## EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11



TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

(Taken telephonically at)

March 3, 1997 10:00 o'clock a.m.

Fourth Floor Conference Room 645 G Street Anchorage, Alaska

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT IN JUNEAU:

12

STATE OF ALASKA -

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. CRAIG TILLERY DEPARTMENT OF LAW: Trustee Representative for the Attorney General

STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR:

U.S. FOREST SERVICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE -

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE - NMFS:

STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION: MR. FRANK RUE Commissioner

MS. DEBORAH WILLIAMS Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary

MR. PHIL JANIK Regional Forester

MR. STEVE PENNOYER Director, Alaska Region

MS. MICHELE BROWN Commissioner

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

1	TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT	<b>':</b>
2	MS. MOLLY McCAMMON (In Juneau)	Executive Director EVOS Trustee Council
3	MR. ERIC MYERS (In Juneau)	Director of Operations EVOS Trustee Council
5	MS. REBECCA WILLIAMS	Executive Secretary
6	(In Anchorage)	EVOS Trustee Council
7	MR. JOE HUNT (In Anchorage)	Communications Coodinator EVOS Trustee Council
8	MS. VERONICA CHRISTMAN (In Anchorage)	EVOS Staff
9	MR. ALEX SWIDERSKI (In Juneau)	State of Alaska Department of Law
11	MS. MARTY RUTHERFORD	Deputy Commissioner, Alaska Department of Natural
12		Resources
13		. •
14		
15		
16 17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PUBLIC TESTIMONY	PAGE
2	MR. LEO T. OBERTS	15
3	MR. EMIL DOLCHAK	18
4	MR. JAMES SHOWALTER	21
5	MR. MIKE KLIEMANN	23
6	MR. TOBY TYLER	23
7	MR. JACK CUSHING	27
8	MS. BARBARA SEAMAN	32
9	MR. MARK LUTTRELL	35
10	MS. SANDY CRONLAND	37
11	MS. DAISY LEE BITTER	38
12	MS. PAM BRODIE	42
13	MS. AMY BOLENBACH	45
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## PROCEEDINGS

(On record - 10:12 a.m)

2.0

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: This is the continuation meeting of Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. Present are Steve Pennoyer representing NOAA, Phil Janik representing the Unites States Forest Service, Frank Rue representing the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Deborah Williams representing the Department of Interior, Michele Brown representing the Department of Environmental Conservation and Craig Tillery with the Department of Law.

Before we move into approval of the agenda I'd first like to note because I'm not sure that we did this last time, to report back from the executive session at the end of the last meeting we had, during that executive session we discussed habitat protection and the Executive Director's evaluation as was described prior to going into the session.

I believe we have an agenda prepared, is there a motion on the agenda?

MR. JANIK: So moved. Move we adopt.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any opposition?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Hearing none, the agenda is adopted. I'd like to move to approval of the February 14th meeting notes which are in the package.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: So moved.

UNIDENTIFIED SECOND: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there any opposition?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Those meeting notes are adopted. Looks like we do not have an executive director's report. I take it the first item of business would be a report on the 1996 audit from Max Mertz.

MR. MERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief today, but feel free to jump in and interrupt any time you'd like. You have three documents relative to the audit in front of you. One is a two page letter that is a required communication. It's from the auditor to the Trustees covering some significant issues that we're required to communicate to you. It's a standard letter that we give to all of our clients. Basically the most important thing in the letter is the fact that the financial statements are, of course, the responsibility of the Trustee Council. While we do prepare the financial statements as part of our audit contract, the financial statements are, in fact, yours.

The other thing that would be important to point out is that there are no disagreements with management doing the audit. Frequently when we do an audit there will be a difference of opinion relative to some sort of disclosure or treatment of a transaction or something. There were none

relative to this audit so I feel in general we have concurrence between ourselves, the executive director and ourselves and the agencies as well that were audited.

The next document you have is the thick document, that's the actual financial statements themselves and there's two parts to that essentially. The first section is the trust fund financial statement covering the CRIS Trust Fund, the NRDA-R and the State Trust Fund and those, there are two, and the second part of that financial statement are the restoration projects. As you're aware, we go in and make a selection of projects that were conducted in FY96 and perform certain procedures on those (indiscernible - cough).

The third document that you have is the internal control and operating comments letter. This is the detail by agency, and we also have a couple this year is all general comments relative to the results of our audit. This was the second year that EVOS was audited. We performed the audit last year, as you're aware of, we incurred a little over 1,000 staff hours in doing the audit. When you do that we are very disruptive to your staff schedules when we're out there, particularly your finance staff. And every agency really went out of their way. I'd like to particularly point out that Fish and Game, Kim Garnero, who is the finance officer really kind of goes above and beyond and helps us pull together a bunch of information relative to the State Trust Fund that really -- it

probably wouldn't be included in her job description, but she does it anyway and we're very appreciative of that. But all the finance staff are very helpful during the audit.

were ranked by dollar amount for each agency. And what we do is we move down the list starting with the highest dollar project until we get 50 percent coverage of the projects that were accepted by the agencies. So we essentially directly audited 50 percent of the projects. Now, there are approximately another eight-10 projects that were selected, you know, kind of at random for testing, so overall I believe our coverage over the actual disbursements that were incurred last year was about 62 or 63 percent of the actual project dollars that were actually tested. Clearly we can't test them all but we feel that the controls and the way we do our testing is such that the results that we get on those that are tested are applicable to those projects that we don't test.

We, of course, audited each of the three trust funds as well and we have to do some interesting accruals and year-end close out stuff for the State Trust Fund because of the fact that the Federal fiscal year ends aren't coincident, and so we kind of have to do, you know, an interim close on that. But we do a lot of accrual work that is standard, that we would have to do in order to get it on to a general accepted accounting principle basis and that went on fine and we feel that the

numbers that are presented for each of the trust funds are fair.

1.5

The report is unqualified. An unqualified report, which I believe is on Page 1, is simply our communication to you that the amount that is presented are in accordance with the accounting principles that are used for each of the trust funds. We use a cash basis for CRIS and NRDA-R because they are on a cash basis. We use what we called a modified accrual basis for the State Trust Fund because it's a slightly different type of entity and the accounting principle used by the State of Alaska are different than the Federal government.

But having said that, each of the trust funds are fairly present and so our report is unqualified. In addition, we present three -- I'm sorry, two reports for each trust fund, one relative to the internal control structure and one relative to the compliance, the laws and regulations for each of the trust funds. And those reports are unqualified as well. In other words, overall what we're saying is that compliance with laws and regulations was maintained during the year by each of the trust funds. And we're also saying that the internal control structure, based on the work that we performed, appear to be sufficient to carry out the duty or to the task at hand of each of those.

Nothing -- well, we do have a management letter that makes suggestion on improvements, none of those suggestions are

critical or serious enough to say that the internal control structure isn't sufficient, in fact, it is. Same results that we had in prior years.

