

Protocol 9.12.06
Henry
Hunt
Company

PRD

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL

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

Public Meeting
August 9, 1999
9:00 o'clock a.m.

Fourth Floor Conference Room
645 G Street
Anchorage, Alaska

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- | | |
|--|---|
| U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE -
U.S. FOREST SERVICE (CHAIRMAN) | MR. DAVE GIBBONS
Trustee Representative |
| STATE OF ALASKA -
DEPARTMENT OF LAW | MR. CRAIG TILLERY
Trustee Representative
for the Attorney General |
| STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT
OF FISH AND GAME: | MR. ROB BOSWORTH for
Commissioner Frank Rue |
| U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: | MS. MARILYN HEIMAN
Special Assistant to the
Secretary for Alaska |
| U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE - NMFS: | MR. BRUCE WRIGHT for
MR. STEVE PENNOYER
Director, Alaska Region |
| STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION: | MS. MICHELE BROWN
Commissioner |

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

1 TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT:

2 EVOS COUNCIL STAFF

3	MS. MOLLY McCAMMON	Executive Director
4	MS. TRACI CRAMER	Director of Administration
5	MS. REBECCA WILLIAMS	Executive Secretary
6	MR. PHIL MUNDY	Science Coordinator
7	MS. SANDRA SCHUBERT	Director of Restoration
8	MR. HUGH SHORT	Community Facilitator
9	MR. JOE HUNT	Communication Coordinator
10	DR. BOB SPIES	Chief Scientist
11	MR. RICK CABLES	U.S. Forest Service Regional Forester
12	MR. ALEX SWIDERSKI	State of Alaska Department of Law
13		
14	MS. BILL HAUSER	Alaska Department of Fish & Game
15		
16	MS. CLAUDIA SLATER	Alaska Department of Fish & Game
17	MS. MARIANNE SEE	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
18	MR. BUD RICE	National Park Service
19	MR. KEN HOLBROOK	U.S. Forest Service
20	MS. DEDE BOHN	U.S. Geological Service
21	MS. CAROL FRIES	Alaska Department of Natural Resources
22		
23	MS. MARIA LISKOWSKI	Department of Agriculture
24	MS. RITA MIRAGLIA	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
25	MR. GLENN ELISON	Department of Interior

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to order	04
PUBLIC COMMENT	
Mr. Gary Thomas	04
Ms. Nancy Yeaton	13
Ms. Theresa N. Obermeyer	16
Approval of agenda	20
Approval of March 1 and May 26, 1999 minutes	21
Public Advisory Group Update - Ms. McCammon	21
Executive Director's Report - Ms. McCammon	25
Draft FY2000 Work Plan - Dr. Spies/Ms. McCammon	85
Vote on Parcel PWS 1028	175
Adjournment	176

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (On record - 9:28 a.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Good morning, and welcome to
4 the August 9th, 1999 Trustee Council meeting. I'd like to call
5 the Trustee Council to order. We're presently missing one
6 representative who is on the way, but we're going to go ahead
7 and start. And I'd like to first, I guess, take public
8 comment. I don't think we can approve the agenda, but we'll go
9 ahead and take public comment now. It's scheduled for 9:30,
10 we're about right on time, so -- Rebecca, do you have the
11 sign-up sheet?

12 MS. McCAMMON: She's getting it right now.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. I don't see anybody
14 on the list that wants to comment, but is there anybody in the
15 audience that would like to comment? Gary.

16 MR. THOMAS: Good morning and thank you for the
17 opportunity to make comment today. My name is Gary Thomas, I'm
18 at the Prince William Sound Science Center and have been
19 working on related Trustee problems and oil spill recovery in
20 state problems for probably the last nine years. We actually
21 had our 10th year anniversary and we're going to have a big
22 celebration in September and the invitations are going to be
23 going out and I'm sure that all the Trustees and the staff will
24 be invited to come over and see our new facilities that we just
25 recently completed.

1 And what I'm here to talk about today is some history
2 about what we've been doing for the past six years over in
3 Prince William Sound that's been, we feel, pretty unique and
4 sort of led to a proposal that we submitted this last year.
5 And what it concerns is wintertime stock assessments of pollock
6 and herring in Prince William Sound.

