EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING Tuesday, December 15, 1998 8:00 o'clock a.m.

Fourth Floor Conference Room 645 G Street
Anchorage, Alaska

10 TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

6

8

9

24

25

| 11 | STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT | MR. FRANK RUE |
|----|--|---|
| 12 | OF FISH AND GAME: Chairman | Commissioner |
| 13 | U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - | MR. JAMES WOLFE |
| 14 | U.S. FOREST SERVICE (Telephonically) | Trustee Representative |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF LAW: | MR. CRAIG TILLERY Trustee Representative for the Attorney General |
| 17 | | - |
| 18 | U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: (Telephonically) | MR. BOB ANDERSON Acting Special Assistant to the Secretary for |
| 19 | • | Alaska |
| 20 | U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE - NOAA/NMFS: (Telephonically) | MR. BRUCE WRIGHT for Steve Pennoyer |
| 21 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Director, Alaska Region |
| 22 | STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION: | MR. DAN EASTON for Commissioner M. Brown |
| 23 | (Telephonically) | TOT COMMITS DIONET IT. BIOWII |
| | | |

Proceedings electronically recorded, then transcribed by: Computer Matrix, 3522 West 27th Ave., Anchorage, AK - 243-0668

| TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT | ľ: |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| MS. MOLLY McCAMMON | Executive Director EVOS Trustee Council |
| MS. REBECCA WILLIAMS | Executive Secretary EVOS Trustee Council |
| MS. SANDRA SCHUBERT | EVOS Staff |
| MR. JOE HUNT | Communications Coordinator EVOS Staff |
| MR. HUGH SHORT | Community Facilitator EVOS Staff |
| MR. STAN SENNER | Science Coordinator |
| DR. BOB SPIES (Telephonically) | Chief Scientist |
| MR. STEVE SHUCK | U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service |
| MS. RITA MIRAGLIA | U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service |
| MR. BUD RICE | National Park Service |
| MR. BARRY ROTH | Attorney-Advisor Conservation & Wildlife Division Department of the Solicitor |
| MR. KEN HOLBROOK | U.S. Forest Service |
| MR. BILL HAUSER | Alaska Department of Fish and Game |
| MS. CLAUDIA SLATER | Alaska Department of Fish and Game |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | MS. MOLLY McCAMMON MS. REBECCA WILLIAMS MS. SANDRA SCHUBERT MR. JOE HUNT MR. HUGH SHORT MR. STAN SENNER DR. BOB SPIES (Telephonically) MR. STEVE SHUCK MS. RITA MIRAGLIA MR. BUD RICE MR. BARRY ROTH MR. KEN HOLBROOK MR. BILL HAUSER |

| ים זכו גייי | $\cap \nabla$ | CONTENT | C |
|-------------|---------------|---------|---|
| TWDTE | OF | COMTEMI | 0 |

| 1 | TABLE OF CONTENTS | | |
|----|---|-----|--|
| 2 | Approval of Agenda | 5 | |
| 3 | Approval of November 30, 1998 meeting notes | 6 | |
| 4 | Public Comments: | | |
| 5 | Grant Baker | 8 | |
| 6 | Rupe Andrews | 10 | |
| 7 | William Blondeau | 12 | |
| 8 | Deferred Project - FY99 Work Plan | | |
| 9 | Molly McCammon/Stan Senner | 14 | |
| 10 | Alaska SeaLife Center Bench Fees (Molly McCammon) | 44 | |
| 11 | Leif Selkregg/Kim Sundberg | 49 | |
| 12 | Small Parcels 5 | | |
| 13 | Kodiak Tax Parcels, Three 10-acre parcels | | |
| 14 | KEN 1086 (Stariski Creek) and KEN 1084 (Morris) Request for Parcels Meriting Special Consideration | 65 | |
| 15 | Requeste for fureers merroring spectral compractation | 0.5 | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | • | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 1 | A | | |

PROCEEDINGS

(On record 8:06 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. This is Frank Rue and I'll be the Chair this morning. Why don't we get started, if we got everyone on teleconference. Why don't we go around and see which of the Trustees are here. I'm Frank Rue, Commissioner of Fish and Game.

MR. ANDERSON: Hi, this is Bob Anderson for Secretary Babbitt.

MR. WRIGHT: This is Bruce Wright sitting in for Steve Pennoyer.

MR. EASTON: Dan Easton sitting in for Michele Brown.

MR. WOLFE: Jim Wolfe, Ag.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MR. TILLERY: Craig Tillery, Department of Law.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, great. I guess I have to officially call the December 15th meeting of the Trustee Council to order. We have a full Trustee Council here. We have an agenda. Does everyone have the agenda before them? Yes, okay. Anyone have any comments on the agenda?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, the only thing, we have an addition this morning, Fish and Wildlife Service brought to me an additional Kodiak tax parcel owned by the Kodiak Island Borough and they have a one-page benefits report.

We have copies of it that have been submitted here and I don't know if the Trustees are comfortable enough to bring that up today or if they would rather wait until the meeting in January.

And, I don't know, have we faxed that around?

2.

MS. R. WILLIAMS: It's being faxed.

MS. McCAMMON: It's being faxed now.

MS. R. WILLIAMS: It'll take a while.

MS. McCAMMON: But it will take a while.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Why don't we decide if we want to take it up when we get to small parcels, which is number 5 on our agenda; is that all right? Okay.

As you can see, we're trying to get through this by 10:00 o'clock, so this will be a record pace we're going to set here this morning. Any other comments on the agenda; do I hear a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. TILLERY: Move to approve the agenda.

MR. WRIGHT: I second.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Moved and seconded, any objection to the agenda?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Hearing no objection the agenda is approved.

Now we need to take a look at the November 30, 1996 meeting notes.

| 1 | MS. McCAMMON: 1998. | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN RUE: 1996, who did that to me? | |
| 3 | Trying to fool me, huh, Molly? | |
| 4 | MS. McCAMMON: Sorry. | |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Well, you never know, they could | |
| 6 | have been. | |
| 7 | MS. McCAMMON: Want to make sure you read them. | |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah. Okay. Anyone have any | |
| 9 | comments on the meeting notes or do I hear a motion to approve | |
| 10 | the meeting notes. | |
| 11 | MR. WRIGHT: I thought we did a lot more work | |
| 12 | than this at that last meeting. | |
| 13 | MR. WOLFE: Seems like it, but I make a motion | |
| 14 | that we approve the notes from the November 30th, '98 Trustee | |
| 15 | Council meeting. | |
| 16 | MR. WRIGHT: I second that. | |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. It's been moved and | |
| 18 | seconded. Any comments, discussion? | |
| 19 | (No audible responses) | |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any objection? | |
| 21 | (No audible responses) | |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Hearing no objection, the | |
| 23 | meeting notes are approved. | |
| 24 | Molly, you have a public comment period set for 8:15, | |
| 25 | we're five minutes ahead of time, do you want to move into | |

public comment now?

2.0

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: And do we have other communities on line? We have, what, Valdez and Juneau? Okay. Why don't we get a sense of how many people would like to comment? How many people do we have here in Anchorage from the public that would like to comment? Okay, we got one person here. Do we have anyone in Valdez who would like to comment? I'm just getting an idea of who's on the list. Is Valdez on line?

MR. BLONDEAU: Yes, I'm in Valdez. This is Wayne Blondeau and I'm ready to answer any questions, but I'm

waiting for the Mayor, Dave Cobb, to show up and possibly Bill Bixby.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, so we may have three

people in Valdez. Is there anyone in Juneau from the public?

MR. WOLFE: We have one down here, Frank.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Well, why don't we start here in Anchorage, we have one person. Are you ready to do it now?

MR. BAKER: I wanted to speak about the Restoration Reserve, a short comment about it, and I didn't want to interfere with other people's comments from other places.

CHAIRMAN RUE: No, we're going to go around the horn, so....

MR. BAKER: Okay.

1.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Sure, why don't we go ahead with Anchorage and, if you would, give us your name and spell it for the record.

MR. BAKER: My name is Grant Baker, it's G-r-a-n-t B-a-k-e-r. And I just wanted to mention a couple of quick comments about the Restoration Reserve expenditures. At the last meeting....

MR. BLONDEAU: They asked if there was anyone in Valdez and I told them that I was here waiting for Dave Cobb to show up.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Could you mute your phone in Valdez, we can hear you and we have someone trying to testify. Thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Blondeau, you may need to step back from your mike.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Go ahead, Mr. Baker.

MR. BAKER: Thanks. I just wanted -- at the last meeting there was a question about if you were creating endowed chairs at the university, how would you have control over it? There was some concern over, you know, how the money was spent. And I just wanted -- what's done with almost all monies that are given into an endowment, the Council can specify precisely what they want money spent on and how they want it spent and to categorize it the way they want to in the

creation of it.

