocate for the contribution to the Alutiiq Museum. And I think he very eloquently described the purpose and the result of the Council's contribution there. It had always been my thought at first that the whole purpose of the museum was to house the oil spill artifacts and at this point they are currently not, the Kodiak ones are currently not there, they're still in storage.

But his perspective was, and I think this is actually the perspective that should be used in looking at this -- the whole restoration effort for the Chugach Region, is that the museum becomes a center piece for encouraging local communities

to respect archaeological resources and to respect their culture and to develop a sense of responsibility and stewardship over the long term for these resources. And certainly through the programs, through Afognak -- dig Afognak and through a lot of the resources that the Alutiiq Museum was done. That has really encouraged that sense of pride in the culture, pride in the artifacts, pride in archaeological sites and hopefully is translating into long term protection of these resources.

And that would be the goal of these kind of individual facilities in the community, that they would become the focal point in the community for housing whatever artifacts are there, but also using it as a springboard for that long term restoration stewardship of resources in the region.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: If I could add as someone who was actually here at that time and looking at that. It was -- one of the keys to that decision to go forward was the strong commitment of the local community, the Native groups and so forth, to fund the ongoing maintenance, and that's again, sort of part of the whole idea of it, bringing in the stewardship and creating a sense of pride and protection for the artifacts and that's certainly something that I would look to see in any kind of a proposal here.

Is there additional comments from Anchorage?
(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there comments from Trustee Council members in Juneau or questions?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, thank you, that question and answer didn't exactly get to something that I was going to ask because I, of course, was a survivor of the Kodiak Museum wars too. I seem to think we went along on that a long time without ever getting a real good readout as to the appropriateness of the actual building and expenditure. And I was wondering, are we running into other problems here besides the philosophical question of whether we want to pursue something like this, which I think Ms. McCammon gave a very good summary of the rationale for doing some of this, but are we going to run into problems in this project, other than our philosophical question, but one that deals more with the practical aspect of committing funds to this type of endeavor?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Pennoyer, is the question whether this is something additional facilities similar or in the nature of the Alutiiq Museum would be legally permissible under the terms of the settlement; is that what you're asking?

MR. PENNOYER: Ms. McCammon, I was a supporter of the Kodiak Project, as you know, but I support the idea, I'm not sure I -- when we get into the broad distinction of how many places you're going do it versus centralized, there's still some questions there, but I liked the idea at the time

and still I think I do, but, yes, you boiled it down pretty well, are there going to be legal problems with this type of an approach?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I would note that in my notebook I have written down Department of Justice with a question mark. And it seems to me that they should certainly be involved. And I believe Bill Brighton last week indicated a willingness to get involved in some of these more people-oriented projects.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice, the Department of Law, the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, all of their attorneys have been invited to all of the meetings that we've held, they've been given copies of all of our material. They have provided as much guidance as they have been able to give, not having a formal proposal before them. Based on the guidance that they have been able to give to us, and at this point it's been fairly limited, I think now is the time for them to take a harder look at what we have and that was one of the reasons for starting to put something on the table is to move this process along because without having something actually out there they've been very reluctant to take any strong positions.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. I understand that Ms. McCammon, I'm just (indiscernible - phone cut out) I just wanted to be sure at some point (phone cut out) raised

expectations and then have the door slammed shut. And I don't know how you engender that type of response you're looking for. It seems to me getting to the very final stage, design and construction plans and land commitments and so forth, is a little bit beyond the point in which we ought to find out if we're going to have a problem with this or not.

MS. McCAMMON: The indications that I've had from Department of Justice is that they acknowledge that something in this area will be done and the question is what and to what scale. So they have already, I think, agreed that there will be something done on this effort.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. RUE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Commissioner Rue.

MR. RUE: If I understand what we're doing now, we were planning on asking the PAG to take a look at this and give us some advice....

MS. McCAMMON: And the attorneys.

MR. RUE: Okay. And the attorneys, so we're not going to raise any expectations, hopefully, at this point because just right now we're just putting a flyer out there and we're going to get some feedback before we actually ask the public to come to us or the communities to come to us with any proposals. That's correct?

MS. McCAMMON: Right, right.

MR. RUE: Seems like Mr. Pennoyer has raised a very good question and we ought to make sure that the attorneys will let this balloon fly.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Much like our information discussion, perhaps an outreach to the Department of Justice to ensure that we can get that.

MS. CHRISTMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I address Commissioner Rue's question about....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Please.

MS. CHRISTMAN: And the question I'd like to address is whether there's a pitfall in supplying a maximum dollar amount and I'd like to just explain why we included that. I suspect it may be part of the discussion when Department of Justice looks at this. What we asked Dr. Johnson to do in the green book was to estimate what the cost of a facility that served only one purpose, and that is to house and display the EVOS collection, what would something like that cost? How much space are we looking at, basically make a connection between the artifacts we're trying to protect, just EVOS related, versus space requirement. And the space requirement is really minute, quite small. And then if you divide it among eight communities, we wanted to know what would that look like.

And in the final report there is an estimate of the space requirements. And one of the reasons we even include in

this flyer a notion of a maximum amount per community is to have some proxy, some general indication of that portion of these projects that possibly could be justified by housing just the EVOS collection.

We already know, for example, that the Chenega repository is in -- and, in fact, most of these ideas are intended to house a much larger collection of artifacts for one thing, collections over and above the EVOS collections and to serve a much larger purpose in the community. We know the Chenega artifact repository alone is estimated to cost 1.3 million and that is on its way and, in fact, support for that proposal was received in fiscal year '96.

So the idea of specifying some number, and the reason we talked a great deal about possibilities without any recommendation of a hard and fast number was at least to give some indication of the scale of what might be justified by just the EVOS collection. That's usually the first question that comes up when we talk to any attorney. What were the artifacts? This report includes an inventory of the artifacts and then there were questions how much space would be required to house them and then what would the cost be? And in most cases what -- the figures that we're discussing would be for a portion of the facility. And that was the idea.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Recognizing that we need to be moving along, Ms. Williams, did you have a comment?

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Well, I would just attempt to summarize and just to make one comment so that perhaps a slightly different view is on the record. With respect to the latter, I was actually most attracted to the 225,000, I was most attracted to three and so I certainly respect Mr. Rue's comments on that, but if we go forward with this package I certainly want to get both Justice's and PAG's reaction to three, I was very attracted to it from a historical perspective, the fact that we did something very similar to that in the Alutiiq, so there is precedent for this and also I think it is something that we can most clearly justify in terms of expending EVOS funds to contributing that portion which is attributable to the EVOS artifacts.

So I will just vote that that goes forward. I will then just -- I don't think it's necessary for a motion, probably we should just see if there's any objection. I'd certainly encourage Ms. McCammon to go forward with this proposal as it's written to get both Department of Justice and the PAG comments and report back to us as soon as possible so that we can take action. I realize that we are working in a small time frame here, window of opportunity, to get these things out in an invitation form in a timely manner. I would like to proceed with the idea that we would like, if possible, if it passes with the scrutiny with the PAG. I think it's a good idea and if we ultimately unanimously think it's a good

idea to get invitations out on these two issues, both the catalogue and the repositories, so I certainly give my green light to go ahead on those two points.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. It appears to be something of a consensus that Ms. McCammon should go forward to the Public Advisory Group to get their opinions on the suggestions she has here, sort of as modified, I think, by some of the Council members comments.

Are there any Council members here or in Juneau that would disagree with that kind of action.

MS. BROWN: Craig, this is Michele. Okay. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, go ahead, please.

MS. BROWN: I don't disagree with it, I think lot of my questions have already been raised but I do think (phone cut out) legal issues resolved, sooner rather than later. I'm also -- I share your view having been a veteran of a lot of Council projects that have been in a lot of places of having extremely strong plan for O&M as well as staffing and those kinds of issues.