7 And in 1994, when we started our research programs up
8 in the Prince William Sound, acoustic techniques were just
9 things that were talked about, they were used on the rivers for
10 sonar, but they weren't used at all for assessments of fish and
11 marine system. And in six years of wintertime surveys we've
12 learned to understand the distribution of pollock and herring
13 in the Sound and during the winter these fish aggregate in
14 fairly small areas and they appear to be the only real dominant
15 species in the Sound during the winter period.

16 Our observations on these surveys -- my expertise is in
17 sonar and one of the things we've tried to do is show that we
18 could repeat our estimates of the biomass and we've been able
19 to go out there and find out the sources of error in these
20 surveys and we're getting repeatable estimates that are under
21 10 percent, so if we're measuring 29 or 30,000 metric tons,
22 we're getting 29, 28, 30,000 metric tons every time. This is
23 pretty significant in fishery science. And it shows that we
24 have a fairly good understanding of our measurement data.

25 Now, what we've learned in addition to doing this is

1 that around these aggregations of pollock and herring in the
2 winter, we find massive concentrations of birds and mammals,
3 and this is Stellar sea lions, harbor seals, many different
4 species of birds, a lot of the large mammals and birds that
5 have been undergoing recent declines in the whole North Gulf of
6 Alaska and also undergoing -- have undergone declines since the
7 oil spill. And the real critical thing here is that all of
8 these birds and mammals appear to be aggregated on herring.
9 Now, if you go through the literature and you take a good look
10 at what we know about wintertime foraging of these large birds
11 and mammals, there isn't any data. It's -- you know, and this
12 phenomena of this aggregation on the herring is well understood
13 by the fishermen who fished herring in the fall and in the
14 spring and have deer hunted out on these islands and they
15 realize this is a naturalist -- it's a really unique phenomena,
16 but it hasn't been monitored and measured and understood. It's
17 not factored into the equation of the survival of Stellar sea
18 lions, of the survival of birds and mammals, and this is an
19 area that's begging to be researched to understand some of
20 these trends in wildlife that are going on in the North
21 Pacific.

22 Well, just to summarize, I'll just say we put in a
23 proposal, it was 00557BAA and we were going to address this, it
24 was going to be sort of a first time effort where we were going
25 to go out and repeat these measurements of forage fish and

1 combine it with observations and counts of the different birds
2 and mammals that were aggregated on these. And I'm just
3 putting in a pitch, this is a fairly unique proposal. People
4 haven't proposed and haven't gone out and done this in the
5 winter and nobody's had the -- ever -- even during the
6 summertime they haven't had the opportunity to go out and
7 measure the birds and mammals where there's been such good
8 information on the forage. And the primary hypothesis right
9 now that is causing declines is the fact that there's food
10 limitation. Now, right now you have a question whether it's
11 pollock and there's a lot of people that are worried that, you
12 know, pollock -- this is a big question, is it pollock? Is the
13 hundred million dollars reductions in the pollock fishery going
14 to do any good to revive the Stellar sea lion populations, the
15 birds and mammals? Well, if it's not pollock and it's
16 something like herring, and these herring aggregations are
17 something we missed because we haven't looked at it in the
18 winter, then we better go back to the drawing board. And I'm
19 just really suggesting, this is a unique opportunity and if we
20 don't do it, someone needs to do it.

21 And that's all I have. Thank you very much for hearing
22 me out. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any questions for Gary?

24 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, Gary, I have a question.

25 Mr. Chairman. Actually, are you going to be monitoring just

1 the forage fish? Are you going to focus on the predators as
2 well? And, just briefly, if you're going to monitor, look at
3 the predators, how would you do that?

4 MR. THOMAS: Well, first the forage fish
5 situation in the winter is different than it is during the
6 summer. Most of your -- there's a huge diversity of fish that
7 is found near shore during the summers and this abundance of
8 different species provide forage for birds and mammals, happens
9 usually sometime in the spring, when fish that are
10 over-wintering in deep water move up on to the near-shore
11 areas. And so studying feeding food limitation in the summer
12 with birds and mammals is extremely difficult, they're eating
13 everything because everything is available. In the winter when
14 these near-shore fishes -- the diversity of it moves off into
15 over-wintering areas, which is usually deep, over 300 feet, you
16 have a much simplified situation.