Again, the audit went very smoothly. Last year, you recall, we had the Federal furlough that we dealt with, it was the first time (indiscernible - phone cut out) last year, so we had, you know, some areas that we needed to work on this year and I would say that, again, staff was very helpful and overall the audit went very smoothly, given the size and the breadth of the audit.

We made no significant adjustments to the numbers that the staff gave us originally to audit, with the exception of some minor adjustments that we had to make at DEC relative some costs that were improperly charged, but those were less than \$2,000.00 was non-EVOS cost was sitting in EVOS project. We also had to move some costs between fiscal years around at Fish and Wildlife Service and that gets into kind of some administrative issues that there were dealing with there that, you know, we feel will be easily correctable, it's not a significant issue, it just has to do with the way the timing between when you approved the money for them to spend and when they actually get it in the system, the time lag that's involved in terms of where do you charge the money until you get authorization in your system. And so they charged it to the remaining authorization for the prior year and those

dollars never got what is called redistributed to the '96 project. We've done that, the numbers in the financial statement include those.

I know you're just getting the financial statement now, so I anticipate there won't be a lot of questions there, so I'll go right into the management letter or the internal control and operating comments letter. And, again, I'm not going to go through it in detail, I don't think anybody wants me to. If there are any specific question, you know, I'll be happy to answer those when I'm done here.

We asked the agencies, however, to respond to each comment that was presented and we have concurrence on every comment. In other words, we feel that, based on the agencies reviews of the comments that we have, that our comments were reasonable and concurred with. I think there's some areas of discussion with respect to each comment that you can take up with your staff, but overall we feel that, you know, the comments were concurred with the agencies.

We also, at the very back of the management letter, just preceding the agency responses, we summarized last year's comment and the status of those comments this year. And, by and large, I would say to a greater degree than we generally see most of clients when we go in and we do an audit and we look at last year's comments there is a great deal of improvement that was made with respect to the issues that we

identified in the prior year, and that includes the general comments that we had last year.

Probably the most notable agency to point out with respect to improvement would have been NOAA, they really made a concerted effort to kind of put their house in order from our perspective. We don't -- there weren't huge issues here, but there were certainly management issues, project management issues, accounting issues that they needed to address and every single one of those was addressed this year.

The other agency that we saw quite a bit of improvement overall was the Fish and Wildlife Service. We felt that Fish and Wildlife Service also made a great deal of strides. There are still some significant issues at Fish and Wildlife Service that we feel are going to be addressed this year. Some of those issues that were brought up last year that weren't addressed this year, they're kind of in the process of improving and I think next year there will be a lot of improvement there.

The one exception to the improvement was DEC, we felt that DEC didn't do some of the project management tasks and accomplish some of the routine tasks that are necessary in order to properly carry this project out. They have already at DEC made changes to the way that they're doing their project management for FY97, they've confined it to different folks within the department and based on kind of talking to those

people and preliminary looking at what they're doing there, we feel that in FY97 there will be tremendous improvement there as well.

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The one area from last year I think I'd like to bring up because from the document that you have in front of you today, additional information has come up and that's with respect to the CRIS fees. CRIS fees apparently are still going to be an issue. And it appeared that when we did the management letter that the court clerk was going to, correct me if I wrong, but were going to actually waive any future fees and reimburse or restore prior fees paid. And at some level I believe the court clerk (indiscernible) has decided that that would not happen. And so the registry fee issue is still there, you're still being charged 10 percent based on your That, in our view, is greatly exceeds both the earnings. market rate, number 1, and number 2, it exceeds what should be charged based on the services that you receive. And we would encourage, and I believe Molly and Traci are continuing to look at the alternatives there in terms of, you know, is there another appropriate depository for the money, and is there other ways that the funds can be assessed that you better return or is there still some room for negotiations (indiscernible) themselves. So that would be something that would certainly be worthwhile right now. You're sitting through the end of FY96, I believe, at about 1.6 million

dollars in total industry fees that have been paid.

Anyway, that kind of summarizes what I wanted to go over. I think overall, again, we saw improvement. The agencies were very helpful and there were no glaring things out there that weren't or haven't already been addressed by each agency.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. We have public comment scheduled for 10:15. If there are just a few questions I think we can go ahead and deal with that now, but if there's going to be much lengthy discussion we probably should go to public comment. Does anybody have a question?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. MERTZ: Thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, after the public comment period if Gina Belt from the Department of Justice could give just a status report on your petition with the court, so that that's clear....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I assume you might be available at the next meeting after we've had a chance to look at all these things so that people could ask questions if there's any or we can get ahold of you.

MR. MERTZ: You bet.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Go.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: This is the final report then 1 (indiscernible).... 2 MR. MERTZ: This is the final report. 3 MS. D. WILLIAMS: I just want to thank you for 4 really doing a terrific job. MR. MERTZ: Appreciate that, thank you. 6 7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Let's do go to public comment then. As I understand it we have Kenai, Homer and Anchorage on line. Is there anyone in Kenai, first of all, who can hear me and second of all who wishes to make a comment? 10 KENAI LIO OPERATOR: Yes, Kenai is here. 11 12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there a way to volume? MR. JANIK: There's a volume..... 13 MS. D. WILLIAMS: I'll get it. 14 15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Hello, is there anyone in Kenai? 16 17 KENAI LIO OPERATOR: We have three participants here in Kenai. 18 19 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there someone in Kenai who wishes to make a comment? 20 MR. OBERTS: 21 Yes. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Please, go ahead. 22 could state your name and spell your last name so that we can 23 24 get a written record of that it would be helpful. 25 MR. OBERTS: This is Leo T. Oberts of Kenai.

Last name is O-b-e-r-t-s. And what (sic) I'm here is because I have parcels that have been in the appraisal status and quite a few things are happening here of late, particularly seeing some of the results that are showing up in other parcels in this area.

Now, the parcel I'm going to be talking about is just

-- I actually have three parcel but I'm only going to talk
about the Big Eddy parcel because the others are really not in
the -- they're great but this is really the greatest of the
other (sic). The Big Eddy parcel is KEN 1039 and it was the
parcel -- the parcel was appraised as rural residential and as
a highest and best use. And then I went ahead and I set up a
parcel (sic) to send on to the Anchorage office to tell them
that I knew that through the years here, dating all the way
back into the '80s, that it always had been appeared as
commercial property on anything that I was involved with. And
so I sent it and then -- now, I guess what's left for one of
the State review appraisal people, Judy Robinson, and I haven't
heard anything on it up to this point.

The material I sent in at that time pretty well showed the value -- actually showed the value as of February, February 8th, 1984, and I had value there as being \$3.50 a square foot and that gets well over a million dollars, almost \$5,000,000.00. Now the property that I'm talking about I would like to really address it primarily to Mr. Frank Rue from the

Alaska Department of Fish and Game because he knows the property very well, he knows it just as well as I know it. And we've been over it through the years and I have constantly tried to get the property set up for the habitat, and this is really what I'm talking about today, is the habitat itself. The destruction that's been taking place in the river is still continuing to happen and it happens over and over again.