My remaining question though is when this came up in the Kodiak situation was there a discussion by the Council of rollout of that kind of idea in the sense of once you do something, I mean, are we then on a path that every community wants to come forward and if we do it here, do we start

thinking of, you know, many sealife centers? I mean, I don't know whether we discussed any of about earlier stages.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I think the answer is that there was no discussion of additional repositories at the time of the Kodiak one, but I do believe that everyone recognized that having funded that there would inevitably be a suggestion from the Prince William Sound area, perhaps Cook Inlet, that we should do something similar in those areas but there certainly was no motions, there were no -- nobody took any action, there really wasn't a whole lot of discussion at the time, other than, I think, a recognition.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, if I might. I think you're right. I think the other thing we had (phone cut out) is the concept of regional versus local, how many and all that type of thing, I think we knew we would need to consider this type of action in other situations, but I don't think we defined how many situations or the type of thing we would be looking at.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I sort of concur on that.

Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: I'm feeling a little bit uneasy at this point in time because I'm not sure what Molly is going to go to Justice about at this point in time. We just got the Comprehensive Plan not too long ago, we really haven't had a chance to start digesting it, we haven't had the PAG input on

it, yet we're trying to develop alternatives for proceeding before I think we got all the input that we'd like to have, but certainly we do need the input of the PAG on the Comprehensive Plan and their recommendations. This is one approach and I think Molly's folks have done an extremely good job of pulling something together that may be a very viable alternative. But I would -- and I want this to move ahead quickly because we've been talking about this it seems like forever, but just like -- since we've taken this long to get to this point, I would like a chance for all of us to have an opportunity to digest what's in the Comprehensive Plan, get the input from the PAG and then have a chance to develop an alternative that we all have a chance to input on at that point and then move forward. And I don't want this to take a long time either.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I think that that is then sort of support for the concept that Molly would take. This discussion and this sort of concept to the Public Advisory Group and bring some opinions back.

MR. WOLFE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is that a fair statement?

MR. WOLFE: That's where I'm at at this point.

MR. RUE: And Justice.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And make sure that -- and they do need to get involved at an early stage so you start finding out if things get ruled out before you....

MR. WOLFE: No, I -- it needs to go the PAG and Justice needs to see it. The only thing is my feeling is, based on past experience, is Justice likes to see something that's got some shape to it before they start commenting.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It's part of our outreach program.

MR. WOLFE: Yes.

1.8

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Commissioner Rue, did you have a....

MR. RUE: I think just a final comment from me is that I think this is good to take it to people now with a number, as Veronica said, to give them a picture, but I want to think before we go to the public whether we want to give them a hard number or what, just as something to think about before we go to the communities. I think it's a good idea.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Then unless there are -- are there any more comments from Juneau?

MS. BROWN: No, nothing more from Juneau, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Then, Ms. McCammon, do you have enough to go forward?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes. If it wasn't for the fact that we already had two meeting with the Public Advisory Group, I don't feel I would have been in the position to even develop this proposal yet, so this was really based on a lot of input

already from the Public Advisory Group. It's very possible in March they may come back with a totally different recommendation, but I don't think that's real likely because of

I will do that.

1.0

1.5

Veronica?

their other input.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Are we ready to -- I think we're probably at this point ready to move along to the data policy.

MR. RUE: I'd like to hear if Veronica has one last thing.

MS. McCAMMON: Did you want something,

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I'm sorry, did you have something else?

MS. CHRISTMAN: The only one thing I wanted to add is when you have time the attachments, especially
Attachment A, does summarize the Public Advisory Group's first work session on this. It was extremely well attended and I would say that a lot of their concern had to do with operation and maintenance. The difficulty coming up with that kind of money, et cetera, and the effort that was in the memo was try to take those concerns and put them into some kind of a proposal or some procedure that might address those concerns through the proposals. So the attachments, I think, would have some indication of PAG concerns.

MR. RUE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: I hate to do this but, you know, I know the PAG has been involved in this all along, but we just got the Comprehensive Plan done not too long ago, as I recall, and so I think we just need to get their last shot at what's being proposed. You've given them a good proposal for them to consider as a part of their evaluation and then I think very quickly after that that we can move forward with shaping a proposal that all of us have a chance to agree to.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there anything else from any Council member?

(No responses)

1

2

3

1.0

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. If we could move along to data policy.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, if I could make one quick announcement that's consistent with having talked about the PAG so much. I'm pleased to announce that the Secretary yesterday did sign all the documents necessary to reconstitute the PAG and confirm the recommendations and nominations we made, so the PAG is official.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you for adding that for.....

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. McCammon.

MS. McCAMMON: And also sorry to announce that

we already had our first resignation. Actually the PAG Chair, Mr. Vern McCorkle has resigned as both Chairman and from the PAG just in the last couple of days, so I have not had the opportunity to talk to him about this. So we have a new opening.

Data policy?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Data policy.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. In your packet you will see a tab marked Data Policy, if you'll recall this was an issue that was brought up in December and deferred for further legal review. And it has received such legal review and we now have a slightly modified version in front of you.

The existing policy is in both the Restoration Plan and then under the Trustee Council procedures that were adopted in August. What we are now proposing is to clarify the policy by adopting the following: Therefore, consistent with State and Federal laws any data resulting from any project to which the Trustee Council has contributed financially are in the public domain and as such must be available to the public. Fees will only be charged for copies of data in accordance with Federal Freedom of Information Act, the State Public Records Act or other applicable law. Data means recorded information, regardless of form or the media on which it is recorded, including computer programs, databases and software. Each final report on a restoration project shall include a brief

description of data gathered in the project, including definition of the types of data gathered, the form or forms in which the data are recorded, the location of the data, and a permanent contact at the appropriate federal or state agency, such that the data are accessible to the public, including scientific users at the completion of the project. MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams. MS. D. WILLIAMS: Move to approve. MR. RUE: Second. MR. WOLFE: Second. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there discussion? Anchorage? (No responses) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there discussion from Juneau Council members? MR. PENNOYER: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I have one question. understand this then, it sort of hinges on whether the Council contributed financially to the development of something. the Council paid for the development of a -- like a database program and for the collection of the data, both of those would be available to the public?

MS. McCAMMON:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any further

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

discussion? Is anyone opposed to the motion?

(No responses)

1.5

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Hearing none, it passes.

Deferred work plan projects.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Mr. Chairman, this is actually -- in the next segment of your packet there is a small spreadsheet that we work from with additional detail on each of the individual projects following that.

The first proposal is an amendment to the existing

Project 97100, which is the administration budget. This is a

supplement of a total of \$100,700.00 with 71.4 for FY97, which

is the existing fiscal year and an additional 29.3 in FY98.

I'm requesting these funds to add to our administration budget

to develop a video -- a stockpile of video footage and still

photographs of the EVOS acquired lands and the Restoration

Program. We have discovered, especially in the past year, that

we have virtually no photographs of the lands that are being

acquired through the Council process and virtually no video for

use in public outreach efforts, in use with the media and as a

major part of our educational efforts leading up to the 10th

anniversary.