I wanted to kind of emphasize the needs of the Council and the purpose of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill monies seem to mesh very well with the abilities and resources of the university as far as what they can do and provide. And I wanted to -- right after the last meeting, the next day, I'm sure you're probably all aware of it. The newspaper article that had come out about the sub-sea oiling is, they believe, you know, more evidence of showing that the source of oil is not from leakage through coal, but from the spill. And so, you know, the damage from the oil is still unknown and the extent of it is still unknown and that still needs to be investigated and there needs to be methods for cleanup and for prevention for whatever harm that causes.

One thought I wanted to put out is there's a lot of interest, even from oil companies and from other environmental cleanup-type agencies to try to enhance contributions or monies that are available for cleanup technology and for cleanup methods. And I think that's one reason why I urge the Council to talk with the university to see what they can come up with as far as how to make this money do the most benefit -- have the most benefits and do the most work.

And I can see contributions from other than the Exxon monies creating an entire building, placed on the university campus, where all these proceedings can be housed there,

library materials, conferencing, teleconferencing, all those things, in addition to the research. And so I think these are things that I wanted to put out there so that the Council understands that these things are available or they're possibilities and they're very, very real possibilities.

And that's it, thank you.

2.4

CHAIRMAN RUE: Thank you, Mr. Baker. Any of the Trustee Council members have questions of Mr. Baker?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. BAKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Why don't we go to Juneau next since we're waiting for people in Valdez to arrive, if that's all right.

MR. ANDREWS: Frank?

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah.

MR. ANDREWS: Good morning, this is Rupe Andrews, Chairman of the PAG Committee.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Hi, Rupe.

MR. ANDREWS: I just have a brief comment this morning. Last summer we heard from Deborah Williams the possibility the Karluk River on Kodiak Island was up for purchase, that there was some negotiation between 25 million and 75 million, but I'm here to urge the Trustees today to look at this again, if the window hasn't closed, of purchasing it.

Somewhere between 25 and 75 million is a magic number. And I'd just like to impress the Trustees again that the Karluk River, probably within the Western Hemisphere, is probably one of the top two wild steelhead streams left in the Western Hemisphere, it has all five species of salmon, too, but this is a stream that should be in the public domain. I'm sure the refuge people would like to see it in the public domain to expand the refuge out there also. We're talking about one of the top streams in North America, they don't build them any more, gentlemen, and whatever the price is I think it's going to be cheap for this kind of a situation. I have no idea where the negotiations are on this now, but this could probably be the most important land purchase that the Trustees could make ever, period.

Thank you for your attention. I'll answer any questions

2.2

Thank you for your attention, I'll answer any questions if you have any.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Thank you, Rupe. Does anyone on the Trustee Council have questions of Mr. Andrews?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: I'm sure none of us disagree with the value of the Karluk, it's an incredible system.

MR. ANDREWS: Like to hear how many steelhead I caught on 17 casts with a flyrod?

CHAIRMAN RUE: Let me see, what's the bag limit?

MS. McCAMMON: Twenty-seven. 1 How many hooks did you have? MR. WRIGHT: 2 MR. ANDREWS: Just one. 3 CHAIRMAN RUE: This is not fair, you're not 4 5 supposed to talk to us about that. MR. ANDREWS: I won't tell you where the other 6 7 stream is. Not until later. CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. 8 Thanks a lot. MR. ANDREWS: 9 CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, thank you. 10 Why don't we go now to Valdez. Do we have members of the public who would 11 like to address the Council? 12 13 MR. BLONDEAU: This is Wayne Blondeau at 14 This is regarding the Blondeau Parcel, Prince William 15 Sound 1056. I received an appraisal report last August and I submitted a response in September to the Attorney General's 16 17 office and I have not heard a word since that time and I wondered if I was ever going to get a reply? And I also 18 19 wondered if everyone got a copy of my letter that wants a copy? 20 CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, thank you very much. MS. McCAMMON: 21 Mr. Chairman.... CHAIRMAN RUE: Molly McCammon, may..... 22 23 MS. McCAMMON:I can respond to that.

received a phone call from the City of Valdez about a week ago

asking for a status report on the Blondeau parcel.

24

25

I had not

heard anything on the status of it, I actually thought that —
I knew we had sent the draft appraisal to Mr. Blondeau last summer and I thought he was still reviewing it. I had not realized that you had reviewed it and sent in comments. Those were submitted to Alex Swiderski at the Department of Law, he passed those on to the Department of Natural Resources and they, in turn, passed them on to the original appraiser, who has reviewed them. Those review comments are currently being reviewed by the Department of Natural Resources review appraiser. She is a single person in that office and has been totally swamped for the last month and a half and, unfortunately, has not been able to deal with it.

I really want to apologize to Mr. Blondeau because I just found out yesterday what the status of the appraisal was and I honestly had not realized that you had submitted comments back in September and no one had responded to you in that time. We do hope that the review appraiser will be able to look at them in the next week or so and, hopefully, we can get back to you with some kind of response in the very near future. But, again, I wanted to apologize, I had no idea that we were in this stage, I thought we were still waiting for comments from you.

MR. BLONDEAU: All right. Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN RUE: Thank you very much,

Mr. Blondeau.

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, we really appreciate your 1 patience on this and, again, I hope to get a response back to 2 you as soon as possible. 3 CHAIRMAN RUE: Do any of the Trustee Council 4 members have questions of Mr. Blondeau? 5 (No audible responses) 6 CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Great. Again, thank you 7 very much for being patient. 8 Is there anyone else in Valdez who would like to 9 address the Council? 10 MR. BLONDEAU: No, there isn't. 11 CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Let's come back to 12 Anchorage then. Anyone from the public like to address the 13 Council? 14 (No audible responses) 15 CHAIRMAN RUE: No, okay. Anyone else in 16 17 Juneau? MR. WOLFE: 18 Guess not, Frank. CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Then I'll call the public 19 testimony part of our meeting to a close and move on to the 20 21 next item, which is deferred projects. Ms. McCammon, would you 22 like to take us through this? 23 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to also

have Stan Senner come up and get to a mike just to answer any

questions. You should have a number of pieces of paper

24

25

regarding this. One is the original memorandum in your packet. 1 There are two spreadsheets in your packet, one is a numbers 2 3 only spreadsheet and the other one is the text spreadsheet. You also have in here the history of the project, of each of 4 the project costs over time. In addition, yesterday you were 5 faxed a two-pager that says "changes from the 12/8/98 6 7 spreadsheets" and also a draft motion. So, I think, we should check here and make sure everyone has all of these documents in 8 front of them. 9 CHAIRMAN RUE: Do all the Council members have 10 11 all the documents? 12 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir. 13 MR. WOLFE: I'm not sure I have a draft motion 14 yet. 15 MS. McCAMMON: It's attached to the one page 16 that says "changes from 12/8/98 spreadsheets." 17 MR. WOLFE: I have that, but I have what's

called "Revised Chief Scientist Recommendation."

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. McCAMMON: Oh, it wasn't attached. Okay, we'll get that faxed to you, too.

MR. TILLERY: Thank you, Jim, for pointing that out.

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: I don't have it either.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, no one has it except for us

here.

CHAIRMAN RUE: We'll fax it to everyone, so we'll talk slow here for a second.

MS. McCAMMON: Well, it'll take a while before we get to the motion anyway.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: As you'll recall, in August the Council approved \$10,272,200 worth of projects for the FY99 Work Plan. At that time there were over a million dollars worth of projects that were on the deferred list for various reasons. What you have before you today is the result of additional review, just some -- I think our best recommendations in terms of funding priorities, given the information that we know at this time and then the recommendations for your action today.

And what I'd like to do is go, briefly, through each of the projects and see if there are any questions or discussion on individual projects.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Which piece of paper are you working from, so we can all follow along?

MS. McCAMMON: I would be working from the numbers spreadsheet, supplemented by the text.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: We also have Bob Spies on line in California, too, so both Bob and Stan are here if you have

any technical questions.

The first one in the pink salmon category is Project 99329, Synthesis of Toxicological Impacts. This is a very important project that is synthesizing the results of all the Trustee Council's sponsored studies regarding oil damage to pink salmon. This additional amount of 24.5 thousand will complete the synthesis of five separate studies. The additional costs are needed because of some unexpected travel, also unanticipated costs associated with the analysis of the data from Exxon-sponsored studies and page charges not in the original proposal.

Since this is such a valuable project pulling together years of studies into kind of one -- into a number of publications, we think it's really important that the additional cost be funded.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Do you want to move through and just hear about each one and then do a motion at the end?

MR. TILLERY: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Good. Does anyone have questions on pink salmon?

MS. McCAMMON: And if there's any questions as we go through. 361-BAA, Graphical Techniques for Synthesis and Communication. This is a revised proposal and this one actually has a change, instead of 26.8 we're recommending 25.6

for this one. But, basically, this takes the SEA Project, which is in its concluding phase right now and develops a presentation for the Trustee Council's symposium in March and then develops that into a video presentation for use in various public forums.

The presentation was done at the Council meeting last year, it was very successful, and we'll be working with them very closely to make sure it's for an appropriate lay audience. So 25.6 on that one.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Chime in if you have questions.