The area we're talking about is for the -- where the tides come in and actually completely stop the river and then, of course, increase the amount of water that the Kenai River shows. And, of course, the Kenai River is out of -- in the entire area here that's the number 3 area for tidal -- the heights of tidal it rates second in the world.

So I have Big Eddy that I would like Mr. Rue to pay attention to that I show Big Eddy here as in the appraisal that I -- that was made up for me and the Page number 24 and 25 show some horrible looking -- horrible piece of property, which is true, because the date that was taken -- where the pictures were taken were on the 23rd of May of last year, and that was the lowest in the 45 years that I've lived here, the only place I've seen -- it was the lowest the river has ever been at anytime that I know of.

And then another parcel, although we're not really going to be directing, other than to show how bad the river is -- was on the 23rd of May last year, Page number 47. Excuse me

49 and 50. And the reason I'm making special issue of it when you see it, it's in horrible condition, like Honeymoon Cove, for instance, I've lost about at least 40 feet, if not more, of the (indiscernible) of.....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Oberts.

MR. OBERTS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: We have a fairly tight agenda today and I would appreciate it if you could -- we like to have people keep their comments to about three minutes or so.

MR. OBERTS: I see.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: If you could just go ahead and summarize your comments that would be helpful.

MR. OBERTS: No, we had asked about it and they said that -- at least we didn't hear that there was a limit.

Well, anyway, what I'm saying is that these areas that I'm speaking of here is -- the river is in bad condition and it's not what you see in the newspapers and it is very bad.

Now, if you look at another one of the appraisals, one of Kobylarz, I'm speaking again to Mr. Rue, if you speak to the Kobylarz property on Page four and six that you see how the river looks like in the summertime and really this is what I'm trying to tell you is that it is -- the damage is so serious that I would say that -- any pricing, I don't think would really make much difference because this is horrible and it

should be corrected. And I feel that from my viewpoint that I have spent so much time over the long period of time here that I feel so sad about the river being destroyed that anything that's to me is -- I think would be well -- would be -- I owe it, I would owe it to you. So anything else about it? The only other thing real quick here is that Carl Durger (ph) from the Fish and Game, I mean the Federal Fish and Game, he made the -- he had a study that he made up that is really great and I would like to have Mr. Rue take, probably, a quick look at it and really bring it up to date on where we are today because they show what the habitat is like and what we should be doing to protect the fish that we have in the Kenai River today. I'll let the other gentleman go ahead here. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much, Mr. Oberts. Are there any questions from Council members or comments? (No audible response) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. next in Kenai? MR. DOLCHAK: My name is Emil Dolchak, D-o-l-c-h-a-k. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Dolchak.

MR. DOLCHAK: Yes. My concern is Kenai Native

2

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

land at Stephanka that they selling for roughly \$1,851.00 an acre and my concern is that right next to KNA lands, Stephanka is Kenai Keys and I notice in their -- the paper I got from the borough their land is selling from anywhere 25,000 to 72,500, that's a lot, that's not an acre. And I can't see why that property should be so high and our property up river from Kenai Keys is high ground and such a low price. And as long as it's in KNA's hands there has been no damage or erosion or stuff on that land because it's private. And the Fish and Wildlife already stated in the paper that they were going to open it up for hunting and fishing if they acquired it. And I can't see Exxon Valdez Oil Spill money going towards that purchase if they are going to open it up to fishing and hunting which would then damage the land as I see it.

1.8

And another thing is down river from Stephanka, at Soldotna bridge, I see in the paper where the party sold 3.3 acres for \$698,000.00, that's roughly \$211,000.00 an acre, so -- and the letter I got from -- the word I got from Exxon Valdez is that it's location. Well, the location up there at Stephanka is very, very good, it's less than a mile from the road and it's all high ground. And Cook Inlet Region and the natural resources land on both side of the river adjoining KNA lands are subdivided into parcels of 24,000 to \$90,000.00 a lot.

Now, I would like to know who made the appraisal. One

of the board members, past president, told me that they had three appraisals done but he couldn't tell me who they were, so I would like you to write me a letter and let me know who the appraisers were that made these appraisals on that particular parcel, that's not counting Moose River that is also in that \$4.4 million deal. So that's what I would like to know.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Mr. Dolchak, do you have an address that we could -- oh, I'm sorry, Ms. McCammon indicates she has your address so we will send you a letter that answers that question. Are there any questions....

MR. DOLCHAK: Post Office Box 3, Kenai, Alaska, 99611.

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

Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Dolchak, thank you for your testimony. I just want to clarify the record in the following respect, I know Ms. McCammon will be addressing some of your specific questions. But it is important to remember in terms of the Kenai Native Association package that the entire consideration for the purchase of this land is not reflected in the dollar and cents figure that you have mentioned. There are several other critical components to that package which are of great benefit to KNA, and that includes the conveyance of the

headquarter site, which is prime real estate property to KNA, (indiscernible) it includes thousands of acres of subsurface, sand and gravel and other subsurface rights. It includes the elimination of the conservation easement know as 22G on KNA land. And so in reflecting upon the fairness of this acquisition to KNA it's very important to keep those other highly valuable aspects of the package in mind.

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

(No audible response)

1.3

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Dolchak. Is there anyone else in Kenai who wishes to

comment at this time?

MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, my name is James

Showalter, that's S-h-o-w-a-l-t-e-r. It's also concerning

Kenai Native Association land -- I just lost my train of

thought. Anyway, due to the sale was, you know, 4.43 million

for this total acreage and within the sale in that there's

internal conflict between the corporation and the stockholders.

And as a rule everything I've ever seen the stockholders are in

command of the company, whereas in this situation the president

is dictating for the sale of this land and pushing for it. And

for under Alaska Statutes, I can't name the statute, but I

think with a large percentage of the corporation assets there's

an Alaska Statue requiring I believe it 90 percent of the

stockholders to vote on the sale of the asset.

Whereas the President of KNA, she is sending out an advisory vote, not a vote, it says advisory, which she has done in the past and she just -- you know, it's being ignored. So I would ask if you could pull the funding on this (sic) properties until this internal dispute is settled between the shareholder and the Board of Directors of KNA.

That's about all I have, thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Showalter. Are there comments or questions from Council
members?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. How many other people are there in Kenai that would like to testify? Is there a head count?

KENAI LIO OPERATOR: That was it.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much. Then let's go to Homer. How many people do you have in Homer that would like to testify?

HOMER LIO OPERATOR: About eight.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Why don't you send up the first four.

HOMER LIO OPERATOR: Okay. We'll start with Mike.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: We would again -- we do have

a fairly tight agenda and a lot of people who want to testify, so if you can keep your comments to (indiscernible) that would be helpful.