The funds would be used to contract, through a competitive bid with an independent film crew and a still photographer, to produce, first, a 10 minute video which would be used just for informational purposes at public meetings and

i	
1	press briefings. And then secondly a larger 30 minute
2	documentary which would be aired on Public TV and other cable
3	TV stations. And then also still photographs to be used in
4	newspapers, magazines, the Council's annual report, to be used
5	at any kinds of public ceremonies, to be used in other
6	educational efforts. There would also be additional raw
7	footage that would be acquired as part of this process, this
8	would be all available to the public upon their request. This
9	is something over the last year that we have been desperately
10	in need of and I'm asking for the funds to go ahead and obtain
11	this.
12	MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, move to
13	approve.
14	MR. RUE: Second.
15	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I suppose what we'll do is
16	go through these as we get to each project, we'll vote on
17	MR. RUE: And do you want to approve them
18	all
19	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Well, why don't we just
20	MS. McCAMMON: Each one.
21	MR. RUE: Yeah.
22	MS. D. WILLIAMS: Each one.
23	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah. Okay. Is there any
24	discussion on this project from Anchorage?
25	(No responses)
,	

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there discussion from Council members in Juneau?

MR. PENNOYER: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. All in favor of this project say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: This project is approved as recommended.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, the next project is 97162, a supplement to this project, and Stan Senner, the Science Coordinator, is here to explain this project.

MR. SENNER: Very briefly. We all recall that disease was implicated in the crash of the herring population in Prince William Sound in 1993. And recent work funded by the Trustee Council has indicated an association between this disease and the pound fishery in Sitka Sound. And if that information continues to be borne out by subsequent research, that has strong management implications for the pound fishery and our approach to management of the population.

We have an opportunity in 1997 when the Department of Fish and Game has decided they can reopen the spring fishery for herring for the first time since they closed it in '93. And the request here is to supplement Project 97162, add

\$34,300.00 so that we can actually look at the disease levels associated with the pound fishery in Prince William Sound.

The prior work, which was in Sitka Sound, and this is an opportunity to look at that in Prince William Sound. The fishermen have worked closely with the Department of Fish and Game on this and are in support of it. And I think it's a great example of sort of the management payoff to the Restoration Program.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Commissioner Rue.

MR. RUE: I would hope that you all support it. I think that this is a very good project and the issue has been raised, at least in other parts of the state, as to whether this is a -- we should do a different method of managing these fisheries through an open pound system and so the Board of Fish -- this kind of information will help not only in Prince William Sound but around the state, so it has important implications for our management in Prince William Sound, but elsewhere in the state as well.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, I'm sorry, but we're missing a lot of that, I don't know why all of a sudden the system started to cut out.

MR. RUE: Because we had the button pushed that's why.

1	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Commissioner Rue, could you
2	repeat your
3	MR. RUE: I was simply exhorting us all to
4	support this project, it has not only good implication for
5	restoration of the resource in Prince William Sound, but the
6	issue of closed pound versus open pound and how you manage
7	herring is an issue around the state and so it has broad
8	implications for the Department in how we manage herring
9	fisheries.
10	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer, did that come
11	through?
12	MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, it did. Can I ask a
13	question?
14	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Please.
15	MR. PENNOYER: Frank, so basically this could
16	lead to a management decision that closed pounding was a bad
17	idea then?
18	MR. RUE: Mr. Pennoyer, that's right.
19	MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Go ahead, is there a motion?
21	MS. McCAMMON: Take action.
22	MR. RUE: I move that Project 97162 be
23	approved.
24	MS. BROWN: Second.
25	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any further

discussion?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: All in favor of the project

4 | say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The project passes.

MR. SENNER: Okay. If you'll look next at

Project 97248, documentation of herring through local and traditional ecological knowledge. This goes back to a proposal that was submitted and reviewed as part of the regular work plan last April. The project was put on hold, however, while we looked and developed a related project to address traditional ecological knowledge more broadly in the program. That has taken shape nicely, we have a TEK, to use the acronym, we have a TEK project underway. We hired a -- or actually the CRRC, Chugach Regional Resources Commission hired two people on contract to assist our investigators and to work in the communities on traditional knowledge.

So that is now in place, so we are asking that you come back and take another look at the herring project, in particular. I won't describe it in detail except it does involve working with our investigators in the SEA Project and the APEX Project

Tape 3 of 3

and then going to communities, talking to fishermen as well as Natives and others who would have local knowledge about herring and other forage fish.

The recommendation from the Chief Scientist is that the goal should be to integrate these two sources of knowledge, not to set up, sort of parallel databases or different databases, but that we want to see the integration of this knowledge for the benefit of the resource.

The recommendation from the Executive Director to you the Trustees is to fund this contingent on approval of a final DPD because we do feel that what is in your packets needs a little bit more work. Also there's been some discussion about whether this project should be a free standing project or actually and formally integrated into one of the others. And our recommendation is that it, in fact, be integrated into the SEA Project, 320. And we have talked about that with the project leader, Dr. Ted Cooney and also the principal investigator for herring, Dr. Brenda Norcross. They're agreeable to this and so what we're really asking is not to approve Project 248 but a supplement to 320T, contingent upon approval of a final DPD.

MS. McCAMMON: And budget.

MR. SENNER: And budget.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: So moved. I move that funding for this is contingent on upon formally integrating it into the SEA Project and final approval be till project description of the budget.

MR. RUE: Second.

MS. BROWN: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there discussion from Anchorage? Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman, just noting that the Chief Scientist indicated that the funding seemed to be high, just like a reaction to that and will combining it with one of the projects help to bring the cost -- to keep the cost down? I'm just asking for your input, that's all.

MR. SENNER: In asking that you approve it contingent on a final DPD and budget, we're suggesting that we'll certainly work to take another look at that budget and if there's a way to trim it some we'll look for every savings possible.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the reasons it's so high is because the approach that is strongly recommended by the TEK specialist is to have numerous visits to the village when you're working on a project like this. And I know the original proposal had maybe one, maybe two visits to

the village, this one calls for four visits to the village, so all of this is kind of in the experimental stage so we may be actually changing this also as we go along.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair, just my reaction now is a literature search with a couple of visits to the communities, it does seem a little high, so anything you can do, I think, we should be looking for ways to save.

MS. McCAMMON: Well, it is more than a literature search, it's a literature search and then going to the communities, explaining to them about the project, coming back, spending a lot of time with local experts in the community actually mapping out areas where they have historical knowledge about herring spawn and things of that nature and then coming back another time with the results of that mapping effort and really sharing the results of the project, so it's much more than a literature search.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: I have my concerns about how this all meshes together but it's more than in this instance and it's obviously something that needs to be addressed statewide, in a lot of different situations, it's a request from a lot of areas. There's knowledge that extends back to our scientific sampling, even (phone cut out) that agencies have carried out and the integration of that type of knowledge

into our management system and into our science basis is a real outstanding question, a lot of different areas.

2.0

I favor doing this, I think it's good in this case relative to a restoration effort, but I also think it may serve as a guideline to answer some of these questions about how we integrate this type of knowledge into the resource management scenarios statewide. So I favor going ahead with it. I agree with looking at the costs and having the integrated proposal as proposed and an evaluation of the costs, but I favor going ahead with it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Mr. Pennoyer.

Are there other comments from Juneau?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY:

MS. BROWN: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had a couple of questions.

One is it seems to me given that you're going to -- you're saying approve the money contingent upon you coming up with a plan that may cost less, it may be integrated with another project and so forth, why do we need to do this now? Is there a timing issue such that we can't wait for another Council meeting? And then I guess my second issue is I think the intellectual property rights issue raised by the community facilitators, is that implicated in this?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, two things. First of all, the herring season is fast approaching and so there is a time critical aspect to this. The project needs to get

underway. This is very common for all the project proposals that the project proposer does not receive official authorization until the Executive Director sends the letter saying all the conditions of the Council's approval has been met. So there is a way of not having the funds go forward until those conditions have been met. In terms of timing, they need to get this underway right now.

The second aspect is, the whole concept of integrating traditional ecological knowledge into the Council's Restoration Program was brought to the Council by members of the Native communities. And we have spent a lot of time in the last year working with them on what this means, developing this proposal, developing protocols for how we conduct such research in communities. Since that time there has been a number of questions raised. There are concerns in the communities about -- they call them intellectual property rights, it's a question of how this information will be used and what format it will be presented and to whom.