MR. WOLFE: Okay.

1.7

MS. McCAMMON: It's minus 1.2 on that one.

MR. WOLFE: Say that again.

MS. McCAMMON: The total on that has been changed from 26.8 to 25.6.

393-BAA, this project was deferred pending further review of funding priorities. It uses carbon and nitrogen to stabilize isotope rations to confirm the relative trophic status of species within the Prince William Sound ecosystem.

The Chief Scientist's review of this is based on the information in our other project, 330, which is the food web model being developed, that this is information that is important in validating that model.

So the recommendation is to go ahead and fund that for FY99. And that cost is 125,000.

recommendation is 8.6 thousand. And this is one of the changes. This project -- last year the Council funded field studies on black oystercatchers to determine if there was any continuing affects from the oil spill. The results of this project are now in and have been reviewed and the evidence indicates that the spill-related effects found originally in 1991 are not now evident, but there appears to be no avoidance of oiled areas and that the population and nesting effort appears to be stable or increasing. These additional funds will allow for a final report as opposed to an annual report, and also allow for a manuscript to be produced. So 8.6 thousand for this one.

379, Assessment of Risk Caused by Residual Oil in Prince William Sound using P450 Activity and Fishes. The recommendation is to fund. It was deferred to assure coordination with the sampling of oiled mussel beds. That's being undertaken by NOAA. The revised detailed project description does exactly that. The project uses two nearshore fishes, masked greenling and crescent gunnel, as indicators of pathways of oil exposure. This is 115,500.

Project 432 was withdrawn by the proposer.

Project 459, Residual Oiling of Armored Beaches and Mussel Beds in the Gulf of Alaska. This was a proposal to go back to two areas along Kenai Fjords coast and the coast of

Katmai National Park and study sites there that -- where oil had been persisting over time to see if there was still the presence of oil there. This would be our last round of assessing residual oiling on these coastlines.

In FY95 the final round of shoreline monitoring was accomplished for Kodiak, this would be the final round for the Outer Kenai and Katmai Coasts, and we anticipate that leaves just some additional monitoring at some point in the future of Prince William Sound for residual oiling. The project is 124,900.

466, Recovery Status of Barrow's Goldeneyes. This project, again, was deferred pending reconsideration of the status of injury of the Barrow's Goldeneye. Although the goldeneye has not been added to the injured resources list, yet, it is being reviewed and a proposal -- anyway, it's being reviewed right now by agency staff. There has been evidence from the Nearshore Vertebrate Project and the marine boat surveys of new and ongoing injury to this species. The project will provide additional information to determine if it should be added to the injured list. Twelve thousand, two hundred.

480, this is an additional black oystercatcher project, we had two competing projects for additional work on black oystercatchers, the recommendation is not to do that additional work at this time and so we're just funding the closeout of the original project.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob
Anderson. I just wanted to note, as a place holder, that the
Service agrees that that should be withdrawn. They may come
back sometime next year with a proposal for some winter
reproduction studies that they'll be working on, but we agree
that that should be not funded.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: In the Seabird/Forage Fish and Related Projects cluster, Project 381, Status of Seabird Colonies, Northeastern Prince William Sound. This is a proposal from the Forest Service, an inexpensive, \$13,000 study to collect information on several small seabird colonies located on lands in Port Gravina, down to Orca Inlet, and these are lands that are in the process or will soon be transferred to public ownership as part of the Eyak acquisition. That's 13,000 for that one.

Project 434, East Amatuli Island Remote Video Link.

This project was deferred pending further review of funding priorities. We're now recommending that it go forward at a cost of 75.8 thousand. This project would put remotely operated video cameras in the Barren Island seabird colonies and then have them set up at the Pratt Museum so you could actually see what's going on in those bird colonies while still staying in Homer. There was a similar project that was tested on Gull Island in Kachemak Bay last year and it was very

.

successful. The idea is to see if there could be long-term use of using video cameras in place of field studies over a long-term. So this proposal is 75.8 thousand.

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

Project 052B, Traditional Ecological Knowledge. recommendation is to fund at a reduced level of 14.2 thousand. The request from Chugach Regional Resources Commission was to have two training workshops for villages residents on the value of traditional ecological knowledge and how to collect it and how to use it integrated with Western science. In further discussions with the proposers, we pared this down to one training workshop this spring, they have been working with a number of the resource management agencies about possible co-management, stewardship-type projects in the future that will probably have some kind of training element to them. this will be something that keeps the momentum going and continues to educate folks in the communities about the value of traditional ecological knowledge. Fourteen thousand, two hundred.

Project 99131, the Clam Restoration Project. This was deferred pending annual review of the Clam Project. That review session was held down at the Maricultural Facility in Seward in October. The review was very successful, the peer reviewers were quite pleased with how far along the project has progressed, especially once they did get into the new facility. And so the recommendation now is to go ahead with full funding

for this year at a cost of \$222,800. This is expected to be the final year of the Council's contribution to the project, which enhances local clam populations as replacements for subsistence resources injured by the spill.

1.

Project 263, Port Graham Salmon Stream Enhancement
Project. This project was deferred pending an analysis of
whether the actual construction was able to be accomplished
last year. It was completed, the stream improvements were
completed this year, so funding in FY99 would include
monitoring the success of those stream improvements, as well as
planting vegetation around the rearing ponds on Windy Creek.
\$42,100 for that project.

Project 99401, Assessment of Spot Shrimp Abundance.

This is a new project that was developed by the Valdez Native

Tribe in conjunction with NOAA, it was deferred pending

submittal of a more complete project description and

satisfactory peer review of that. We do have that in hand now

and the Chief Scientist has recommended that it be funded.

There have been numerous concerns over the declining number of

shrimp in Prince William Sound and those concerns have been

raised by both subsistence users and commercial fishermen.

Since the oil spill, shrimp harvest seasons have diminished to

the point of closure. This project would study the abundance

of spot shrimp to determine whether the population could

sustain seasonal opening for subsistence commercial harvest.

And this one has been developed in close conjunction with the Department of Fish and Game.

1.8

CHAIRMAN RUE: If I can make just one brief comment. I think on this one it's very important that we coordinate and make sure our methodologies are the same so that any research that we do on spot shrimp, as a Department, is consistent so that we can compare our data. So we'll be working with folks to make sure that happens.

MR. SENNER: Mr. Chairman, I know there have been some initial consultations between the NOAA PI, Chuck O'Clair and the folks in Cordova and I think those will continue as needed.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Good. Great.

MS. McCAMMON: Project 444, Harbor Seal
Population Studies, Community-Based Research. This was a
proposal that was submitted by the Alaska Native Harbor Seal
Commission to do some additional field work on harbor seal
populations. The original proposal had some serious problems
that came up through the review process. A revised proposal
was not submitted until November, that proposal also had some
-- it was a significantly improved proposal, however it still
has some issues that have not been able -- we have not been
able to resolve in the short period of time since the proposal
was submitted. We believe that this project would be even
better if we could wait until next year to begin it and spend

the next few months making sure that the Harbor Seal Commission, the Chief Scientist, the National Marine Fishery Service and the Department of Fish and Game are all working together to coordinate and integrate their efforts.

We want to make sure that any additional harbor seal work is well integrated into the vast amount of work that we've already invested money in. So the recommendation is to not fund at this time.

If, in our discussions over the period of time, if there's some small, discreet work that needs to be done next summer that could be easily accomplished in order to get to a larger project, we may come back to you at some point with that.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob
Anderson. I just would like, Molly, for you to send a signal
to the applicant that we support their efforts and really think
that this needs to be coordinated and done in a way that makes
the Federal and State agencies comfortable, but I look forward
to seeing a revised and improved proposal sometime next year.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Anderson, we have conveyed that message. I'll pass it on, also, to Monica Reidel and the Harbor Seal Commission. And I do anticipate that we will be able to put together a successful project.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Project 360-BAA, this is under

Ecosystem Synthesis, Guides for Future EVOS Activities. This is a proposal from the National Research Council to do a review of a future long-term and monitoring program. This was submitted under the assumption the Council would have made a decision on the Restoration Reserve by now. Since that decision has not been made yet, we're recommending do not fund this year. And I would anticipate that this proposal, hopefully, will be back next year.

1.5

The same with Project 99455, Investigation of the Data System for the EVOS Long-Term Monitoring Program. Again, this is dealing with the whole data system design issues. And we are recommending that it not be funded this year, but it will likely be back before you next year.

That brings us to Project 99470, amended. This is an amendment to the proposal on the 10 Year Symposium and related events and material. Over the last six to eight weeks, a group consisting of representatives from the Pratt Museum in Homer, the Valdez Museum, the Prince William Sound Science Center, the Prince William Sound Regional Citizens Advisory Council and the Restoration Office have been talking about what additional outreach efforts could be done over the next year in conjunction with the 10th anniversary of the spill.