MR. KLIEMANN: Okay. My name is Mike Kliemann, that's K-l-i-e-m-a-n-n. I'm a resident of Fritz Creek located near Homer and I'm speaking for myself. I'm also speaking from a short written statement.

Thank you very much for pursuing purchase of the Homer Overlook Park small parcel. Please open the purse to meet the desires and needs of the Overlook Park parcel owners, keeping in mind the open space and park needs and all stated desires of the interested residents here to see this purchase completed.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Mr. Kliemann.

Are there any questions of comment from Council members?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Could the next person in Homer....

MR. TYLER: Okay, I'm right here. I'm having trouble with my voice this morning but I'll make it. My name it Toby Tyler, that's T-y-l-e-r, and I'm a board member for the Katchemak Heritage Land Trust and I'm wearing two hats today. I also want to make a comment for the Center for Alaska Coastal Studies at the end, if I don't get lost.

As a member, and as you know, we've been working long

and hard with a lot of other people in town to see that this preservation of the Overlook Park, as it's called, takes place. And we're hopeful that it's coming finally to a conclusion. I wanted to say in passing that you should realize that there are -- is not only this land trustee on the Kenai Peninsula, Katchemak Heritage Land Trust, but there are three other land trusts in Alaska and I'm sure they'd be happy if you would use them in any way that you can find them to be valuable to you. There's one in Juneau, one in Anchorage, in the greater Anchorage area, and one in Fairbanks as well as ours here on the Kenai Peninsula.

This idea of preserving the Overlook Park is nothing at all new, it's been going on -- it was going on long before the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill even happened. And unfortunately some very strong efforts just never quite made it in the past years. And finally when one of the major ones that was done by George Ripley sort of collapsed the present owners purchased the property. And at the time I had no idea, I don't know most of these people personally or very well, I had no idea what their intention was at the time and how much of that was influenced by their desire to preserve that land. It doesn't really matter, the main thing is that they've held it all these years and it has been preserved and it's now available for you to finally complete this much desired sale of this property and make it available to the public.

I would hope that you can go through with it. I know there's some question as to how much the value of it is at present and that there will be some other people addressing that, I'm sure, today. The main thing is no matter what happens, if this goes through these people are going to be heros in the eyes of many people in this area and it's important, I think, and I'm sure that the land trust and other groups in town will somehow try to make that apparent, perhaps with a plaque up in the Overlook place where everybody can see it, we don't know, but that's important.

Now, switching hats. As a member for the Center for Alaska Costal Studies it was somewhat of a surprise to me to hear Molly McCammon this morning on the news saying about the fact that so many student groups go down and collect samples to take back to their schools down in that wonderful area that's offshore of the Overlook Park. And that's fine, except that the Center for Coastal Studies for years has been trying to educate people to the fact that you go down and you look at the critters, you pick them up, you study them and then you put them right back down where they were. It actually takes a permit to collect things like that and take them back with you and a lot of people don't realize that.

Hopefully if this Overlook Park goes through we can work with the land trust and the Center for Coastal Studies and the State Parks or whoever is involved and perhaps get some

signs and indicate to the public that that's certainly what has been degrading those tide pools. Not only the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill (indiscernible) but also the fact that people do go down there and collect, which is really illegally done. There are organism living out in the Homer small boat harbor which are not the same ones, but they would be just as exciting to study. And they tell me if they would go out there and collect them they're coming from a less -- an already somewhat injured area and there would be less stress on these tide pools out there in Overlook Park.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much.

(Indiscernible - laughter)

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman....

MR. CUSHING: Guys ready for the next

testifier.

MS. McCAMMON: This is Molly McCammon.

Mr. Tyler, I would like to apologize if there was any mis-impression that I left the radio audience this morning. I did not, I believe, say that it was used for sample collection and I apologize if that was the impression that was left. This is an area that's very popular with students and kids from all over the school district for studying the intertidal and subtidal area, and I think that's of value there. And I did not want to give the impression that I was giving license to go

collecting there.

MR. TYLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Any other comments?

MR. CUSHING: Yeah, this is the next testifier, I'm Jack Cushing, the Mayor of Homer. Do you folks have available to you the map that's submitted with the Overlook Park in your -- I think it's in your packet, if you can open up to that page, it's on the back side of the Overlook Park. That would be helpful in my testimony.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I believe we all have that available.

MR. CUSHING: Okay. It's a map of Katchemak
Bay. First as a local citizen, since the Overlook Park is
outside the City of Homer's city limits, I just want to thank
the Trustees for their persistence and support of Overlook Park
all along. And the City of Homer has voiced its support for
the park project and the local person that comes to town and
birds and everybody else they don't know it's not a part of the
City of Homer and it's very important that that piece just gets
picked up from just the general sense of the appearance that
Homer has as you first come into town. That's the first thing
you see as you look at Homer is you look down at that as well.

Speaking as the Mayor I'd like to just be able to fill you in on these number of parcels that you're seeing coming in now on the Homer Spit and just bring you up to speed on the

intent of that. If you're looking at the map, even though they're coming in -- I have several parcels right now -- the history of that is the city put together some proposals, it was comprehensive enough and the proposals -- it was one lot, I believe, at the time and it was rejected because it wasn't comprehensive enough. We met with you folks and -- or with your staff and were -- it was indicated that if we could resubmit with a much more comprehensive proposal, for these Spit properties now I'm talking about, down on the Homer Spit, that we'd stand a much greater chance in the review process.

What we did in conjunction with the Katchemak Heritage
Land Trust and the Trust for Public Lands, a national
organization, is we attempted to put together a comprehensive
proposal for a majority of the presently undeveloped, privately
owned intertidal lands at the base of the Spit and halfway out
on the Spit. On the map there the parcels that we're targeting
are the white area right under the word Homer and then some of
the white area up past the word Spit.

We were also -- the indications were also made to us that if the City of Homer showed a good faith effort on some of their own land out there that -- in fact, this is the direction we'd like to see portions of the Spit maintained in the future, that it would really help our review in the small parcel process.

What we've done to put our money where our mouth is, so

to speak, is the big chunk of land you see right under the end of the word Homer and the start of the word Spit, that is a city owned piece of land and what we've done on the majority of that in the past couple of months is we've given stewardship of the majority of that piece of land to the Katchemak Heritage Land Trust, we actually signed over and paid for the assessment and everything and they're going to be -- it's in perpetuity and it's -- as I said, the majority of that piece of land is definitely being put into some sort of thing that we're trying to maintain at least an equal portion of the Spit in the future, being maintained for the wildlife, the intertidal values. We feel that in the long run for the health of everything in the City of Homer is very important.

1.6

I think it's important to know that it's a partnership between the city, the Land Trust, the Trust for Public Lands, the Outside organization, the Alaska Maritime Refuge and many citizens. Also in conjunction with conservation easement that we have with the Land Trust on the city's piece of land there, we've started, and you'll be seeing the application to the restoration projects for -- to just make sure that the intertidal flushing is maintained in a healthy state on other portions of the Spit.