And in the protocols these are listed as one of the items that need to be discussed with communities and worked out in advance. And I think their big fear is that they will be contributing towards the gathering of information that will be used to regulate against them. And in this case I think we have to take things on an individual, project-by-project basis, what are the goals of this project, work with the individual

community and work out those questions because when you talk to them on an individual basis about this project, they have no problems with it.

But there is this kind of greater issue out there, it's being referred to as intellectual property rights and it's kind of this who owns the data, and this does tie into this question of data ownership and we've made it very clear that we are a public organization using public funds, that the data is public, but there are ways that subsistence division is done over the years to aggregate data in a way that doesn't implicate individuals and things of that nature. So I think we have to deal with these things on a case-by-case basis. I think if we can have a successful project that that will ease some of the communities' fears about this.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Any further questions or comments? All in favor of this project say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: This project passes.

There's one more?

MR. SENNER: One more, last one here. This is Delight and Desire Lakes, 97254. You had an extended discussion on this in December in Juneau. There were several questions raised about costs if ultimately a fertilization

program were to be undertaken. Some other questions. You have in your packets a reply from the Department of Fish and Game responding to some of those questions that were raised.

You can note in the Chief Scientist's recommendation that he still, in fact, has some questions about ultimately cost and need for a fertilization project. However, our review of this at the staff level and talking with others is that there is agreement that the basic limnological work that's been proposed here at Delight and Desire Lakes is, in fact, valuable in itself whether or not a fertilization project ever were to go forward. That the land managers and fisheries managers will learn important things about the ecology and caring capacity and management, including proper escapement levels of those lakes. And that that's of inherent value from a restoration standpoint.

So on the basis that those limnological -- that the limnological work is valuable and that that is really what's proposed here, not fertilization, our recommendation is that we go forward.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Is there a motion for purposes of discussion?

MR. RUE: I move that this project be approved. Do you want me to state the number and all that stuff?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: No, that's fine.

MR. WOLFE: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It has been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion about the project?

Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: I have several items. First of all, we do concur with Mr. Senner's comments that if this project is approved it is not a precursor to fertilization and should be viewed as completely independent of any subsequent discussion about the merits or demerits of the fertilization program. To the extent we support this project, we support it purely based on its merits as a limnological study and we in no way are supporting at this time a fertilization project. And I would ask that the Trustee Council's motion on this would be specific that it is not perceived as a precursor to or in any way supportive of a fertilization project.

Secondly, obviously this is an area that is of tremendous concern to the Department of Interior in terms of its location for all the reasons that, and I just counted, particularly for Mr. Reinhardt's benefit, the 11 people who testified on acquisition of the English Bay lands and the 100 letters, minimum, in support of the acquisition and people's great interest in the Kenai Fjord area.

We would like to offer to ADF&G to work with you, have at least one or two individuals from now the Biological Resources Division and the Water Resources Division of USGS to work with you to refine the project design and to do

appropriate assistance in the field on this project. So we 1 would like to be more involved in this project and would ask 2 that ADF&G work with us in proceeding with this project. 3 MR. RUE: Okay. I don't think that's a 4 Does that suggest that we need to change the project 5 problem. 6 description or do you think it's something we just -- something our people can do? 7 MS. D. WILLIAMS: Yes, we would like a sentence 8 in the project description saying that ADF&G will work 9 10 with.... 11 MR. RUE: Coordinate with? MS. D. WILLIAMS: Yeah, coordinate with USGS, 12 right. 13 MR. RUE: I don't think we have a problem with 14 that at all. 15 16 MR. SENNER: You're talking about the same cost, not changing..... 17 MR. RUE: Yeah. 18 19 MS. D. WILLIAMS: We would not propose to change the cost, correct. 20 21 MR. RUE: No problem with that. MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman. 22 23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Brown. 24 MS. BROWN: I have a question. It seems like we've done a number of similar other activities and even with 25

the caveat that's put on them, that says we're not necessarily going to go to fertilization, what do we have in mind in this project that we have not -- knowledge that we have not gained from other similar projects?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Senner.

MR. SENNER: Yes. Ms. Brown, the -- I think the key piece of information here that the limnological work can help address is what the capacity -- caring capacity and productivity of those two lakes really is or are, whatever. And that's something that you have to do on a case-by-case basis. It's not a matter of just plugging information into a model that's been derived elsewhere and so the opportunity here is to learn something specific about these lakes which then, in fact, could help adjust what the department manages the escapement to be. And that is something that is of restoration benefit and benefits the fishermen who derive the service from it, so it is something case by case.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, as a follow up to that, I think that's a good answer, but the -- there are a lot of lakes particularly as you go down the Kenai Peninsula, we've done limnology on a number of them, but probably not all of them. What makes these two particularly unique in your view that we ought to fund this study here or is this just a statement that

we really ought to do it anywhere in the spill area where the information is lacking on what the optimum escapement ought to be?

2

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SENNER: I'm not sure, Mr. Pennoyer, that I could offer a reason that what makes these two lakes unique, it's a proposal that's come before the Trustees for these ones in particular. They are important to a number of fishermen in Lower Cook Inlet and one of the questions that was raised at the Trustee Council meeting in Juneau, which we did get more information on is whether there is importance of this particular fishery from a subsistence standpoint to the residents of Port Graham and I think the answer came back that there are at least eight permit holders in Port Graham and that, in fact, it is important for both commercial and subsistence purposes to those residents. So you're absolutely right, there are a lot of other lakes in the oil spill area, these two have come before you with, I think, demonstrable importance to local residents and it's on that basis that we continue to recommend it favorably.

MR. RUE: And, Steve, I think in addition, this is Frank, we've also seen a significant downturn in productivity in these two lakes since the spill, since the parent year, returning from the spill year, I think, is as I read it. So there is something going on with these lakes that is somewhat unique.

MR. SENNER: I do want to say no one has proposed a direct spill effect in this case, but the timing is more correlation rather than causation but there has been an apparent downturn.

MR. RUE: Right.

1

2

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't -- Frank, Delight and Desire have been, for the last 20 or 30 years interesting case studies in Lower Cook Inlet, on the outer coast. It is an area that we've done a lot of other studies in, but I just, you know, we've done Coghill Lake and we did limnological studies there, we dumped fertilizer in it for a while, we've done limnological studies on care and capacity all around Kodiak Island, in some areas of the Kenai Peninsula. And I'm not clear what funding this means -- I like sockeye research projects, they're a favorite of mine, I started there and I enjoy seeing the results of them and I think they're important, but in terms of where we're going ultimately in research around the spill area, I'm just wondering how to fit this in because I think there's a lot of places we don't have good knowledge and (indiscernible) data -- good knowledge on what optimum escapement ought to be to different systems and how they're reacting.

I'm not clear whether we're doing case by case because were just finding out about them or if there is a plan how to approach this on a broader area, are we doing certain lake

types for information and then trying to translate the knowledge or are we going to try and do it everywhere where we think there is a problem or a lack of information. I'm not particularly against this project, I'm just trying to -- my mind -- actually I'm not against it, but I'm just trying in my mind to fit in how this goes together with the fertilization work we've already done and have suspended. The limnological studies we've already done and have suspended and others we may want to do.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Senner.

MR. SENNER: You asked -- you do make some good comments. Let me just say, we do not have a plan that addresses a -- sort of a rationale or a systematic program on the lake fertilization question. It has been case-by-case. I believe that maybe Bill Hauser from the Department of Fish and Game may want to add a comment in here, but I think the one that I would come back to is that although our research in the sense of basic research is heavily oriented toward looking at underlying causes of long term decline in harbor seals and marine birds. And looking at factors that influence productivity in the marine system, we always need to be mindful and open to the opportunities where we can make a direct sort of management pay off that benefits local users. And I think that would be my justification for wanting to go ahead with this.