A large proposal was submitted to us for an education curriculum, as well as a number of smaller items. We looked at it and picked out those items that we think are important to go

forward right at this time, recommending \$18,800 worth of these. These include funds for an art and essay contest among school children in the spill area. I should also say we've been working with the Forest Service quite a lot on this, too. An art and essay contest among school children. The art contest would be put into a calendar, similar to the calendar that's done for the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta by school children on endangered geese. And the essay would -- the winner of the essay contest would be invited to the 10th Symposium and deliver the essay in person on the first day event.

I think this is a good way of getting school kids who were probably four or five years old, six years old at the time of the spill to talk to their parents and their family members and people in the village to talk about what the spill meant to their community and describe that to the public.

We've also been in touch with the "We Alaskans" section of the Anchorage Daily News and they plan to print all of the submittals, or at least the winning submittals in an issue of "We Alaskans".

The other item is an informational newspaper, which would be a very -- a four-page newsletter on newsprint, it would be very easily and cheaply reproduced and handed out in large quantities to basically kind of answer the key questions about the oil spill, what was injured, what is recovery like now, is there still oil out there, what's different now 10

years later? Could it happen again? Questions that we're going to be answering and talking about on the first day of the symposium.

1.3

And then, finally, copies -- additional funds to reproduce and distribute additional copies of the Council's video on the restoration efforts, which is currently being produced. So 18.8 thousand for that.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob

Anderson again. It sounds like a good endeavor to me to get
the children involved in talking to their parents, especially.

My understanding of this project and all the others is that the
Justice Department looks at these and ensures that they fit
within the consent degree. Some question have been raised by
my counsel's office about ensuring that we do that.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, Mr. Anderson, I believe that will happen or has happened.

Have you heard anything, Molly?

MS. McCAMMON: I have not heard anything from Department of Justice on this.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Well, I assume silence is acquiescence; how about that?

MR. TILLERY: The Department of Law has reviewed it and has concluded that it fits within the legal parameters of the settlement.

MR. ANDERSON: Great, thank you, Mr. Tillery.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Thank you.

2.0

MS. McCAMMON: I should point out that the Department of Law and the Department of Justice don't always agree on what....

CHAIRMAN RUE: In this case we'll take Mr. Tillery's advice.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, those are the individual projects within what we refer to as the Annual Work Plan. A separate project, outside of the Work Plan, is Project 99405, which is the Port Graham Salmon Hatchery Reconstruction. The recommendation for that project is \$781,300 and we are recommending that it be funded.

As you probably know, the hatchery was destroyed in a fire on January 13th of 1998. The Council was funding several projects and the State's criminal fund was also funding an additional project there that dealt with the rehabilitation and enhancement of local pink salmon, sockeye salmon and coho salmon stocks for the benefit of both local subsistence and commercial fisheries. The community is very committed to having that hatchery rebuilt, as well as the associated cannery with it and they have requested Council funding for a partial amount of that reconstruction. The total cost of the hatchery is approximately 2.2 million. In addition, the cannery, I believe, is another approximately two million, so it's about a \$4 million project.

The proposers have been working very diligently and, I think, pretty successfully to obtain other funds. At this point they have a significant amount of the additional funding, there's just one piece of their funding package that still has some question to it. And so our recommendation is that it be funded, but contingent -- the construction phase, contingent on, first of all, successful NEPA compliance and then, secondly, all of the funding actually being in place. The NEPA compliance would be done by the Forest Service, they've already reviewed it and their potential costs are included in this proposal.

2.4

And we do have folks from Fish and Game and Stan is here. It has been reviewed very closely by the Chief Scientist, by our peer reviewers. It has been reviewed by the Department of Justice and it's my understanding that all of the questions and concerns that were originally identified have been resolved.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any questions on this project?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair, this is Jim Wolfe.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Go ahead, Jim.

MR. WOLFE: I guess, Molly, my remaining question on it is, how did we arrive at what was an appropriate share for the oil spill, Exxon?

MS. McCAMMON: It was not done through any kind

of calculated cost method, it was -- I think they basically identified other funding sources and we had indicated, early on, that the Council would not likely fund the entire thing and so they did look for other funding sources and it was pretty much the amount of money that was remaining to fully fund it.

1.1

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair, again.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, go ahead, Jim.

MR. WOLFE: Follow-up question. I'm supportive of it, but I am concerned that we are paying a significant portion of the cost of putting a new hatchery in there, which I don't know if we need this for a long-term recover under Exxon or if this is a short-term, and I assume it should be a relatively short-term. And so I still have a question on whether or not roughly a third of the expenses should be picked up by this funding?

CHAIRMAN RUE: Jim, this is Frank Rue. I guess my feeling on this one is that it will basically become self-sustaining, once it's up and running the hatchery will pay for itself through cost recovery, all the monitoring that we're requesting and requiring that they do to make sure that the wild stock/hatchery stock interactions are watched, will be paid for by the hatchery, so this really is just a start up capital cost, as I understand it. And then once it's up and running we will be done with it. Is that right?

MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

25

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yes, Mr. Tillery.

It should be noted that a MR. TILLERY: significant portion of this has been provided by the State through criminal restitution monies over the next year, we don't know the amount because it's money that's going to be paid off of interest earned. One thing that we're being very careful with with the criminal monies, and it fits within the description here for the monies, we're being asked to contribute from civil funds, is that there is also, as I understand it, a cannery component that's with this and that none of the Exxon Valdez funds, whether they be civil or criminal, are to go into that cannery project. Sort of much like the SeaLife Center where you had to make sure your funding went for -- didn't go for the visitor component, but went for the research component. On this one, someone is going to have to monitor pretty close to be sure nothing goes into the cannery, that it's all in the hatchery side.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Right.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Tillery, I appreciate that. I guess, you know, to kind of wrap up my comments is I do not object to the project, I support the project. My concern is that we have some reason or basis for how we came up with our share that we can talk to folks about it if there's a question on it, that's the only thing. So given that I think I'm

hearing that we do have a basis to say why we came up with that number and so I'm okay.

1.1

1.3

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, in addition, under the benefit cost section in the detail part of the description, the hatchery is expected to be involved in sockeye and coho rehabilitation work throughout its 20-year life. Hatchery supplementation is expected to be needed for at least five cycles to ensure adequate escapement while providing enough fish to satisfy subsistence harvest in both the Port Graham and Nanwalek River systems. And since the predominant life cycle for the English Bay River sockeye is five years and Port Graham River coho cycle is four years that gets you to almost 20 years there. So I think we were also looking at the investment over, basically, a 20-year life span of the hatchery.

CHAIRMAN RUE: And, if I could, those two species which....

MS. McCAMMON: Correct.

CHAIRMAN RUE:you know, aren't the primary commercial focus at this point. It'll help a lot with subsistence and augment commercial.

Any other Council....

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair, this is Bruce Wright.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, Bruce, go ahead.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm not opposed to the project, but I am concerned that we are making a commitment to this

project and so I would like some assurances that we won't be asked for additional funds to keep this operation going. You indicated that it'll be self-sustaining, though you didn't indicate when that'll take place. Maybe in our resolution we should say something about we're not responsible for operational costs.

And the second concern I have is that if this place burns down I want to make sure it's totally insured this time, so they don't come back for help again. So I would like also in the resolution that it is insured and that we don't have to worry about this thing in the future.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, Bruce, are you proposing that when we get to the motion you're going to want to add an amendment to that effect or would you like it in a transmittal letter?

MR. WRIGHT: Either way. That could be one of the contingencies, that it's insured.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, their intent is to fully insure it, and part of the problem in the past was it was woefully underinsured, however, it was such an old building that I think there was such -- they couldn't get much insurance value for it.

MR. WRIGHT: I see.

MS. McCAMMON: But since this would be a brand new building it would be fully insured at the replacement

value.

MS. SCHUBERT: Also....

CHAIRMAN RUE: We're looking at some notes here, if you can bear with us for a second.

MR. WRIGHT: Certainly. I'm not sure how to handle the operational cost concerns that I have, but -- and, I guess, along those lines, in the past we have funded projects for this facility and, Molly, did -- we had a certain level of funding when the building burnt down, are those funds available for this project now?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, we still have funds and what happened was they -- one of the buildings did not burn down and so they relocated some of the raceways and the holding tanks into that one and there were some additional funds that were reprogrammed to buy some new equipment so that they could basically take place in a temporary operation. I don't have the long-term funding forecast for those two projects, but I can get that, what we're expected to commit to the long-term portions of those projects. We'll get that information in a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN RUE: I think the other thing we ought to look at, Molly, is where we would put the two things, one, full insurance and, two, the expectation that this is a one-time capital project, you're expected to cover the costs with cost recovery. I think that's in there, but....

MR. TILLERY: I think, Mr. Chairman, that that can be just provided for in the motion.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MR. TILLERY: It's fairly simple.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Do we want to wait until we get some more information on this one or do we want to move ahead here?

MS. McCAMMON: I would appreciate it, because I think we do have, to the ongoing projects that we have going on there, there is at least an expectation that they go on for a certain life period. And I think that those operational costs are being built into the projected operational costs of the hatchery, but Sandra has those right here.