Let's see, I'd like to invite any of you to come down to the Sea Bird Festival, it's a local thing where we're basing a large part of our May economy on the actual shore birds that

are coming through and using this part of the Spit and it'll be real obvious what sort of direction we're sort of trying to hopefully maintain. Right now I think that current change of direction of the 60 acres of the part of the Spit out there that everybody's been real cognizant of since it happened in the last two years, everybody sees what we're up against right now with the lands in private ownership, there's a real strong possibility that we could develop in the next 50 years well over 70-80 percent of the Spit as it stands right now. I think in everybody's mind, if that were ever allowed to happen, we'd feel there would be a gigantic loss in this area.

Just really briefly here to finish up. The Governor's office has indicated strong support for this project and hopefully you'll be hearing more from them directly today. We feel that at this point now -- while this land is still intertidal it's probably one of the best buys for the acreage being this close to a population area. Once that land is developed and a particular land owner goes through the process and is able to get Corps permits and everything else, the cost of the land just skyrockets, but when I think -- you know, some of the acreage you've been looking at hundred of thousands for just a few acres, you'll find that once the appraisals come in on this that hundred of thousands will buy literally just a whole lot of acreage on the Spit right now in the current intertidal state that it is.

It's just typical things that we're getting. The citizens of the area, the visitors to the area are telling us they feel the Spit is getting more and more cluttered, where we're trying to hopefully change the direction on that.

And to finish up here, this might be an opportunity, most of your parcel acquisitions are being administered either by a State -- sponsored by either a State or Federal agency. The City of Homer doesn't particularly care if this would be purchased for administration by State or Federal agency, that doesn't matter to us at all, but we would -- if it makes a difference to you, we would be willing to be the sponsoring agency, the Municipality of Homer would be and, of course, with easement being place to either a State or Federal agency.

And with that I'll end unless any of you have questions.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Mr. Cushing, it's very much appreciated, that was very helpful information. Are there questions or comments from Council members? Commissioner Rue.

MR. RUE: Yeah, I would just quickly add to Mayor Cushing. I was at the Shore Bird Festival last year, it's really a very interesting time and I would recommend it to anyone who is interested in shore birds.

MR. CUSHING: That was a little bit broken up, but I think I got the gist of it and thanks a lot for coming.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Mayor, I have one question which is the land to the -- I guess it's the northwest of the area that you're talking about, that seems to jut out into a little spit, is that currently preserved; is that city land and is that in a preserved status?

MR. CUSHING: That is. Everything that's grey on the map is in preserved status and actually the whole lagoon right about the large word Homer, that's also -- that's not shown as grey but that's jointly owned right now, the beach part is owned by the city and the lagoon part is owned by the State, so there's actually a lot more grey that is preserved back toward the base of the Spit, so we're looking specifically at the properties that on the map here start about half an inch out.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anything?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Appreciate it. If we could have the next person from Homer.

MR. CUSHING: Thank you.

MS. SEAMAN: Hi, my name is Barb Seaman and I'm the Executive Director for the Katchemak Heritage Land Trust.

I'll probably repeat a little bit of Jack's -- what Jack said, but I have a written statement and I'll read through it anyway as quickly as I can.

I'm delighted to be here today encouraging you one last time, I hope, to approve the purchase of Overlook Park in Homer. I hope that in your discussion concerning the purchase price you will take into account the appraisal the Overlook owners obtained per Trustee guidelines. I believe that it more accurately represents fair market value of this property. I speak for hundreds of Land Trust members and Overlook supporters when I thank you for seeing this habitat protection project to a successful conclusion. You are doing a wonderful thing for spill injured species and for thousands of peninsula residents and visitors.

You may remember hearing my comments at the last teleconference meeting. In addition to a comment about the Overlook parcel, I spoke briefly of a limited opportunity that the Trustee Council has to protect some exceptional intertidal habitat and valuable recreation property on the Homer Spit and in Beluga Slough, which was what Jack was just referring to. Within the growing package of parcels proposed for acquisition are high visibility lands under intense development pressure. These intertidal areas sustain many species injured by the oil spill and are also very popular for public recreation and subsistence fishing.

I'm pleased to report to you, as Jack commented on, that the City of Homer and the Land Trust are signing a perpetual conservation easement protecting over 26 acres of

publicly owned intertidal land on the Spit. Those properties are adjacent to some of the proposed lands with the Trust for Public Land is hoping that you will acquire. I urge you to join with the City of Homer and the Land Trust in preserving more important properties by ultimately approving purchase of private lands nominated by the Trust for Public Land.

I'd also like to take this opportunity, as Jack did, to invite you to come to Homer for the Shore Bird Festival in early May and I would be very willing to guide you on a tour of these properties should you be able to come down and see them.

Thanks one more time for all the hard work and perseverance that you had to endure in making the Small Parcel Habitat Protection Program work, it is a success and we appreciate the work involved. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much.

Are there questions or comments from the this end?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. What I'd like to do is just check in with Anchorage to see if there are people who wish to make comments there and then we'll get back to Homer.

How many people do we have in Anchorage that would like to make a comment?

MS. R. WILLIAMS: None.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Then let's get back to

25 Homer.

SEWARD LIO OPERATOR: Mr. Chairman, this is Seward on line.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Oh, Seward, okay.

SEWARD LIO OPERATOR: And we have one person here to testify.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Then why don't we go ahead with the Seward person. Is there anyone else who has joined us on the network since we started besides Seward?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Why don't you go ahead with Seward.

MR. LUTTRELL: Hi, my name is Mark Luttrell, I'm the Director of the Eastern Kenai Peninsula Environmental Action Association in Seward and I just wanted to thank you for the opportunity to provide some testimony. I also want to thank you very much for the effort that you put forth in protection of Kenai Fjords National Park, the purchase of English Bay Corporation land and also purchase of 20 acres at Lowell Point here in Seward. Your efforts have ensured protection of these parcel in perpetuity.

I'd like to speak to you briefly about the Homer Spit and Beluga Slough. It seems to me from the perspective of the goals of the Trustee Council that these two parcels provide a unique opportunity to restore lots of recreational services and lots of habitat values. Beluga Slough and the Spit are

critical habitat for migrating shore birds, as you probably know, and the Katchemak Shore Bird Festival celebrates that. It think it's second only to the Copper River Flats as a layover for migratory waterfowl.

The purchase of the small acquisition package would restore lost recreational service, I mean, as you know if you ever had any visitors up here, Homer Spit is the place to go, it's a national treasure. It's also the launching spot for world famous halibut fishing, it's popular for beach walking, clam digging and, of course, bird watching. The small parcel package that's before you has been shepherded through the very prestigious and conservative Trust for Public Land and the Katchemak Heritage Land Trust, both of which have an extensive history in conservation protection in Alaska and, in the case of Trust for Public Land, the rest of the Lower 48.