But, Bill, or anyone else from the Department of Fish and Game? I think you have to come up here.

MS. McCAMMON: You have to come up to the mic.

MR. HAUSER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, just a very quick comment about the system and why it's different. Quite simply it's very -- it's a rather small drainage compared to the other sockeye systems and it's got a very rapid flushing rate which will affect the limnology of the entire system and productivity, so it would be an excellent research opportunity. It always has been.

MR. RUE: It's somewhat unique, different from others that we've looked at, yeah.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Are there further comments from Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer, Michele, are there further comments from Juneau?

MS. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is Michele, I'm not opposing this project, I just think that as we get down (phone cut out) being repetitive type of project, if we're going to see a lot in the similar area because of the need to do case by case, we may want to think hard about developing some criteria by which we're going to evaluate which ones we want to work on. I mean, there's been a case made these present some unique issues but, you know, I think if we're

going to see repetitive types of projects coming forward it would be good to have some thoughts funneling into what are we going to judge these on in the future.

MR. SENNER: Ms. Brown, we do have supplementation material which were adopted at an extended workshop. Those criteria don't specifically address fertilization issues and if that's something that the Council would like the staff to look at more closely, I think that's something we can do, but -- Ms. McCammon.

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, Michele, I'm not aware of any other proposals for lake fertilizations that are kind of out there in the wings. This one has been around for a least a couple of years, that has kind of come and gone through various stages, but I think if there does appear to be a rash of these in the future, which I don't think there will be, then I think it would be appropriate to look at it more comprehensively.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, both.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, one last question/comment. I think the Trustee Council and (phone cut out) help facilitate some great leaps forward in the understanding of sockeye limnology and the effects of things like supplementation and lake fertilization. And certainly the Fish and Game Soldotna Lab has done a lot in that direction.

As just one last update for personal interest, I know we're running out of time, can the Forest Service update us on

where we are on the Coghill Lake fertilization project?

MR. SENNER: Mr. Pennoyer, I think I can do that. This is Stan. The project is over, the fertilization had ended. The result was an increase in the plankton levels in lake and smolt levels were increased accordingly and so in that sense it's been a success. I think the only sort of remaining issue there, and it's one of a longer term management situation, is how to manage that mixed stock fishery to make sure there's the kind of escapement there that will keep going, the increase in productivity that's been there. But the Trustee Council's role is essentially over in that project.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, that, in fact, the fertilization has not been continued there?

MR. SENNER: That's right, it is over.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Commissioner Rue.

MR. RUE: Yeah, one quick question, perhaps, of Molly. I don't have the Restoration Plan in front of me, and maybe I should, and I can't remember what we said about our goals for this sockeye or whatever. Do you think we've done enough in the Restoration Plan to kind of direct ourselves on research in this area?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I don't really view this as a direct restoration activity for sockeye. How I view it is as a replacement fishery restoration activity for

injuries to commercial fisheries and to subsistence. So it's kind of a different approach.

MR. RUE: Yeah. Perhaps we should make sure as the projects come forward that we thought though that and we kind of hook back to the Restoration Plan and I'll, you know, put that burden on the Department as we propose projects because I think some of the questions that have just been asked could have been helped if we had consistently referred back to the Restoration Plan and said, remember we had this objective of doing this for this particular resource, this particular use. So, you know, I'll look to that in the future as a department, but I think that it would be good for all of us to consistently think of that, what are we trying to do here.

MR. SENNER: And Molly is correct....

MR. RUE: It's more of a service that....

MR. SENNER: ....that we would not carry forward under the sockeye restoration heading, it's restoration of service.

MR. RUE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Additional comments from

Anchorage? No?

MR. WOLFE: I do.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Wolfe.

MR. WOLFE: Do we have a friendly amendment to the motion and could somebody restate....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I think I'm going to try to do that and see if that works. But before I do that, anything else from Juneau?

MS. BROWN: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. What I understand it, the motion is to approve Project 97254 with the understanding that this is being approved for the purposes of limnological work only, that approval of this project does not mean either approval or disapproval of fertilization of the lake but is simply approval of the limnological aspect of this. And that the Department of Fish and Game is to work cooperatively with the Department of the Interior in carrying out this project. Does that capture everything?

MS. McCAMMON: Captures.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: With that as the motion, then, all in favor of the project.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.

(No opposing responses)

1.0

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The project passes. Before we go into executive session we are losing Council members and it is appropriate to mark that occasion. Molly.

MS. McCAMMON: Well we do have a number of people that have left the Council process in the last couple of months and I have Certificates of Appreciation for them that

I'll distribute for everyone to sign. The first one is Doug
Hall who was the Deputy Administrator of NOAA and served on the
Washington policy group very effectively. He has now returned
to the private sector and is working with the Nature
Conservancy. And I have an appreciation in his honor to sign.

The next person is Ray Thompson with the Forest Service who was very active in the restoration planning phase and the restoration activities on the behalf of the Forest Service and Department of Agriculture in the last few years. He has moved on to greener pastures in Montana recently.

And then the third on is the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Interior for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, George T. Frampton, Jr. and I have a certificate in his honor here also. Today is his official last day on the job. And as most of you know we sent around a little blank card for you to sign and you probably didn't see what we were going to attach it to. And this isn't the original, this isn't what was sent to George, but it's what it was attached to. And this is a Calvin and Hobbes cartoon and I'll read it to you because I think it's very appropriate for the work that George did and also for the work that the Council does.

And it starts out: People keep talking about opening more wilderness for development. We seem to understand the value of oil, timber, minerals and housing but not the value of unspoiled beauty, wildlife, solitude and spiritual renewal. We

need to start putting prices on the price list. Yeah, if our woods are worth a zillion, jillion, bagillion, think what Alaska is worth.

So the signatures that you did last week were framed in in a separate deal around here and it was sent to George at the party on Wednesday, Dan Sakura presented it to him on behalf of the Council and, Dan, I don't know if you want to describe George's party or reaction.

MR. RUE: Is this going to take a long time?
MS. McCAMMON: Briefly.

MR. SAKURA: On behalf of Mr. Frampton, I would just like to thank the Council for the wonderful gift. I presented it to him at the party on Wednesday and he very much appreciated it. And he would like for me to express his gratitude to the Council for the wonderful gift. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Are there Council members that would like to make comments or say anything at this time in Anchorage? Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: I just want to thank all three individuals and particularly George and Doug for their tremendous leadership over the last three and half years and I think much of what we're accomplishing today and that we've accomplished in the last three and a half years can be attributed directly to their insight, judgment, work and belief

in this process.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Is there anyone in Juneau that would like to make any comments?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, yeah, I'd like to second what Deborah said, I think that (phone cut out) great support. Early on in the process there was a lot of questions how we were going to interact between Washington, D.C. and locally, regionally and make a smooth operation from that process and I think the gentlemen that she's mentioned have help facilitate that. I'm appreciative of that and I think that we have accomplished things we couldn't have otherwise. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you.

MR. RUE: I guess I'd like to make one final comment. I certainly add my appreciation to the work of all three people listed her, but I'd also like to thank

Mr. Frampton for having such a capable designee here in Alaska to help us get through all the hard work we do here. And not only for his work but his wisdom in finding such a capable person to sit in for him at the meetings.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. I would certainly echo these remarks. All three of these individuals have contributed greatly to the process over the years and we wish them well in where they're headed.

We are at the point where we need to go into executive session. I think....