As far as the insurance, it's a little bit difficult to say, contingent on obtaining full fire insurance, since they wouldn't obtain fire insurance until after the building was constructed.

MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh.

MS. McCAMMON: So it's a little hard to say you can't build it until -- there's a little bit of.....

CHAIRMAN RUE: Chicken and egg problem.

MS. McCAMMON:chicken and egg thing.

MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, right.

MS. McCAMMON: But it is expected to be fully funded. The one -- what we have for the pink salmon project

here is \$75,000 a year expected to go through FY2001, so that 1. would be two additional years after this year. MR. WRIGHT: But that's the funded project, 3 that's not so much to fund basic operational needs. 4 MS. McCAMMON: Well, they use this as part of 5 their operational costs, so it is currently operational. 6 CHAIRMAN RUE: That's for the overall cost or 7 is this the future cost? 8 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. 9 MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh. 10 CHAIRMAN RUE: We're showing zero, zero, zero. 11 MS. McCAMMON: This isn't a capital cost, this 12 is an operational program cost. The capital cost would be a 13 14 one-time.... 15 CHAIRMAN RUE: Okav. MR. WRIGHT: 16 Okay. 17 CHAIRMAN RUE: So is there an expectation that they will be coming to us every year then; is that what you're 18 19 saying? 20 MS. McCAMMON: I would say for two more years 21 after this year, the expectation.... 22 CHAIRMAN RUE: Until they build the run up and 23 can do the cost recovery? MS. McCAMMON: 24 Right.

MR. SENNER: Mr. Chairman, it's for development

25

of the brood stock necessary to actually get it.....

1.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Right, to have enough fish to pay for it.

MR. SENNER: Yeah.

MR. WRIGHT: I think that's satisfactory.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. We're just looking at one last thing here.

MS. McCAMMON: The criminal project has actually received their grant in a larger sum and then they're spending it over a period of time, so instead of getting an annual appropriation they got a larger lump sum that they're using also for operational costs. But from the joint trust funds for the -- it's only the pink salmon project, which is expected to be 75,000 a year through FY2001.

MR. TILLERY: There were actually two components of criminal monies that went into there, there was subsistence monies that went in, which I believe helped transition to the -- when they had the fire and they moved into the other one, one of the subsistence projects, I believe, paid for that. The new appropriation is dealing with replacement of the building.

Mr. Chairman, would this be funded through a grant?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, it would be and it would be our anticipation to put it as a designated grant to the Port

Graham Village Council through the capital budget. And we have

discussed this with Representative Phillips and she is very supportive of it and is willing to do this.

MR. TILLERY: Okay. It would seem to me that we could just ask that a grant condition be insurance, which I'm pretty sure would be a grant condition, even in the absence of us asking for it.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Mr. Tillery, do you think that needs to be in the motion, can we just....

MR. TILLERY: I think it can just be added into the motion very simply.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any other comments on this project from Trustee Council members?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe, go ahead.

MR. WOLFE: I was feeling pretty good and then I heard the statement that we only need the hatchery for two more years.

MS. McCAMMON: No, I didn't say that, I just said that this is developing, two years are needed in funding from the Trustee Council to develop the brood stock that then will be coming back over time. And so the actual life of the hatchery is 20 years.

MR. WOLFE: I understand the life of the project, but as far as us needing a hatchery down there to produce stock, though, for that area or to replace stock in

that area, we're talking only a couple more projects then.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Mr. Wolfe, I think what we're talking about is a couple of years to subsidize the operations until the pink salmon start returning in adequate numbers that they can fund.....

MS. McCAMMON: Do cost recovery.

CHAIRMAN RUE:their operations through cost recovery.

MS. McCAMMON: Correct.

CHAIRMAN RUE: But the expectation is that the fish will be available for subsistence and commercial use over the long-term and it'll be sockeye, coho and pink salmon.

MR. WOLFE: That's fine.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair, I have one last question. I just want to make sure that everybody, especially the Chief Scientist, is satisfied that there's guarantees that the wild stocks will be adequately protected.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Mr. Wright, Stan Senner is here, he may want to address that.

MR. SENNER: Bob Spies, do you want to respond to that?

DR. SPIES: Yes. That was the concern in the whole process from the beginning is whether the wild stocks would be adequately protected. And there is going to be an otolith marking program in place. And there's two other things

that I think are necessary to protect the wild stocks. One is a in-season sampling program that looks at the mixture of proportions of wild and hatchery stock in the fishery. And the second one is renumeration of wild escapements in the river system there. And although those programs are not in place because the stocks -- the hatchery production is not to that size yet, we've been assured by the Commissioner of Fish and Game that they'll work with the Port Graham Hatchery through they're annual management programs to put those programs in place as necessary and as the hatchery transitions from the brood stock development into the production basis of the hatchery.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Spies.

This is Frank Rue again, that's part of their -- the hatchery permit requires them to do all those things. And we also have a special harvest area that is designed to avoid -- to focus on harvesting the hatchery stock versus the wild stock. The brood stock comes right from the Port Graham River, so it's genetically the same fish, so we've done everything we think necessary to avoid those kinds of problems.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Spies.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any other comments or questions on projects?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Are we ready for a motion?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, there was just one more and that's the -- and I don't know if you want to deal with that separately, the Alaska SeaLife Center bench fees.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Oh, is that part of the -- should we go to that now and then do.....

MR. TILLERY: I think we can deal with that separately, Mr. Chairman, would be my....

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, my preference would be to do the deferred projects first and then move to the bench fees, if that's okay with other Trustee members.

MR. WRIGHT: I agree.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the Trustee Council adopt the recommendations contained in the 12/8/98 Deferred Projects for FY99 Work Plan document, as amended by the undated sheet described as "Changes from 12/8/98 Spreadsheets," with the following conditions.

First, that if a principal investigator has an overdue report from the previous year, no funds may be expended on the project involving the principal investigator unless a report is submitted or a schedule for submission is approved by the Executive Director.

Secondly, that a project's lead agency must demonstrate to the Executive Director that requirements of NEPA are met before any project funds may be expended, with the exception of funds spent to prepare the NEPA documentation.

And third, that with respect to Project 99405, the Port Graham Hatchery, that the Executive Director specifically consult with the proponents of this project to be sure that they're aware that the Trustee Council does not intend to be involved in long-term operational funding of this project, although certainly will be looking at the next two years of developing the brood stock. And that there be a condition in the grant that this building or hatchery be insured to the extent reasonably possible.

And, finally, that the funds approved for this project are for capital project and do not lapse on September 30th, 1999.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, thank you, Mr. Tillery. I think that was in the form of a motion, do I hear a second?

MR. WRIGHT: I second that. Thank you,

Mr. Tillery.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any comments or discussion on the motion?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, would you like to call the roll, Molly?

| 1 | MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Tillery. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. TILLERY: Aye. |
| 3 | MS. McCAMMON: Bob Anderson. |
| 4 | MR. ANDERSON: Aye. |
| 5 | MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Wright. |
| 6 | MR. WRIGHT: Aye. |
| 7 | MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Easton. |
| 8 | MR. EASTON: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. McCAMMON: Jim Wolfe. |
| 10 | MR. WOLFE: Aye. |
| 11 | MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Yes. I guess we don't normally |
| 13 | do a roll call, do we? That's all right, it's fun to do it |
| 14 | once in a while. |
| 15 | Okay, the next item on the agenda is the Alaska SeaLife |
| 16 | Center bench fees. We have some folks from the SeaLife Center |
| 17 | here to prepare [sic]. Since the agenda is very full and we |
| 18 | have about 40 more minutes, do we want to just move right into |
| 19 | that without a break? |
| 20 | MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. |
| 22 | MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I think you were |
| 23 | all sent a packet of information that included a two-page memo |
| 24 | from myself, a one-page spreadsheet and some backup documents. |
| 25 | As you know, at the last meeting the SeaLife Center requested |
| | |

that the Trustee Council reconsider its bench fees paid for the work that is currently being funded at the SeaLife Center.

Having completed a partial year of operations, including the first cycle of seasonal visitation and research, they now have a much better idea of the actual operating costs of the research portion of the Center.

As a result of that request I had staff go back and look at the existing cooperative agreement between the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the SeaLife Center, the lease documents and the Center's cost assumptions and what we discovered you'll see is on the spreadsheet that's attached to the memo. We went through project by project with the amount of space that is allocated for these various projects and the approved negotiated cost. And as we worked through this spreadsheet, we came up our negotiated bench fees of \$156,633.60 total.

When we then analyzed the costs for these various research areas what we realized is that basically the Council got a great deal last summer and probably an even better deal last year and are only paying 30 percent of the actual costs of these research areas. The full costs of these areas is reflected in a column just to the right of those numbers, and that full cost totals \$551,926.09.

As you look through the various numbers and all, what you realized is that it costs a lot to have animals in

captivity in a lab and have the proper animal care for them.