17 And I think the reviewers of the proposal didn't
18 really understand this because they have never made these
19 observations. What they have are these big concentrations of
20 pollock or herring and there's a very sharp dependence. And
21 all you have to do is go out on a boat and see this event to
22 know that it's real. And so as far as measuring the animals,
23 these fish, at least the herring, are concentrated in area,
24 you'll have 31,000 metric tons in an area of two square
25 kilometers. I mean this is a real small area. The measures of

1 birds and mammals would be done from a very small boat, a
2 skiff, in this area. They're moving into these -- the back
3 part of Zaikof Bay, which is -- you know, it's protected most
4 of the winter and you can make Dave Shield, who is my co-PI,
5 was going to do those observations, he's very experienced with
6 flying transect techniques and estimating sighting -- doing
7 sighting functions and coming up with good estimates of the
8 numbers of these different animals. And that's really the
9 first step, is to show the co-occurrence of these two, the
10 predators and the prey, and this could lead to all kinds of
11 avenues of different kinds of research. There's going to be
12 bird people, there's going to be mammal people, there will --
13 there's humpback whales in there. There's just -- it's just a
14 real virtual naturalist spot and, you know, the first thing to
15 do is to document that co-occurrence and how tight it is and
16 who the players are.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Would you look at the fish
18 predators that might be in there, like adult pollock?

19 MR. THOMAS: We've done a lot of acoustics and
20 there are some large fish in there and we've sort of confirmed
21 that with our sample fishing with the seines, and salmon sharks
22 are in there during the winter, too.

23 MR. WRIGHT: How many?

24 MR. THOMAS: And I just talked to Lewis Herman
25 in Hawaii and he wants to come up, he's missing all of his male

1 humpback whales and he thinks that they're over-wintering now
2 in these locations where all the herring are and he wants to
3 get involved in the project. Andrew Trike wants to get
4 involved in the project because, you know, they've been really
5 struggling to get wintertime information, and this is just the
6 opportunity, and we have access to that area for probably at
7 least a quarter of the wintertime period when there's windows
8 of good weather, we can just jump out there and get on these
9 areas and see what's going on.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Can you see the salmon sharks
11 acoustically?

12 MR. THOMAS: Oh, yeah, they're a very large
13 target. They're in the.....

14 MR. WRIGHT: And there's lots of them in the
15 wintertime or there's some?

16 MR. THOMAS: There's -- we never tried to --
17 we've never went through and estimated them.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

19 MR. THOMAS: We could do that, it would
20 probably be pretty easy to do.

21 MR. WRIGHT: Now, you said you've been out
22 there the last five or six years.

23 MR. THOMAS: Since 1993.

24 MR. WRIGHT: And these are doing surveys for --
25 I mean, why were you out there and why wouldn't that continue?

1 MR. THOMAS: There was a combination of
2 projects, but the primary project that got us out there was the
3 SEA Program. And the SEA Program is very much interested in
4 knowing the number of predators in Prince William Sound to
5 estimate their impacts on salmon fry survival. And once we
6 started doing these surveys there was two approaches to measure
7 the densities of fish, actually when the fry were out
8 migrating. And, secondly, estimate them when they're in a
9 pre-spawning wintertime configuration. That's usually when you
10 can get repeatable measurements and know how many are around.
11 And so when we started doing that, all of a sudden Fish and
12 Game got interested. Actually, initially, the fishermen were
13 interested after the '93 collapse of the herring population,
14 nothing was done, and we said that we could go out and do this
15 measurement in the winter. And so we were the first ones on
16 the spot after the first collapse. And we got money -- I think
17 Jerry McCuen got money from the state legislators to start
18 that. Since then Fish and Game has picked it up and even up to
19 the last year those techniques have been -- are gradually
20 becoming used more often in the fisheries -- with the fisheries
21 management program. They relied on them quite heavily last
22 year when after, you know, the second collapse of the herring
23 population. To actually say, this is all the fish we have and
24 we're not going to open the fishery.

25 MR. WRIGHT: Will those Fish and Game surveys

1 continue and will you piggyback on those?