I think it's just a very good opportunity for the Trustee Council to yet again put on the white hat. So I thank you, I hope you can support the acquisition of Beluga Slough and the Spit and I can't leave without also plugging the Overlook Park, that's also a very worthy project.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you. Are there questions or comments from Council members to Mr. Luttrell?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much.

If we could then go back to Homer, I believe there are about four more people there.

MS. CRONLAND: Yes. This is Sandy Cronland, C-r-o-n-l-a-n-d and I'm an owner of Overlook Park and I want to thank you for the opportunity to address the Council. Since before this land came under our ownership, which was in 1985, we have fully supported its destiny to become State land. After an arduous three year process we're excited to see these negotiations finalized. We feel that all of the information available should be brought to the Council's attention so that you can make the final decision on purchase of Overlook Park and at a fair price.

There are two appraisals of Overlook Park that meet State and Federal guidelines. Both were completed by State approved appraisers and both have appraised numerous small parcel subjects that have been purchased by the EVOS Council. We clearly understood from the guidelines set forth at the beginning of this process that there could be two appraisals to negotiate from. The State would purchase one and the landowners could submit one. We've exercised the privilege and contracted the local appraiser a year ago now who we feel had realistic insight to the fair market value in the Homer area. Unfortunately there is a \$60,000.00 difference between the two appraisals and the review appraisers have chosen to recommended the lower appraisal value, which is the one the State

purchased. At this point, without wishing to encumber the 2 process any further we simply ask that the Council consider both appraisals before making their final offer on this land. Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Ms. Cronland. 5 Are there questions or comments from the Council members? Ms. Williams. MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, if someone 8 would like to address this \$60,000.00 issue, I would like to 9 hear an explanation of it. 10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It's on the agenda, it'll be 1.1 the next item on the agenda after public comments, is that..... 12 Okay. Obviously we'll be 13 MS. D. WILLIAMS: talking about the acquisition but also the \$60,000.00 issue 14 that Ms. Conland brought up? 15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes. 16 MS. D. WILLIAMS: 17 Okay. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: 18 Okay. Other comments? 19 (No audible response) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Who else would like to speak 20 from Homer? 21 MS. BITTER: My name is Daisy Lee Bitter, 22 B-i-t-t-e-r, and I've been an Alaskan educator for over 42 23

years, 29 years of those were in Anchorage, and I spend a great

deal of time along the shores of Katchemak Bay with many

24

students in tow sometimes. I would like to approach this from another angle. I've been also active in the Land Trust and help set up the educational programs for the Center for Alaskan Costal Studies when I was on that board.

But what I feel that I'm speaking for now are students. And these areas here around Homer are accessible to well over 50 percent of all Alaskan students. I've gone to other areas that you can reach by the Alaska road system and none is as rich as these around here. I've also been in intertidal areas from Baja, California clear -- well, through Cook Inlet and one of the very richest intertidal areas I have ever seen anywhere is that below Overlook Park. It is not quite as accessible as those on Beluga Slough, Bishop Beach or the Homer Spit, where we have taken hundreds, even thousands, of students.

But we would then to the intertidal areas below

Overlook Park have to hike so far that we felt that it was not

prudent to take younger students there, so mostly we took high

school students and university students. I look on these areas

and I would not find any disagreement from anybody who's ever

been there, they are a highly diverse, they're wonderful

ecosystems and they are extremely valuable, biological,

ecological study laboratories, natural ones, not ones that you

have to go out and spend educational funds to provide.

Over the 30 years that I've taken the university classes and numerous groups of Anchorage, Mat-Su and Kenai

Peninsula Borough's, we can provide them with first hand biological, ecological learning. One of the things that many people in this state don't realize, and having been a principal in Anchorage for several years, the Anchorage School District has some very rigorous insurance rules and we can no longer take Anchorage school students across Katchemak Bay on charter boats because of the high limitations I have. So what does that do? Even though we set up these wonderful educational programs at the Center for Coastal Studies across the Bay, they are not accessible to Anchorage students. And you stop to think what percentage of the school population resides in that municipality.

So what is the result? It means that we work with them on this side of the Bay and because of the extensive development on the Homer Spit in the last 10 to 20 years those areas that we took them are really shrinking. And so we use Bishop Beach and that is getting very, very high pressure. And so we feel that if these parcels are not picked up and protected that irresponsible development, say, in Overlook Park since it drains directly in some of these riches, intertidal areas along the Northern Pacific coast, it could have devastating effect and we can't afford to lose them.

So I would ur -- I thank you for your past considerations and your taking a look at getting these small parcels together. And it would be a wise, very highest

investment for the high habitat and educational values because we can't afford to lose these irreplaceable biological, ecological laboratories.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Ms. Bitter. Are there questions or comments from Council members?

Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Quick question. Since collecting was brought up earlier, were your students involved in collecting there or do you have any thoughts about the collecting issue?

HOMER LIO OPERATOR: They're asking about collecting.

MS. BITTER: Twenty to 30 years ago we collected one of different species, preserved them and then took those collections back. Because I had to present my plans to the Anchorage School District administration for these trips before they'd let us take that many students down here. And what we did, we made a collection that was distributed about the school district, so not only the students we took down here, and I might add that one of the early trips we made in a DC-3, that tells you how many years ago that we started doing this. And that collection moved around, all around the school district so thousands of students learned from this collection. Because I really don't believe in collecting out there and I

often go out on my own where there's a large group with a camera and say, you know, please don't collect it unless you are going to -- hundreds will learn, if you have a salt water aguarium in your school. We really frown on the collecting.

And just Friday night I spoke with the director of curriculum for the Kenai Peninsula School District and related to her that I had seen and heard about a few students from some schools that were taking live critters off the intertidal areas and she said she will follow up on it and I know she will.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. Are there other questions or comments?

(No audible response)

1.3

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Can we have the next person from Homer?

MS. BRODIE: Hi, this is Pam Brodie. I missed the last Trustee Council meeting, you know how much I hate to miss them, but I want to take this opportunity to thank you so very much for successfully completing negotiations with the English Bay Corporation, you've made a very great many people in Alaska and throughout the country very happy with that acquisition which has been a priority to environmentalists for many years.

I also want to speak briefly about the small parcels, the Overlook Park and Spit potential acquisitions. Because I

live in Homer I have been careful about supporting Homer acquisitions because, of course, you've given me the opportunity to represent environmentalists statewide and nationwide on the Public Advisory Group. I do want to say, though, that these particular properties have a lot of local support and the potential to be enjoyed in terms of recreation and education by people from all over Alaska and America who come to visit Homer. These really are special places as you know, the Spit properties are a priority for the Trust for Public Land, which doesn't even have an office in Alaska and yet they have picked this out as a place of extraordinary habitat values nationwide. And the Overlook Park is also, as Daisy Lee Bitter was saying and Toby Tyler, very valuable as habitat and it is extraordinarily beautiful place. although many people come to Homer there is remarkably little public lands on the Homer side. If you can't afford or don't have the time to get in a boat to go across the bay there's actually very few things you can do in Homer. And so getting a little more public land with opportunities for trails will be a tremendous asset to everyone who comes to visit.