MS. McCAMMON: Five minute break, too.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Well, let's talk about it first so the public can assume what we're going to do. The plan, I believe, is to go into executive session and rejoin as a public session -- I would suggest the public plan on 12:30, that would give everybody time to get some lunch. I don't think this little area out here in front of the door will be available to sort of gather in and so if you could pretty much time it to come back at 12:30 and we'll plan to restart the public session at that time to the best of our ability.

Ms. McCammon.

1.6

MS. McCAMMON: That's correct, Mr. Chairman, we plan on having the door to the kitchen closed and this entire area will be closed for executive session and public members who are interested in stay, the Oil Spill Public Information Center downstairs is opened and available, there's phones there. We also have extra office space if you need to make phone calls or whatever.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And we will check downstairs before we go back into public session in case anybody is waiting down there.

I guess we're going to need a motion to go into executive session; do I hear such a motion?

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I move we go 1 2 into executive session to discuss habitat acquisition issues, 3 both small and large parcels. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And.... 4 5 MS. McCAMMON: Executive Director's evaluation. MS. D. WILLIAMS: Oh, and Executive Director's 6 evaluation. 7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there a second? 8 MR. RUE: 9 Second. 10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any discussion? 11 there anyone opposed? (No opposing responses) 12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Hearing no one, we are in 13 executive session. And I guess the people in Juneau, hang up 14 15 and we will call you back in about five minutes. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I know that you 16 17 don't want to chair this thing forever and you're doing a good job by not taking any breaks, could we have about a 10 minute 18 19 break? CHAIRMAN TILLERY: We will have a 10 minute 20 break and we'll be back on in 10 minutes. Thank you. 21 (Off record - 11:24 a.m.) 22 (On record - 1:05 a.m.) 23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The meeting is called back 24

The Trustee Council did meet in executive session,

to order.

25

the matters that were discussed were those described prior to going into session, habitat acquisition and the Executive Director's evaluation.

The next item on the agenda is the English Bay proposal. Deborah, does the Department of Interior care to lead off?

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Trustee Council members, members of the public, members of staff, it is with great pleasure and enthusiasm that we bring to you today a resolution to acquire English Bay Corporation's land holdings within the boundaries of Kenai Fjords National Park. As you know, there has been tremendous support for this acquisition. Eric gave us over 100 letters today and the Trustee Council office has several hundred more. We heard some excellent today in support of it.

And what we would like to do, very briefly, is describe the land transaction with you. And to do that we have Buff Bohlen, who is the chief negotiator, so he will briefly walk the Trustee Council members and the public through the terms of the offer that we hope the Trustee Council will agree to make today. We also have in the audience today Ann Castellina, the Superintendent of Kenai Fjords National Park who will be available to answer any questions you have. Buff.

MR. BOHLEN: Thank you, Deborah. It really is a great pleasure to bring this proposal to the Council. It's

the culmination of several years of discussions between the Department of Interior and English Bay Corporation. And I would like to just start off by commending their Board, and particularly their late chairman and their president for their marvelous attitude in this and their desire to add these lands to the park for the benefit of all the people in the United States.

Now, I won't go into much depth on the value of these lands in terms of their habitat protection because I think we had some very good testimony from the public this morning. Suffice it to say that although all these lands provide valuable habitat for nearly all of the injured resources and services harmed by the oil spill, some parcels, such as James Lagoon, have especially high values. And six of the seven parcels were ranked as having high values for wilderness, and as you know that is one of the main attractions for the visitors who come to Kenai Fjords National Park.

The package we have put together involves the purchase of in fee of 30,200 acres in the park and additional 2,270 acres in the adjacent maritime national wildlife refuge, Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. The basic price for those lands, we're asking the Council to approve \$14.1 millon for this fee purchase. And this price was based on the English Bay Corporation retaining access rights for hunting, fishing and other activities on all the lands within the park that they

were selling. Because the park does not allow hunting under its legislation, English Bay Corporation has agreed to limit those rights to about 9,000 acres in the southwest portion of the park. And will sell to the Department of Interior their access rights on the remaining acreage within the park.

And the Federal Trustees have already agreed, pending approval today of the Council of the 14.1 million, they would then approve 1.1 million from the Federal restitution funds, criminal funds, for the purposes of purchasing these access rights.

I think altogether it makes a very attractive package at a price that is fair to the Government and fair to English Bay. I would add one other very important element, English Bay has offered to take \$500,000.00 of their proceeds to put them in a special fund to protect archaeological sites and cultural artifacts that are associated with their lands within the park. Obviously these sites and artifacts are of great importance, historically and culturally, to the people of Nanwalek, formerly known as English Bay, and I think this is a step for which they should be commended. This money will be used to survey and protect these archaeological sites and artifacts and the English Bay people will be working in close cooperation with the people of the National Park Service in a joint effort to protect these areas.

That's the summation of it.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Do Trustee Council members 1 have questions for Buff Bohlen? 2 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Anyone in Anchorage have a 3 question? 4 (No responses) 5 6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any Council member in Juneau who has any question for Mr. Bohlen? 7 MS. BROWN: No question again, thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: 9 Okay. MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I believe we 10 have a representative from the English Bay Corporation here, 11 perhaps it would be appropriate to hear from him now if he 12 would like to speak or perhaps after the resolution is reviewed 13 in more detailed. 14 15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It would be, I think, 16 appropriate now. MS. D. WILLTAMS: 17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Would you like to come up 18 and make a statement. 19 20 MS. D. WILLIAMS: Let me underscore Buff's comments that we thank English Bay with our entire heart for 21 persisting in this transaction. It has been a long and tough 22 negotiation, it's been a negotiation that has gone on over 23 three years, maybe even four years, depending how you count. 24

And we really do commend English Bay for its desire and

25

commitment to have these parks (sic) as part of the park and also the proceeds from the transaction, should it go forward, for the benefit of the people. Bill.

1.8

MR. TIMME: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, my name is William Timme, Bill Timme, I'm counsel to the English Bay Corporation. I want to extend the corporation's appreciation for the Council's consideration of this package today. To express our President, Don Emil's, regrets that he was not able to be here today as he had initially had intended.

You're right, Deborah, this thing is -- I was just thinking about it this morning, it was about four years ago that we first started meeting with representatives of the Park Service to see if there was someway which we could accommodate the Park Service desire to have the lands that the corporation had selected within the park. And now, fortunately, as a result of a lot of people's hard work and long efforts, especially Buff's and Don Emil's and members of the Park Service and a lot of your help and arm twisting, I'm certain, we're at this point where the resolution is before the Council.

Our only regret is that Bobby Kavasnikoff, our Chairman, is not here with us today to witness this. I had an opportunity to meet with him shortly before he died and it was a matter that was foremost on his mind. He saw this as being an opportunity to provide an economic opportunity for his people for the future, to provide access to lands to the public

in general and most importantly to provide an opportunity to fund -- for using the SEA money, archaeological study of an area that's very special to the people of Nanwalek. That they have a long history of settlements in the area that have, because of the inaccessibility of the area, has not been touched upon.

1.8

We hope the Council will act favorably with respect to the resolution. Again I want to express on behalf of the corporation our gratitude for the hard work that the Federal staff has put in on this project and we look forward to working with the Park Service very closely in the future with the implementation of this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be an opportune time to present to the other Trustee Council members a resolution regarding Robert "Bobby" Kavasnikoff that we would hope to get Trustee support for and signature for the resolution because as Mr. Timme so appropriately said, Bobby Kavasnikoff's inspiration is what probably provided the most important momentum for this transaction. So with the Chair's permission if I could read the resolution?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Go ahead.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Robert "Bobby" Kavasnikoff,
Native leader, musician, husband and father, 1953 to 1997.