2 MR. THOMAS: Well, this is one of the things --
3 this project is probably going to be the key, whether it's
4 going to continue, at least, with our involvement. These
5 surveys are sort of the -- are the foundation for doing the
6 bird and mammal studies. And if we can do these surveys --
7 that's one of the reasons why there was such a tremendous
8 outpouring at the last PAG meeting. I mean there was -- I mean
9 R.J. Kopchak commented, I commented. Several people tried to
10 call in, but couldn't get in, but they sent letters in. I gave
11 you a packet, it has a letter from Ken Roemhildt, head of North
12 Pacific processors. I know that Jay Stinson, President of
13 Alaska Draggers was writing a letter, he tried to call in. I
14 know Chris Blackburn, Alaska Groundfish Database, tried to call
15 in and couldn't get through. I think she was writing a letter,
16 too, so there's a lot of people that are very much interested
17 in this for different reasons and to continue the biomass
18 estimates of the herring and pollock is a very high priority
19 because that's been the thing that's helped keep some of the
20 commercial fishing going during the winter in Prince William
21 Sound and it's helped put -- institute conservation practices
22 with the herring, which have been really depleted. Unlike the
23 herring, the pollock population is increased from 40 to 115,000
24 metric tons in the Sound just in recent years through the
25 recruitment of a really large 1994 year class. So if there

1 were ever a lot of predators feeding on salmon in the Sound, it
2 is right now.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Thanks.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any other questions for
5 Mr. Thomas?

6 (No audible responses)

7 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you.

8 MR. THOMAS: You bet.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Maybe we can go on line. Is
10 there anybody on line?

11 MS. YEATON: I'm Nancy Yeaton from Nanwalek.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes, would you like to make
13 any public comment?

14 MS. YEATON: Yes, I would. First of all, I'd
15 like to say good morning to everybody. Good morning from
16 beautiful Nanwalek and thank you for giving me the opportunity
17 to get on line to make a comment. And this is in regards to
18 the 20 million dollar set-aside for communities. And I wanted
19 to make comments about the fact that this money would be really
20 important for many of the communities, to have it set aside for
21 them in order to be able to work hand in hand with scientists,
22 to continue projects that have already been started in the
23 communities. And this plays a real important factor to a lot
24 of the communities. I think of the clamming project that we
25 have going on between Nanwalek and Port Graham and we're able

1 to be part of that team work that goes on with the scientists
2 in regards to planting clams and keeping data on them and going
3 in the spring and summertime to be able to check the clams and
4 measure them and be an actual part of the process of keeping
5 all this information within the community and working with the
6 scientists.

7 And these, I feel, are just very important projects
8 that EVOS has funded and will continue to fund in the future,
9 hopefully. And I think with the money that is hoped to be set
10 aside for the communities that it would be able to provide
11 funding for scientists and the communities to be able to work
12 together on keeping data on the resources in these areas that
13 are very important to us.

14 And I know that we have stressed this over and over in
15 the past and I'm sure a lot of times you or many of the people
16 get tired of the communities saying, you know, but we have
17 these resources that are very important to us. I went out with
18 my grandchildren yesterday walking through the lagoon and
19 through the beaches and it was just wonderful to hear their
20 voices asking and questioning all this life that's in these
21 tide pools, and I thought, you know, this is so important to
22 carry on for the future generation and for the communities,
23 these small communities, to be able to have their knowledge
24 validated by scientists working with them on some of the
25 resources that are depleting and trying to research those. And

1 it's just really important information for the communities, as
2 well as the scientists. And I know that funding is definitely
3 being cut on many of these project, and if EVOS, the Trustee
4 Council, would just consider and support the money being set
5 aside for these two groups of people. The scientists and the
6 community members can work together. It's just really, really
7 important, I can't stress that enough.

8 And that's what I have to say about the 20 million
9 dollar set-aside for the communities.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you, Nancy. Can you
11 spell your last name?

12 MS. YEATON: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Nancy, can you spell your
14 last name, please?

15 MS. YEATON: Y-E-A-T-O-N.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay, thank you very much.

17 MS. YEATON: You bet.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any questions for Nancy?

19 (No audible responses)

20 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you. Anybody else in
21 Nanwalek that would like to testify?