It's very expensive to do this kind of work. And the Council
was basically paying 30 percent of those costs.

Attachment 1 in your packet is one of the pages of the cooperative agreement between Fish and Game and the SeaLife Center. And Section Z talks about the space for EVOS research. As you kind of go down through it, basically the city should give priority to research related to the EVOS restoration mission. And you go down, the rent for space to conduct research funding with joint EVOS settlement funds, including the 4,000 square feet allotted to Fish and Game, should not exceed the cost per square foot computed on an annual basis for the research component of reasonable personnel costs and administrative expenses, operations, curatorial and repair and replacement costs, including reasonable reserves for repair and replacement, but not including costs for depreciation, debt service or amortization.

To the extent that revenues collected from the adjacent public education and visitation components of the SeaLife Center exceed costs, the excess revenue shall be used to the extent reasonably practicable to subsidize the rent for space to conduct EVOS-related research.

What we have determined and what we have heard from the SeaLife Center is that, at this point, they do not have excess revenues and will not likely have those for at least another

year to two years until they get things running on a more 1 smooth basis and adjust to the seasonality of the operations of 2 the Center. 3 On that basis, my recommendation for this year, and 4 this year alone, at this time, is to pay the full 5 non-subsidized costs of EVOS research at the Center. 6 This would be an additional cost of \$385,300 with.... 7 CHAIRMAN RUE: Eighty-two thousand. 8 9 MS. McCAMMON: Well, rounding, it's all With an additional \$27,100 in general administration rounded. 10 11 costs in Fish and Game for a total of \$412,400. 12 MR. WRIGHT: How did we get the 27,100? 13 MS. McCAMMON: It's based on the two percent? (Inaudible reply) 14 15 MS. McCAMMON: Seven percent. 16 MR. WRIGHT: On our spreadsheet we had 26,900. 17 That's only 200 bucks, but I was just staying consistent. 18 MS. McCAMMON: It's once you start rounding 19 everything, that's what you get. 20 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. 21 CHAIRMAN RUE: So is that clear to everyone 22 on.... 23 MS. McCAMMON: And we do have Kim Sundberg and Leif Selkregg are here if there are any additional questions. 24

CHAIRMAN RUE: Do Council members have

25

questions?

MR. WOLFE: I do have one question. There's a recommendation that the total bench fee cost be withheld within the last month of '99, why are we doing that?

MS. McCAMMON: This is as a request from Fish and Game, and they can actually do this -- they can do the up front payment and the withholding of 10 percent administratively, without Council action, but they did talk to me about that. Just, over time, when they actually submit bills for costs, sometimes there's a difference of opinion in terms of what is being billed for and whether the service was actually provided. And this provides Fish and Game with a little bit of leverage at the end of the season in case there are some disputes over costs.

MR. WOLFE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair, this is Bruce Wright.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, Bruce, go ahead.

MR. WRIGHT: At our last Trustee Council meeting the debt service was a big issue in our discussion and once the SeaLife Center can resolve the debt issue and they're out of debt then, of course, everybody will be lots happier, hopefully they'll have some excess funds, surplus funds that they can use to support EVOS and other research at the facility. And could somebody describe the plan for reducing or eliminating this debt?

MS. McCAMMON: Leif.

MR. SELKREGG: Sure.

MS. McCAMMON: Leif Selkregg is here to answer

that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Chairman, my name is Leif MR. SELKREGG: Selkregg, I'm an advisor to the Alaska SeaLife Center Board of Governors and Board of Directors. One of the attachments that's been provided in your package is a SeaLife Center Short-Term Plan of Finance Action Plan. And let me tell you, first, that the initial priority of the Board of Governors, the Board of Directors and staff has been to address the cash flow demands between November of '98 and peak season of summer of And the first six items on this schedule demonstrate the attention of the Board on what we'll call short-term cash flow demands, including establishing a personal loan in the amount of 400,000 from a Board member accelerating pledges in the amount of \$500,000. The sort of normal business management of our retail component of our business, which we'll forward -find about 400,000. The adjusted EVOS fees proposal that is before you today and an accelerated additional cash fund raising plan in the private sector to realize an additional \$600,000.

Those short-term case flow initiatives have been taken on by the Board and we are successfully accomplishing each of those and hopefully today EVOS will be a partner in seeing that

through.

The second to the bottom line is the long-term capital funding political action strategy to retire the debt over the years '99, 2000 and 2001. We have \$17 and half million of debt which was structured through the City of Seward, which allowed us to fully fund the construction component of the SeaLife Center. That debt we are approaching from two perspectives. First is an initiative that will simply retire the balance of that debt to the greatest extent possible. We're targeting the full 17 and a half million. We think anything below that will be a -- contribute to the success. And that's being done with initiatives with the delegation, as well as private fund raising initiatives.

We have a program to basically try to retire about \$5 million of that debt per year over the next three years. And if we're successful in doing that, we'll continue to have tremendous philanthropic success on this program and public/private partnerships. The other part of that strategy is in the restructuring of the debt and the refinancing of that. These are not tax exempt -- excuse me, these are tax exempt revenue bonds that were initially sold, really, as junk bonds with fairly high interest rates. We are working with financing institutions to restructure that debt and actually bring the debt service payment down. We hope to do that next year. We are finalizing some litigation with our construction

contractor, which we should be able to accomplish in the next few months. And, that resolved, we'll be able to refinance the debt and bring our debt service payment down until we can actually retire the debt.

The last line is the ongoing analysis of the bond holder requirements and the balance of funds in renewal/replacement accounts. We are maintaining very good relationship with our bond holders, we would like to refinance. Just to mention, last night in the -- the SeaLife Center went before the City Council for the City of Seward and asked relief on a short-term payment -- on payment in lieu of taxes. And the City Council approved holding off that payment until peak season of next year, so we really have a partnership with the City of Seward, the private philanthropy and, hopefully, today with EVOS. And the Board of Governors' and the Board of Directors' number one agenda going forward is retirement of debt and I hope that I'm coming to you next year with a report that demonstrates that we've been able to successfully accomplish, at least, a major portion of that.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Any questions of Mr. Selkregg?

I guess at this point, we don't have a motion before us, but

I'd invite Kim Sundberg to the table also, in case folks do

have questions of Mr. Sundberg, who is the Executive Director

of the SeaLife Center.

Are there other questions from Council members and/or I

guess I would invite comments from Mr. Sundberg and Mr. Selkregg on the Executive Director's proposal here. So, first, are there Council members? Any questions? And is it okay if I ask them to respond to Molly's analysis here and proposal?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah.

MR. TILLERY: Yeah, for whoever it is. What do you anticipate -- do you anticipate a subsidy for our research for next fiscal year or do you anticipate that it will be full cost?

MR. SUNDBERG: Well, until some of these components that are on that flow chart come together, I couldn't predict right now whether we'd be able to subsidize research for the next fiscal year. We're working actively to get these funding components into place and our long-term goal has been to subsidize the research, which we did in 1998. For '99, we won't be able to do that. I can't predict right now for 2000 whether we will or not.

What we're trying to do, aggressively, is to market our research space so we get higher occupancy of it and market our visitor facility. We had 190,000 visitors this year, we're looking at probably closer to 220,000 next year if market projections from the tour industry follow though. And the goal of the SeaLife Center is to subsidize research, and we did that

this year and we hope to be able to do that again in the future, but right now we need to basically break even and cover our costs and that's what we're asking for.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any other questions from Council members?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. I guess I would invite

Kim or Leif to give us any thoughts they have on the Executive

Director's proposal.

MR. SELKREGG: Over the last couple of weeks I've had the opportunity to work with the Executive Director and staff in looking at a variety of views of the cost of research at the SeaLife Center and we've actually gotten incredibly detailed about understanding the total square footage of the SeaLife Center's research component, which is about 42,000 square feet. Of that we've really only been renting out around 17 and a half thousand square feet as net rentable. It's a tremendous facility and it is expensive to hold animals and do research in labs with animals.

We've benchmarked other facilities around the country to understand sort of an efficiency ratio of that gross to net, we're right in the same sort of order of magnitude of other comparable research facilities in terms of our costs. I feel that the approach that's been taken here by the Director and staff indicate our communication with them last summer when we

did anticipate what the full cost would be. We negotiated a subsidized rate on a view that we would like to continue the subsidy capacity. At the end of the year we've analyzed that and because of the record keeping of the staff here and the history of the negotiation we were able to go back and look at the basis of those costs. And it will certainly meet our requirements if EVOS is able to follow through today and allow us to adjust our '99 bench fees.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, great. Thank you very much. Any questions from Council members? Yeah, Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I sort of concur that my understanding when we entered into this venture was that there was going to be a subsidy, but that subsidy was based on projections, and that the subsidy was going to occur as money was allowed. They made some projections that apparently have turned out to be somewhat optimistic and now having seen sort of the cold realities, as I understand it, they're now asking that we revisit those subsidies and, you know, and bring them back more in line with reality, which, in my view, is something that we should do. It would seem to me that we shouldn't penalize them for having gone out and done, essentially, their best to try to subsidize research. no evidence here that money, you know, was deferred into, for example, the visitation site or anything else. So, in my view, it was a good try, it didn't work this year, hopefully it will

work in the future and it seems to me that we should follow though and basically -- I think there are several different ways to do it and the Executive Director's recommendation of how to do it is probably the -- logistically is the simplest way to do this and, in my view, we should follow that recommendation.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Perhaps any other Trustee
Council members want to speak? Maybe it's time for a motion
here so we get it on the table and then we can discuss it
further. Do I hear a motion?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RUE: It looks like Mr. Tillery is our motion maker today. Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: I would move that the FY99 budget be, I guess, amended to pay for the full non-subsidized cost of EVOS research at the Alaska SeaLife Center in the amount of \$385,300.