Bobby Kavasnikoff could always be found center stage in his home town of Nanwalek ready with a smile and a song. As a village leader and Chairman of the English Bay Corporation Bobby spoke eloquently about Native issues. His role in negotiating the sale of village holdings in Kenai Fjords National Park led to the establishment of a permanent endowment for the people of Nanwalek, training and jobs for village youth and long term protection of Native heritage.

But it was through his electric guitar, golden voice and home grown songs where Bobby's passion took root in the heart of Alaska. He reached Alaskans through rock and roll, leading the English Bay band to local fame at the Alaska State Fair and statewide Native gatherings. When Bobby talked or sang people listened. He returnally (sic) served as Grand Master for community events with his band often providing entertainment for dances and pageant. He was a central figure who brought smiles to his village, whether as a jolly Santa Claus for village children, a band leader or a steady voice promoting Native issues.

As members of the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council we join with the family and friends of Bobby Kavasnikoff in honoring his life accomplishments and vision. We extend our sincere condolences to Bobby's wife, Susan, his eight children, his parents, his 12 brothers and sisters and to the community of Nanwalek. Bobby's leadership, commitment, talents and sense of

community will be greatly missed by all.

And I move that we pass this as a resolution of the Trustee Council.

MR. WOLFE: Second.

MR. RUE: Second if you need it.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Would anyone else like to make any comments at this time?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. All in favor of the resolution say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The resolution passes. If you could have Council members sign it and that will be provided to his family. Thank you, Deborah.

At this time I would like to take a somewhat unusual step, but if there are any members of the public either -- and let me start here in Anchorage, who didn't speak earlier, at the earlier public comment period, who would like to add anything about this particular transaction as it's been described, I'd just like to take a few minutes, and I would request that you keep any remarks pretty brief, but if there is anyone who would have some additional comments from Anchorage could you raise your hand or identify yourselves?

## (No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And I guess I'm not too sure what sites are on the line, but if there's anyone at any of the sites would like to comment who has previously spoken on this issue, could you please identify yourself?

## (No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. We had an awful lot of comments earlier on this issue.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. McCammon.

MS. McCAMMON: I'd like to make a comment.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. McCammon would like to

make a comment.

MS. McCAMMON: For the non-members of the public. Ms. Williams was correct when she said that this particular acquisition had received some of the greatest amount of public support of any of the elements of the Council's habitat protection program. We have in our library over 500 letters and comments from individuals in Alaska and outside the state of Alaska supporting this acquisition. Since last Friday alone we have received more than 135 individual, either letters, e-mail or telephone calls that are represented in this binder. And they're all unanimous in support of going forward with this acquisition. And I think this definitely is a major part of this public record.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams.
MS. D. WILLIAMS: I believe all the Trustee
Council members have the resolution in front of them, I would
move now that the Trustee Council adopt the resolution to make
an offer to English Bay Corporation to acquire the lands that
we've discussed.
MR. RUE: Second.
MS. BROWN: Second.
CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motion to adopt the
resolution for the acquisition of the English Bay lands has
been moved and seconded. Is there additional discussion,
first, here in Anchorage?
(No responses)
CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there additional
discussion from Council members in Juneau?
MR. PENNOYER: No, Mr. Chairman, thank you.
CHAIRMAN TILLERY: We'll bring it to a vote.
All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.
IN UNISON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.
(No opposing responses)
CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motions carries, we have
unanimously agreed that the offer will be extended to English

25 Bay as described in the resolutions.

Thank you very much, Deborah and congratulations Buff and congratulations English Bay Corporation.

(Round of applause)

2.0

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And there's more on the agenda, if I can find it. I believe the next item on the agenda will be the -- what is now know as the Roberts parcel, it was the Schilling parcel, Kenai small parcel 1038.

Mr. Swiderski, would you like to come up and describe for us briefly what that is.

MR. SWIDERSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members of the Trustee Council the Roberts parcel which was originally known as the Schilling parcel was sold to

Mr. Roberts at the beginning of last summer. As originally contemplated this parcel encompassed approximately 5.9 acres.

It's located on the Kenai River at the -- just downstream from where the Sterling Highway crosses the Kenai River in essentially downtown Soldotna.

The parcel originally appraised at \$1,304,000.00. Following discussions with the Council we determined that the price given the nature of the parcel was higher than was appropriate for the Council to be spending, spoke with the land owner and he agreed to reduce the size of the parcel from 5.9 acres to 3.34 acres, nevertheless, reserving in the reconfigured parcel all of the shoreline that was in the original parcel and, thereby, retaining a vast portion of the

original restoration benefits of the parcel.

This parcel has more than 600 feet of shoreline along the Kenai River, the Kenai River provides spawning habitat for all species of Pacific salmon, specifically pink salmon spawn and dolly varden spawn and rear along this stretch of the river. The stream side vegetation afforded by this parcel not only stabilizes the stream banks but protects water quality, moderates temperatures and provides cover for rearing fish.

As the Council is well aware, the increasing pressure of fishing in the Kenai River, including bank fishing, has destroyed much of this stream side protection all along the river. This parcel is currently subject to shoreline easement held by the Kenai River Sportfish Association. Pursuant to that easement they have constructed a boardwalk and put in place bank stabilization measures to provide for the regeneration for destroyed habitat along this stretch of bank.

That easement is not a perpetual easement, it can be terminated by the land owner upon one year's notice and one of the benefits of this acquisition would be to effect -- merge title with that easement and acquire it, thereby providing permanent protection for the boardwalk. By virtue of its location at the Sterling Highway crossing and in downtown Soldotna and it's also adjacent to the Kenai River -- I'm sorry the Kenai Visitors Center, the parcel will attract many bank fishermen and thereby deflect fishing pressures from more

remote parcels and, I think, I would submit, make it easier for fishery managers when they need to to close other parcels to bank fishing.

The acquisition of the parcel has received extensive public support, strongly supported and the current configuration is strongly supported by the Kenai River Sportfishing Association, also by the Kenai Borough Mayor and the Soldotna Mayor.

The current price of the parcel as reconfigured is \$698,000.00. This price was arrived at by calculating a square footage for the initial parcel as it was appraised and applying that to the reduce size of 3.34 acres. I was assured by the -- Dennis Slattery who was the review appraiser who confirmed with the appraiser who appraised the property that by reducing the size of the parcel and keeping within it the shoreline, all of the shoreline that the square foot price would go up, which in effect means that the Council will be acquiring this parcel as somewhat an undetermined amount below what the parcel would appraise at.

I have prepared a resolution that also includes -because the parcel was reduced in size, the one boundary, and
there is, I believe, in your packet a map that shows the parcel
with the proposed reconfiguration, that one boundary will need
to be surveyed and the resolution does include provision for
the survey costs to be paid by the -- with the use of Trustee

Council funds to be provided, with Ms. McCammon's approval. It believe the cost should be relatively low because there's survey markers out there, but that one boundary would need to be resurveyed.

Are there any question?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any questions of Mr. Swiderski from the Council members in Anchorage? Mr. Rue.

MR. RUE: Not so much a question as a comment. I think I'd just like to commend this parcel and the efforts of Mr. Swiderski in getting a proposal before us, as well as the property owners. I've been on the parcel a number of times and the Kenai Sportfishing Association has done a tremendous job down there, not only developing access but doing it in a way that protects the banks and maintains a natural bank so that we can have access to this incredible resource but also maintain its habitat functions. I think it's an area that has gotten a lot of attention, a lot of people will use it. It's really not only an important parcel, but it's also an incredible example for other property owners to see how to do it right in protecting their banks.

So I think a lot of people put a lot of effort into this and I would commend it to the Council.

MR. PENNOYER: (Indiscernible)

MR. RUE: Pardon?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer, was there a

comment?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, we were talking about the boardwalk process and the fish walk contribution and how that plays into this.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I'm sorry, did you have a question for Alex on how the fish walk works?