22 (No audible responses)

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. Any other people on
24 line?

25 (No audible responses)

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. Maybe we'll go back
2 to Anchorage. Anybody here that would like to testify? And
3 please try to keep it to three minutes or so.

4 MS. OBERMEYER: Last, but not least.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

6 MS. OBERMEYER: How are you, sir? Theresa
7 Obermeyer, and forgive me always for being a little late, I
8 would have liked to come earlier. And I look at some of these
9 documents and I'm very impressed with some of the research
10 that's being done.

11 I always have something to pass out. And I'd like to
12 very briefly explain what I'm passing out. First of all,
13 Mr. Gibbons, do we know that a picture is worth a thousand
14 words. The picture, if you will open this page, to me, is a
15 summary and wake-up call of all that's going wrong in the state
16 of Alaska. I hope that you will look at that and form your own
17 opinion about that picture. Would you be kind enough,
18 Mr. Tillery?

19 And, of course, I just am very interested in your work.
20 I have contacted Mr. O'Neal several times out of Minneapolis in
21 the hope that the lawyers who filed suit against Exxon would be
22 paid because, as we know, it's a death knell to any future
23 litigation if these lawyers are not paid. Of course,
24 cha-chink, cha-chink, cha-chink [sic], they will be collecting
25 interest as Exxon has not decided to pay because, to my

1 knowledge, there hasn't been any movement along those lines.
2 Although I don't read anything about it in the press. I read
3 in about March that there were supposed to be oral arguments in
4 Seattle on May 3rd, and I have read almost nothing since,
5 except that AKPIRG is trying to raise money in order to work
6 toward a settlement.

7 And I'm just hoping that there can be that because, as
8 I say, I don't think other lawyers will spend a decade doing
9 something if they don't see a light at the end of the tunnel.

10 So, of course, I'd be glad to just, very briefly,
11 explain about Eric Wohlforth and the Permanent Fund. I'd like
12 us to remember as Americans that we have to support a system of
13 checks and balances. Where I live there is absolutely no level
14 of accountability. And so, finally, after I have been
15 collecting documents on the Permanent Fund -- and do we know
16 that we all own this Permanent Fund? We're Alaskans and we own
17 this, but why don't I see any of these people at the board
18 meetings? I've been going to them for several years now and I
19 go and I'm the only person that is not a paid employee or a
20 board member or who hasn't flown in from all over the world.
21 It's amazing. And do we know, to my knowledge, this is the
22 largest pot of cash in the United States of America, 26 billion
23 dollars?

24 I used to kind of say, well, I can't count that many
25 zeros, but you see -- and that's all a psychological game to

1 make us think that we are less than the board members. But I
2 finally thought, well, I'm just going to compile how many --
3 because the only thing that made sense to me in the documents
4 that I was receiving was the individual transactions, that was
5 money, nothing else really made sense. The documents don't
6 cross reference. Do these people even know how to add? I
7 don't believe so.

8 But, in the meantime, if you would check my little
9 summary here of individual transactions that I just want to
10 make sure you understand, that those are investments in the
11 stock market because of the employees' and the board members'
12 inside knowledge of this largest pot of cash in the United
13 States of America. Of course, Mr. Tillery, we know as thinking
14 people that the two main questions are how much and why. How
15 much were these individual transactions and why did each of
16 these people have individual transactions? I don't believe I'm
17 ever going to get the documents but, Mr. Tillery, would you
18 please file suit? Go through the whole process and find out
19 how much and why. I think it would be a great undertaking.

20 And, of course, the other thing just to bring up, is if
21 you look at my little chart here, is your retirement,
22 Mr. Tillery, is right on Eric's desk. Look at what
23 organizations this one law firm are the attorneys for, I mean,
24 it's amazing and I kind of understood that, but we live in a
25 place where there's so much information so what we have to do

1 is kind of summarize that and try to get to the ethics, I
2 believe we should.

3 But also, as we note, Mr. Gibbons, there will be a
4 special election coming up on September 14th. I hope that
5 everyone will really think about how our future should go. Of
6 course, I want to say, publicly, I am against any more money
7 being given to this government, they have billions and yet
8 we're supposed to give them more. I don't think so. But I
9 hope you got the little -- this picture. Please -- I'm not
10 going to explain it, I want you to look at it and form your own
11 opinion, but if you'd like to ask me at the break I'd be glad
12 to explain it, but I think smart people get the hidden meaning.