MS. McCAMMON: And additional....

MR. TILLERY: And additional \$27,100, although I'm not totally sure about that, to the Department of Fish and Game and general administration fees, for a total of \$412,400.

MR. WRIGHT: I second that.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any further discussion on this?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: I guess I would concur with what Mr. Tillery said earlier, I think this lives within our original agreement with the SeaLife Center, we don't have to revisit net versus gross space, we just go ahead and deal with the agreement as written previously and recognize that the subsidy wasn't possible this year given that the revenue wasn't as high as anticipated. So I feel comfortable supporting this motion.

Any other questions?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Then I'll -- all those in favor signify by saying aye.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Oop. You're awfully quick, Jim.

MR. WOLFE: I know, I'm slow sometime, but there was another portion of what was drafted out as a motion for us that didn't get on the table and it has to do with this amendment of the negotiated bench fees for '99. It does not reflect any commitment on the part of the Council for bench fees for FY2000 which will be up for renegotiation at that time. I think that's still a good point and part of it is, I think, that the Executive Director needs to work with the Center in advance of us putting together our 2000 budget to see if they can get their projections for the 2000 budget and give us a better handle on what we can anticipate for 2000.

| 1. | CHAIRMAN RUE: Mr. Wolfe, do you feel |
|-----|---|
| 2 | comfortable leaving that as a general statement and not part of |
| 3 | the motion or do you want to propose amending the motion? |
| 4 | MR. WOLFE: Yeah, that's probably good enough |
| 5 | just as a statement. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, it's always my assumption |
| 7 | that we renegotiate this anyway, so I felt comfortable. |
| 8 | MR. TILLERY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, that was my |
| 9 | thought, in not putting this into the motion, was it certainly |
| 10 | wasn't part of the motion, but I certainly concur with |
| 11 | Mr. Wolfe. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, so do I. |
| 13 | MR. WRIGHT: So do I. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. So I was just about to |
| 15 | call for a vote. Any other comments before I call for a vote? |
| 16 | (No audible responses) |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, hearing none, all those in |
| 18 | favor signify by saying aye. |
| 1.9 | IN UNISON: Aye. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Those opposed? |
| 21 | (No opposing responses) |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. The motion passes. Thank |
| 23 | you, all, very much. |
| 24 | Okay, let's go back to the agenda. We're going to move |
| 25 | into small parcels and Kodiak tax exempt parcels. We have |

about 35 minutes. If you'd like to take us through that, Molly?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, the -- as you know, the Council in the past has agreed to provide funding for the acquisition of lands held by the Kodiak Island Borough at key waterfront locations along Uyak Bay within Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. These were acquired by the Borough as a result of forfeitures for tax delinquency, so they're referred to as the Kodiak tax parcels. But the Council, even though they agreed conceptually to funding a number of these, asked that these parcels come back when they had gone through an appraisal and were ready to proceed for acquisition.

Before you today you have three acquisitions, as well as a fourth one which was submitted to me this morning. The three that you have are KAP 1089, 1090 and 1091 and these are the Christensen, Naumoff and Easter parcels. They total 26,021 acres. Their combined cost is \$47,000.

As we dealt with small parcels all along in Kodiak Refuge, these have the opportunity to be sold to the private sector and to be used for, basically, private hunting reserves, camping areas, things like that. By the Council providing funding and allowing these to go into the public domain it ensures that these parcels are in existence for use for subsistence users, for all members of the public. And there is a map that's attached showing the location of these three

parcels. I don't have a map..... 1 CHAIRMAN RUE: Of the new one? 2 MS. McCAMMON: Of the new one. 3 I quess, do we even want to deal with the fourth one now or do you want 4 to.... 5 CHAIRMAN RUE: What's the feeling of other 6 Council members, should we even deal with the fourth one or 7 postpone that till January? 8 MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair, we do have a paper on 9 10 that fourth item and it doesn't look that..... MS. McCAMMON: It's very similar. 11 I think I give it..... 12 MR. TILLERY: Yeah. MS. McCAMMON: It's very similar to the others. 13 MR. WOLFE: Yeah, I suggest we go ahead and 14 15 take it up. CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Hearing no objection, 16 let's go ahead and take it up. I'm looking for my paper on 17 that one. Here it is, I've got it. Everyone have the 18 19 paperwork on the fourth parcel? 20 MS. McCAMMON: Could you describe, Steve, where the fourth parcel is located? 21 MR. SHUCK: Yes, the fourth parcel.... 22 MS. McCAMMON: And this is Steve Shuck with 23 Fish and Wildlife Realty Division. 24 25 MR. SHUCK: Thank you. The fourth parcel, I

just found out when I was visiting in Kodiak last week with Kodiak Island Borough, it is another tax parcel that the Borough foreclosed on and when we appeared before the Council several months ago with the request for funding the first seven tax parcels, this latest one had not gone through the Borough process to, I guess, comply with Borough regulations and State law. When I was there, this last week, they informed me that the necessary work had been done and they wanted to sell this one to us as well.

If you'll look on your map attached to the first three

If you'll look on your map attached to the first three -- the write-up on the first three parcels you will see the Naumoff parcel, it's located at the head of Brown's Lagoon. This fourth parcel, the Kodiak Island Borough parcel, is directly east and adjoins the Naumoff parcel.

CHAIRMAN RUE: So the whole head of the bay or quite a bit of the head of the bay now would become public?

MR. SHUCK: Yes, sir.

MS. McCAMMON: It's not water frontage though?

MR. SHUCK: That is correct, it is not water

frontage.

MR. TILLERY: Between the Naumoff and the

second line?

MR. SHUCK: Yes.

MR. TILLERY: What is that gap in the Naumoff

25 | parcel?

MR. SHUCK: That is -- the gap is part of
Brown's Lagoon, it's a river that goes down and empties into
Brown's Lagoon, but at high tide is actually salt water rather
than fresh water. The mapping just does not show the
hydrography, except for Uyak Bay itself.

CHAIRMAN RUE: So that is public -- that's the
tide land?

MR. SHUCK: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, okay. Any questions by
Council members on this fourth parcel or on any of the parcels?

\$12,000.

Mr. Tillery, go ahead.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, on the fourth parcel the Borough has foreclosed on it and we'd be buying it from the Kodiak Island Borough?

MR. SHUCK: That's correct.

MR. TILLERY: And the price listed here is

MR. SHUCK: That is correct.

MR. TILLERY: Was it appraised?

MR. SHUCK: Yeah, that -- the appraised value is \$12,000, it was appraised originally last year, the appraisal is now over a year old, it's been updated and the updated appraisal has been approved by all three review appraisers.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MR. SHUCK: As with all of the Kodiak Island
Borough parcels, State law requires that once the Borough takes
their back tax money owed and reasonable expenses, the
remainder of acquisition funds go to the person who lost that
property.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Any other questions of
Steve or of Molly on any of these parcels?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, there is a draft resolution and I was just given this this morning, so I haven't had a chance to look at it. And I know it's been submitted -- I think it's been submitted to all the attorneys and I'm not sure if people have had a chance to look at it yet.

CHAIRMAN RUE: I haven't. How do we want to handle that, have any suggestion?

MS. McCAMMON: We could do a conceptual motion subject to review and just generic agreement to the resolution.

CHAIRMAN RUE: I like that. Does anyone want to give us a generic motion?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Mr. Tillery, it may fall on your broad shoulders. No one else seems to be volunteering.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Council authorize the expenditure of \$59,000 for the four

tax parcels identified in this draft resolution. That the parcels be acquired under the set of conditions that normally attach to these small parcels and that the Fish and Wildlife Service provide the Council with a resolution to be formally signed after it's been reviewed by various legal staff.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Do I hear a second?

MR. WRIGHT: I second that.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. I have a question. Do other members have a question? And this is just on the motion, did you say 54 or 59?

MR. TILLERY: Fifty-nine thousand.

CHAIRMAN RUE: That's what I -- okay, 59.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chair, I do have one quick question for clarification.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Mr. Wolfe, go ahead.

MR. WOLFE: Just to -- maybe for the record, all of the papers indicate that this will become part of the refuge and I just wanted to emphasize that.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

MR. SHUCK: That is correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Even though these are isolated islands in the landscape of Native-allotted and Native-conveyed lands, they'll still become part of the refuge?