MR. PENNOYER: Well, no, I think that was an element that was presented to us as further reason why this makes a lot of sense and we were just going to ask that question on the record.

MR. SWIDERSKI: I believe it does enhance the value of the parcel to the Council in a couple of different One is that it does allow a concentration of fishing there that will deflect pressure from other parcels and by fishing there on a boardwalk people will not be threatening banks. And, of course, an advantage to the Council is that the boardwalk is already in place. The boardwalk was not included, I believe I'm correct, in the value of the appraisal because there was an easement for it and technically title to the boardwalk, I think, currently will remain with the -- would remain with the Kenai River Sportfish Association, although as I say, the owner can terminate the easement upon a year's notice and acquire that interest if it so desires. essentially we will be buying protection provided by the boardwalk and the bank stabilization measures that are already

there and I, too, have seen the parcel and I would agree with Mr. Rue, that it is well done.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any additional questions or comments for Mr. Swiderski from Juneau?

MR. PENNOYER: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Any from Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Alex. I noticed that Ben Ellis is in the audience. Ben, would you like to address the Council?

MR. ELLIS: I'm Ben Ellis, the Executive
Director of Kenai River Sportfishing. We appreciate the
consideration of purchasing this property. To maybe address
the boardwalk issue just a little bit, the area prior to
construction of the boardwalk a year ago by the Soldotna
Visitors Center was a complete mud hole, it was a catastrophe,
people fishing in mud and slopping in mud and tearing habitat
up. In the first segment of the boardwalk, the first 72 feet
was constructed on the city of Soldotna property there at the
Visitors Center, which is a sliver, as you see in your diagram,
out of this parcel, of which the original parcel was. And then
another 200 feet was added in August onto the Schilling
property with the 10 foot easement that you've been talking
about.

The total cost of that project is right at \$140,000.00

and that's the bank stabilization and the boardwalk and the steps going into the river for hip boot fishing type of thing. And I might just mention all this -- the 140,000 was raised through private funds, though fishing events, Senator Stevens participates in the Kenai River Classic. So we're committed to continue this type of effort, we encourage the Council to purchase the property because we do think it's a critical area for habitat. The part that you're looking at is still in fairly good riparian state, we'll be interested in working with any of the new owners to design, create a further extension of the boardwalk using Classic funds and to do it in the most habitat responsible way. Our sportfishing association has two goals and that is to protect the fish habitat and to promote responsible sportfishing.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much. Are there any question from Council members of Mr. Ellis, here in Anchorage?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Happy Valentine. Let the record reflect that Deborah received flowers. Are there any questions for Mr. Ellis from the Juneau Council members?

MR. PENNOYER: No. Thank you very much for the explanation.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ellis.

MR. RUE: One last comment. I would just like to say that the Sportfish Association has done a tremendous job in developing some of these access facilities and rehabilitating banks. They're doing a great job.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Actually let the record reflect, this was just care of me, this is to the Trustee Council, the entire Trustee Council, so we all get a couple of roses from Kenai Fjords Coast and Critters Within. We thanks. Thank you whoever sent them.

MR. RUE: I guess it was those otters.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: The otters, yeah. That's very splendid, we'll all split and enjoy these beautiful flowers.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I'd like to just briefly make one comment about the parcel 1038. That is I think we're doing really a pretty good job on the Kenai, we were looking at that map earlier, of finding areas, of acquiring them and of protecting the banks. And I think we have to keep in mind that when we do protect banks and we take some of the river and we say, okay, let's don't fish anymore, let's let this bank recover that people -- we need to find a place for those people to go and to fish. And I think one of the most important things about this parcel is it allows -- it really is a place that is protected, it's a good fishing location, one that now has a fish walk on it. It's going to allow the bank to be

stable but we're going to be able to direct traffic away from other areas, allowing them to restore, while putting people in this area. And I think it's really -- it's part of an overall comprehensive strategy but it's a very necessary part of that overall comprehensive strategy. Anyway, with that, is there a motion? MR. RUE: I move that the Council approve the purchase of the Roberts parcel for a sum of \$698,000.00. MS. BROWN: Second, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motion has been moved and seconded. Is there any further discussion from Anchorage on the motion? (No responses) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any further discussion from Juneau on the motion? MS. BROWN: No, thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Hearing none, all in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.

(No opposing responses)

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motion carries. Thank you. Congratulations.

We have one item left on the agenda and, Molly, do you want to explain that or who will be explaining that? It has to

do with the Chenega.....

MS. McCAMMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a small amendment to the Chenega resolution that does two things. First of all it clarifies that for the \$34,000,000.00 purchase price for the Chenega property that 24,000,000 comes from Trustee Council funds and 10,000,000 from the Federal restitution funds.

And then secondly it allows us to go forward by changing the language when Department of Law and Department of Justice are authorized to go forward to request the money from the court. It allows us to go forward right away, get the money from the court, put it into the Federal NRDA R account, be getting interest on it while we're waiting for the closing to occur. But then those funds would be almost immediately available for when that event happens.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Are there questions of Council members?

MS. D. WILLIAMS: So moved.

MR. WOLFE: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It's been moved and seconded. Is there discussion from Council members in Anchorage on this motion?

(No responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any discussion from Council members in Juneau on the motion?

MS. BROWN: No, thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed.

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motion passes.

MS. McCAMMON: It's a resolution.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The resolution passes and we'll be signing it and sending it around.

I think that brings us to the end, almost on schedule.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Wolfe, it doesn't bring us to the end?

MR. WOLFE: Not quite. I wanted to just take one second to extend my appreciation and thanks to the Interior folks and folks of English Bay for continuing to negotiate and work out a deal that I think is to the benefit of all the parties and really happy to see this part of what we were trying to achieve and set out to achieve in the Restoration Plan to provide some protection of habitat throughout the oil spill area with as much balance as we could. So this just adds one more piece to the puzzle.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Other comments

by Council members? MS. D. WILLIAMS: You don't get three roses for 2 that though, Jim. 3 MR. WOLFE: Sorry, sorry. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That increased your rose 5 allotment. All right. Is there a motion? MS. D. WILLIAMS: Yeah. 7 MS. McCAMMON: Recess. 8 MS. D. WILLIAMS: I move to recess. 9 executive session we discussed the need for a subsequent 10 executive session to discuss habitat acquisition, particularly 11 12 small parcels, further, so I move to recess until we can have that executive session. 13 MR. WOLFE: I second. 14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It has been moved and 15 seconded. 16 Is there any discussion in Anchorage? (No responses) 17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any discussion in 18 Juneau on the motion? 19 20 MS. BROWN: No. MR. PENNOYER: No, thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: All in favor say aye. 22 IN UNISON: 23 Aye CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed. 24 25 (No opposing responses)

1	CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. We are recessed.
2	Thank you very much.
3	MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Bye.
4	(Off record - 1:37 p.m.)
5	(MEETING RECESSED)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	·
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
3	) ss. STATE OF ALASKA )
4	I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Owner of Computer Matrix do hereby certify:
6	THAT the foregoing pages numbered 5 through 141 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council's Meeting recorded electronically by me
7 on the 14th day of February 1997 and thereafter transcription me to the best of my knowledge and ability;	on the 14th day of February 1997 and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability;
9	THAT there are numerous indiscernibles in pages 2 through 34 due to a malfunction of the first tape which caused a great deal of warbling;
10	THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the request
11	of:
12	EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL, 645 G Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501;
13	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 13th day of December
14	1996.
15	SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY:
16	
17	Last VV . I
18	Joseph P. Kolasinski
19	N∲tary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires: 04/17/00
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,