Thank you.

1

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you, Pam. Do we have any comments? Ms. Williams.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: Ms. Brodie, I'm going to ask you a very hard question and you don't feel you want to answer

it now you don't have to, but here is the question. The

Trustee Council is not facing a finite pot of money between now
and the year 2001 or 2002 and we have to deal with real honest
to goodness tradeoffs. How would you compare spending, let's
just say, a million dollars to add to AJV or Eyak large parcel
acquisition versus a million for small parcel acquisition, be
it in Homer or someplace else? These are the decisions -- as
you know, we're going into executive session today and we'll be
starting to talk about, you know, in a very serious way,
tradeoffs. Tradeoffs between large and small parcels
acquisition and tradeoffs among small parcel acquisition. Can
you give us some guidance on a millon or \$5,000,000.00 on AJV
and Eyak versus small parcels? How about that for a....

MS. BRODIE: You're right that's a hard question. I don't have a clear simple answer for that. Eyak and Afognak Joint Venture are very high priorities for the environmental community nationwide and statewide. We have always supported looking at the -- at money that you're putting aside for the future -- the word slips my mind right now, but the \$100,000,000.00 that you're planning to have as sort of a Permanent Fund because land acquisition is a permanent benefit. And certainly I would see that as a resource for small parcels, in particular, but buying the land has the permanent benefit and it has had enormous support from people in Alaska.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there other questions or

comment from the Council members?

(No audible response)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. We have, I believe, one more person in Homer?

HOMER LIO OPERATOR: Yes.

MS. BOLENBACH: My name is Amy Bolenbach and I participated with the Katchemak Heritage Land Trust in asking you to purchase Overlook Park for the last three or four years. And I don't need to repeat everything that everyone else has said, so I just wanted to make one comment about the prices of Overlook Park. The Tulin property, close to Homer was 220 acres and I believe you paid \$1.2 million for that and Overlook Park is 97 acres and the appraisal that you've done is talking about 279,000. I'm a little confused about the difference there in the price per acre. The Tulin property was developed which make it higher market value but for the goals for the Council I would think that Overlook Park would be more valuable because it isn't developed and the intertidal life is in fairly good shape there. So I'd appreciate it if you'd think about that when you think about the price.

And I just want to repeat Overlook Park is wonderful because -- it's most important because of the intertidal life and the Spit is most important because of the shore bird habitat.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much. 1 Are there questions or comments from Council members? 2 3 (No audible response) CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. 4 Is there 5 anyone else from Homer that would like to testify? HOMER LIO OPERATOR: That's all, thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anyone from 7 Kenai who's come on who would like to comment? 8 MS. R. WILLIAMS: They dropped off. 9 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anyone else 10 in Seward that would like to comment? 11 They dropped off also. 12 MS. R. WILLIAMS: 13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Anyone from Anchorage? MS. R. WILLIAMS: 14 No. 15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is there anyone in Juneau that would like to comment? 16 17 (No audible response) 18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. The public comment session then is closed. Thank you very much for your comments. 19 I suspect we will proceed now to the next item on the agenda 20 which is the Overlook Park small parcel. Ms. McCammon. 21 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I'll start on this 22 and if Alex Swiderski whenever can jump in and (indiscernible -23 24 Yes, we are very pleased to have this parcel before you

for your consideration today. Overlook Park is right outside

the City of Homer. It's 97 acres. It's three-quarters of a mile north of Watts (ph) Lake on the Sterling Highway. You can actually see it from the Sterling Highway Scenic Overlook.

Last fall we were with the Public Advisory Group, we were actually on a boat at the base of this property and could actually see the tidal pools that people were talking about and the access from Bishop Beach.

The benefit for public ownership of this parcel would primarily be to protect the intertidal and subtidal habitat which a number of the public members have testified it is incredibly rich and incredibly diverse, and also ensure public access to these areas in perpetuity. And (indiscernible) is popular with local community groups, including public schools and natural history study groups. The potential threat is some kind of development, there is approaching subdivision development close by and this would ensure that this property is in permanent protected status.

The original appraisal was reviewed and approved by

Federal and State review appraisers, an offer was made to the

landowners, the landowners were not willing to sell at that

price. They provided some additional information to the review

appraisers, this would be taken into account by the review

appraisers and they still stayed with the original appraisal.

At that point the landowners did go out and secured their own appraisal from an appraisal firm that has done work

for the Trustee Council on other properties. This was submitted to the review appraisers for their review, it was subsequently rejected. In the meantime over this period of time the original Council appraisal had expired because it was over a year old, so the Department of Natural Resources contracted with the appraisal company to update that appraisal and based on the fact that market values had increased over the past year the appraisal did -- an updated appraisal did come up with a higher price.

And so the price that you have before you today for your consideration is \$279,000.00 and this is an update of the original appraisal that the Council had reviewed -- State and Federal appraisers had reviewed and approved.

And, Alex, did you want to add anything else to that.

MR. SWIDERSKI: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would add is that Deborah Williams, you asked about the \$60,000.00. The appraisal commissioned by the landowners was for \$340,000.00.....

MR. KOLASINSKI: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, this is the reporter in Anchorage, I can't hear Mr. Swiderski.

(Note: Telephone connection got really bad at this point)

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay.

MR. SWIDERSKI: I'll repeat that, the appraisal commissioned by the landowners was for \$340,000.00. That was reviewed and was rejected. There was a fair amount of

discussion and back and forth concerning that appraisal. And then, as Ms. McCammon indicated, this past summer because the original appraisal had become stale, the original approved appraisal, we commissioned an update on it and the updated appraisal was valued at \$279,000.00.

During discussions with the landowners last week (indiscernible) that appraisal, they indicated that if they were to receive an offer for \$279,000.00 they would be willing to sell at that price.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Questions or comments from Council members. Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Not so much in the context of the appraisal, but would you refresh my memory on the parcel itself and the map we got in front of us? What is the access to the property (indiscernible) the land directly above it. And then who owns land between that and the highway?

MR. SWIDERSKI: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Be sure you speak up.