MR. SHUCK: Yes, sir. These lands are part of

the lands that were involved in the merger between Larsen Bay Tribal Council and Koniag, Incorporated. When Koniag made the agreement with the Trustee Council to sell the lands, the majority of the large parcel to the Trustee Council, there was a strip of land along the shores of Uyak Bay that was not included, that was because those lands were reconveyed by Koniag back to Larsen Bay Tribal Council for distribution to tribal members. These are lands that were -- these lands that we're acquiring now are some of these individual parcels and, I believe, the intent was of the large parcel agreement that we would be acquiring all of Koniag's land up to the small parcels and, as they become available, we hope to be able to work out -- negotiate an agreement with the sellers to purchase these and end up buying the majority or a large percentage of these small 10-acre tracts along the banks of bay. MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, any other questions?

(No audible responses)

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

CHAIRMAN RUE: All right. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Those opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, the motion passes.

MR. SHUCK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RUE: All right. Thank you. 1 believe that brings us to the end of the agenda. Are there any 2 3 other.... MS. McCAMMON: No. 4 CHAIRMAN RUE: No? 5 6 MS. McCAMMON: Two more items here, 7 Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN RUE: How can that be? What are the 8 9 other two items? MS. McCAMMON: Fish and Game's.... 10 CHAIRMAN RUE: Oh, the parcels meriting 11 12 special.... MS. McCAMMON:proposal. 13 14 CHAIRMAN RUE: Oh, this was important. 15 right. The State has -- as we all know, 16 MS. McCAMMON: there is a soft moratorium on small parcels at this point. 17 of the parcels that the Council approved acquisition of last 18 year, the Baycrest parcel, which is down near Homer, that offer 19 20 has expired as of December 15th. Basically the owner is in the process of dividing it up and selling it off. And the State 21 has decided that there are other higher priorities for those 22 23 funds than the Baycrest parcel at this time. What they would like to do is have two parcels, KEN 24

1084, the Morris parcel, which is a 40-acre piece of land on

25

the Ninilchik River owned by Dorothy Morris and KEN 1086, which is at the mouth of Stariski Creek, 48 acres. They would like to have these parcels which have been submitted, have met the threshold criteria, have been evaluated and are kind of on that low, between the low and moderate scale, for restoration benefits. They would like to have these designated as parcels meriting special consideration and have them go forward for appraisal and then, depending on what happens with the appraisal, possibly have them come back to the Council for consideration. So this is kind of in lieu of the Baycrest parcels if there is a successful appraisal done and agreement with the land owners about a possible purchase.

So the motion would be -- or the proposed action would be to designate these two parcels as parcels meriting special consideration to go forward for appraisal only.

MR. WOLFE: So moved, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Do I hear a second?

MR. TILLERY: Second.

CHAIRMAN RUE: It's been moved and seconded that we move ahead to appraisal on these two -- actually just designate them as parcels meriting special consideration. Any questions or discussion?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Those opposed?

(No opposing responses)

1.4

1.8

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. The motion passes and these two parcels are designated.

Okay, Molly, other items for the Council here?

MS. McCAMMON: No, Mr. Chairman, other than I just wanted to put on the record that we do have a number of people who are taking advantage this year of early retirement and are leaving the Trustee Council process. We do have certificates of appreciation prepared for them and I did want to acknowledge, on the record, their work. One of them is Rich Goossens with the Forest Service who has served as a review appraiser for a number of years and has been very actively involved in having a number of our acquisitions go forward. So Mr. Goossens is onto greener pastures, I guess.

The other person is Joe Sullivan with the Department of Fish and Game who has been actively involved in the Restoration Program for years and most actively as a project manger for a number of the Department's projects. So again, we do appreciate all of Joe's and Rich's hard work and we'll be sending around certificates of appreciation.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, great.

MS. McCAMMON: Lisa Thomas is the other one. Lisa Thomas is another member who served as one of the liaisons

at the Department of Interior and has now become a State employee working on the new Kachemak Bay National Esturian Research Preserve down in Homer. So she's changed jobs just in the recent month.

So, again, three very fine people who have dedicated a lot of time and energy, hard work to the Restoration Program who are moving on in their lives.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Well, great. I know all of us appreciate their work, although it's hard to say anything nice about someone who's going on to greener pastures, having fun, but I would concur with everything Molly said about the folks that we're talking about here, they've all done great work for us.

Any other Council members want to say anything at this time?

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yes, Mr. Wolfe, go ahead.

MR. WOLFE: Now that you mentioned greener pastures, I thought maybe this would be a good time to mention that this will be my last official Trustee Council meeting, at least as a representative anyway, and I will be moving on to greener pastures. I'm not quitting, but I am retiring from the Forest Service effective the first of the year, so I probably won't see most of you guys in this capacity again.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Is that right? I didn't realize

you were doing that, Mr. Wolfe. We will see him at the next meeting to roast him or something?

MS. McCAMMON: I was just informed of this yesterday, so I'm still in denial and approaching anger.

CHAIRMAN RUE: This is sort of sneaky, Jim.

MR. WOLFE: Well, yes, and one of the reasons for that is I didn't want to be kind of a lame duck here to try to push the Eyak package on through to closure, and hopefully, with a lot of help from Mr. Tillery and Maria and Molly, we're getting there.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Well, I'm sorry to hear that you're leaving, you've been really a terrific inspiration on the Council and have done a tremendous amount of great work. I know I've really appreciated having you on the Council.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to echo that. It has been -- I've been working with Jim Wolfe for -- since forever, I think, on the Eyak deal, in fact.

MS. McCAMMON: Since forever.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah, he's become an

institution.

MR. TILLERY: I mean this was shocking and unhappy news and I certainly, in my own sense, would be, Jim, I would expect you to show up at the next Council meeting just to get what's due you.

CHAIRMAN RUE: Yeah. At least for public

testimony. 1 MR. TILLERY: Right. 2 I'll think about it. MR. WOLFE: 3 CHAIRMAN RUE: It'll be pleasant. 4 5 MR. WOLFE: Retirees, huh? We have a busy schedule that I'm looking at here. 6 CHAIRMAN RUE: I know it. 7 MR. WRIGHT: Well, perhaps we need another 8 meeting before the end of the year? 9 10 CHAIRMAN RUE: I don't think so. 11 MR. TILLERY: We can just continue this one, Frank. 12 13 CHAIRMAN RUE: No, I think we need to adjourn. Well, I am sorry to hear that, Jim. 14 15 MR. WOLFE: Well, I appreciate your acknowledgement, but it's time to move on to something 16 I've really enjoyed working with this group and I 17 think some of the accomplishments that we've achieved over the 18 19 last few years have been pretty significant. CHAIRMAN RUE: That's absolutely right and 20 you've been a big part of that. No question. 21 22 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, Jim, I'm really going to miss 23 This is a big surprise. And you've had such insightful participation at this group. I know Steve Pennoyer is going to 24

miss you a lot. So, for the record, can you tell us what's the

25

greener pastures? 1 MR. WOLFE: Oh, I have some land down New 2 Mexico way, at least, for the wintertimes, I think, will be a 3 lot easier to tolerate. These short days are getting to grow 4 on me more. Pennoyer and I talked about that yesterday. 5 you get a few more years on, it seems like it affects you more. 6 CHAIRMAN RUE: Well, you may want to 7 8 reconsider, I just talked to someone who's been retired for a while and they say it gets really tiring packing all the time 9 and unpacking to go on trips. You may want to rethink this 10 retirement. 11 Uh-huh. MR. WOLFE: Well, I appreciate it, 12 13 guys. CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay. Do we have any other 14 15 business before us, Molly? MS. McCAMMON: (Shakes head in the negative) 16 CHAIRMAN RUE: Okay, there's no other business, 17 18 do I hear a motion to adjourn. MR. WOLFE: So moved. 19 CHAIRMAN RUE: And a second? 20 21 MR. EASTON: I second. 22 CHAIRMAN RUE: All in favor signify by saying 23 aye. 24 IN UNISON: Aye. 25 CHAIRMAN RUE: Those opposed?

(No opposing responses) CHAIRMAN RUE: Great, we are adjourned. Thank you very much. MR. WOLFE: Thank you. (Meeting adjourned at 9:42 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE

| - | |
|---|--|
| 2 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)) ss. |
| 3 | 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: |
| 5 mulas the foregoing pages numbered 4 through 70 | THAT the foregoing pages numbered 4 through 72 contain |
| 6 a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valo Spill Trustee Council's Teleconference Meeting record 7 electronically by me on the 15th day of December, 199 | a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil |
| | electronically by me on the 15th day of December, 1998, commencing at the hour of 8:06 a.m. and thereafter transcribed |
| | |
| 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 20th day of December 1998. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY: |
| 15 | $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A})$ |
| 16 | Joseph P. Kolasinski |
| 17 | Notary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires: 04/17/00 |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | i |
| 25 | |
| | |