MR. SWIDERSKI: Not access -- public access to the land from the road and that, I think, is part of the reason for the value of the parcel. There is access apparently at low tide and I'm not sure (indiscernible) higher tides to the parcel from the beach. Apparently people drive (indiscernible) vehicles from Homer to access the property. It is adjacent to another parcel, the Baycrest parcel that we are also

```
negotiating on. An update on the (indiscernible) done on that,
there is road -- there is access to that parcel from the road,
and conceivably there would -- eventually there may be access
to the Overlook parcel from the Baycrest parcel, I think, if we
acquired the Baycrest parcel but, of course, that is not a done
deal.
                MR. PENNOYER: Now, if they're adjacent --
where's Baycrest on the map?
                MR. SWIDERSKI: Baycrest, I believe, is the
next parcel to the east.
                MS. McCAMMON: To the right on the map.
                MR. SWIDERSKI: To the right, I'm sorry.
                MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.
                CHAIRMAN TILLERY:
                                   Mr. Pennoyer.
                MR. PENNOYER: And ownership of the parcel
above it, of the Overlook Park is -- it says public lands,
Federal or State, what is ownership of that?
                MS. McCAMMON: So it'd be State land.
                MR. PENNOYER: It is State land. In park
status or just.....
                MS. RUTHERFORD: It's not in park status.
I believe it is classified as recreational.
                CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there other --
Mr. Pennoyer.
```

MR. PENNOYER: So what is the State's intent

1

2

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

regarding that piece of land, then, that's directly uphill from 1 2 the land we're talking about acquiring? (Indiscernible) 3 MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman. 4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams. 5 MS. D. WILLIAMS: What's the intent with 6 7 respect to Overlook Park? MR. SWIDERSKI: It would be managed by State 8 parks as -- for recreations and preservation or conservation purposes. 10 MS. D. WILLIAMS: Would you need legislative 11 action to have it managed as a State park? 12 MR. SWIDERSKI: No. 13 MS. D. WILLIAMS: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Rutherford. 15 MS. RUTHERFORD: I think the other thing that 16 is important to know is that we have a ranger station right 17 there, it would be -- we have people who are managing it right 18 at hand and that is (indiscernible) for that entire area. 19 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I think there is a ranger 20 21 station on that other parcel I think. MS. D. WILLIAMS: Would it be designated as a 22 State park though? 23 24 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That would be up to

(indiscernible - interrupted)....

MR. SWIDERSKI: That would be, yeah. The

Department of Natural Resources has the authority to acquire

land for management as park land without a designation.

(Indiscernible - static).....

MS. RUTHERFORD: The other thing I think that we're saying is that we got a lot of lands that are designated recreation -- or classified recreational land that are legislatively designated areas that are managed for recreational purposes. It is not unique in any sense of the word. We're quite comfortable with it. Now, sometimes when we feel it's appropriate we do go in for legislative designations which does provide a higher level of protection. But if we -- if it's acquired with a conservation easement, you know,

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Janik.

MR. JANIK: Yeah, a follow up to Mr. Pennoyer's question on access. Is there now -- would there be public access to the parcel? What is the immediate adjacency to the parcel I guess is the question? I can't see on the map very clearly.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: If I understand it to access the -- you got a cliff here.

MR. JANIK: Yeah.

there's extensive protections on it.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Then to access the parcel there is the Baycrest parcel which has road access and some

kind of a road or trail that actually could lead to this parcel and we are negotiating with this landowner, but right now all this testimony you heard about all these kids that go to it and so forth, they just come along the shoreline.

MR. JANIK: I see. So in terms of public, full public property, there is nothing currently adjacent to the parcel.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Well, not that would provide
-- I mean there's this....

MR. JANIK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: ....but it's a pretty steep cliff is my understanding, so you really would -- a sort of road access that would do this.

Commission Rue.

1

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RUE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I understand it there would be an easement with the Federal government on this parcel then....

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That's correct.

MR. RUE: .....which would protect it pending any further designation by the Legislature or whatever? Okay. And give it additional protection above and beyond the normal piece of State land that's just classified recreational?

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That is correct.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman, it not also just classified recreation, it's also classified as habitat. And I

think that's an important clarification too. MR. RUE: Right. But without the easement language DNR can't change the classification. MS. RUTHERFORD: Correct. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Williams. MS. D. WILLIAMS: I mean, it just (indiscernible) no different than other small parcels that we have purchased where there isn't legislative action pending to identify them as a park. With a conservation easement they are protected. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: This would be done, as I understand it, the same as Lowell Point or Kenai River and Tulin or any of those. UNIDENTIFIED MALE VOICE: That's right. Or any of the large parcels for that matter. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Or by the (indiscernible). Are there other comments or questions from the Council members about this parcel. Ms. Williams. MS. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Trustee Council make an offer of \$279,000.00 for the purchase

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BROWN: Second.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Seconded by Ms. Brown. Are there questions?

(No audible response)

of Overlook parcel.

CHAIRMAN TILLERY: All in favor of the motion 1 2 say aye. IN UNISON: Aye. 3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed. 4 (No opposing responses) 5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Hearing none the motion is 6 passed and, Mr. Swiderski, would you direct an offer to 7 the.... 8 MR. SWIDERSKI: I will do that. There's a 9 resolution that Ms. McCammon has (indiscernible) reviewed by 10 the Council. 1.1 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. So there's a 12 resolution that people can review sometime today and perhaps 13 before we leave we can sign it. 14 15 MR. SWIDERSKI: That would be great. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you very much. 16 thank you to the people in Homer who have come out and testified today and given their comments in support of this 18 parcel. 19 I believe that we are now -- is there anything else 20 Ms. McCammon before executive session? 21 22 (No audible response) 23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: There was a proposal to have 24 a -- one of the reasons I think we had this meeting was to have

-- the primary reason was to have an executive session to

discuss some of the habitat negotiations and acquisition 1 strategies that sort of reflect on price and so forth. 2 there a motion for executive session? MR. PENNOYER: Move we go to executive session 4 for purposes of looking at small parcels land. 5 MS. McCAMMON: And large parcel and other 6 habitat negotiation (indiscernible - multiple voices).... 7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It's been moved and 8 seconded. Is there anyone opposed? 9 (No opposing responses) 10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Hearing none the session --11 the public session is closed, we'll be going into executive 12 session. We will come back into public session, probably just 13 very briefly, and I would guess around 3:00 o'clock, but I 14 15 don't believe we'll be bringing people on line for that, is that correct. 16 17 MS. McCAMMON: We will bring on Anchorage. CHAIRMAN TILLERY: We will bring on Anchorage 18 unless someone calls in and specifically requests it. 19 MS. McCAMMON: There's no action anticipated. 20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: 21 Okay. So thank you very much, people who have joined us and we will be disconnecting 22 23 now. (Off record - 11:36 a.m.) 24

(EXECUTIVE SESSION)

1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
3	STATE OF ALASKA )
4	State of Alaska and Owner of Computer Matrix do hereby certify  THAT the foregoing pages numbered 4 through 56 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Telephonic Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council's Meeting recorded electronically by me on the 3rd day of March 1997 and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the request of:
10	
11	EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL, 645 G Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501;
12	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 10th day of March 1997.
13	SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY:
14	
15	Long to Comment
16	Joseph P. Kolasinski Notary Public in and for Alaska
17	My Commission Expires: 04/17/00
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	, and the second