13 So did I give one of these to you, Molly?

14 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, you did.

15 MS. OBERMEYER: Oh, good. And thanks -- did
16 you have a question?

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Anybody have any questions
18 for Ms.....

19 MS. OBERMEYER: Obermeyer.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS:Obermeyer?

21 (No audible responses)

22 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you.

23 MS. OBERMEYER: Thank you, sir.

24 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is there anybody else in
25 Anchorage that would like to testify?

1 (No audible responses)

2 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Anybody else on line?

3 (No audible responses)

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. I'll bring the public
5 comment period to close then. Thank you very much.

6 And we've now got a full Trustee Council, so I'll ask
7 for approval of the agenda at this time.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman

9 MR. TILLERY: I move we approve the agenda.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes, Molly.

11 MS. McCAMMON: I have two changes to the
12 agenda. Under the habitat protection status report, small
13 parcels, we have two small parcels that are actually before the
14 Council today for consideration. One is Kenai 1084, the Morris
15 parcel and the other is Prince William Sound 05, or a portion
16 of Prince William Sound 05, it's US 349 which is part of the
17 Valdez Duck Flats, and that's a U.S. Forest Service parcel.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you, Molly. Any other
19 changes to the agenda?

20 (No audible responses)

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Now, I'll ask for a motion
22 to approve the agenda.

23 MR. TILLERY: I move that we approve the agenda
24 as amended.

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Do we have a second?

1 MS. HEIMAN: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay, it's been moved and
3 seconded, all in favor?

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you. Now, I'd like to
6 move to approve the minutes from the March 1st and May 26th
7 meeting notes. They're under the tab -- are there any changes
8 to the meeting notes?

9 (No audible responses)

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is there a move to accept
11 them?

12 MR. WRIGHT: So moved.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is there a second?

14 MS. HEIMAN: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: It's been moved and seconded
16 to approve the meeting notes, all in favor?

17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you. Next on the
19 agenda was an update on the Public Advisory Group, but I
20 understand that Mr. Meacham can't make it here today, so
21 Ms. McCammon will do that for Chuck. Molly.

22 MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chuck
23 Meacham is the Vice Chair of the Public Advisory Group and
24 chaired the last meeting, wished to extend his sincerest
25 apologies, he had some medical things he needed to take care of

1 today unexpectedly and was not able to be here by telephone.
2 But I did talk to him this morning and he emphasized some of
3 the things that he wanted to be sure to bring up to the Trustee
4 Council as a result of the meeting.

5 In your notebook you'll see a copy of the meeting
6 summary. The meeting was held on July 15th and 16th. It began
7 with a discussion of the Restoration Reserve and the Gulf
8 Ecosystem Monitoring Plan. We had a public hearing that night
9 on the FY00 Work Plan and then the next day went through in
10 more detail, through that Work Plan.

11 The Public Advisory Group spent a lot of time on the
12 first afternoon talking about the proposed GEM Program and what
13 we had given them, myself and Bob Spies, Dr. Spies, our Chief
14 Scientist, was just an overview on where we were in terms of
15 overall planning. We anticipate having a very detailed
16 workshop, briefing session, probably sometime in September or
17 early October with the Public Advisory Group and also with the
18 Trustee Council to go into more detail of where we are on the
19 GEM planning process.

20 There were a lot of issues brought up in that
21 discussion, probably the major issue centered around the
22 proposed 20 million dollar community set-aside. There was a
23 lot of discussion on what constituted community-based projects,
24 whether having a specific set-aside for them was important. If
25 you'll recall in the Restoration Reserve resolution from last

1 March, the Council did not take a position on that set-aside,
2 but they did say that the long-term research and monitoring
3 program would include elements of community involvement,
4 traditional ecological knowledge, community stewardship and the
5 kinds of projects that have come forth from the community over
6 the last five years. The resolution also indicated that this
7 was an issue that needed further consideration and further work
8 and that it would be coming back before the Council.

9 There was some -- if you read through the meeting
10 summary, I think it highlights some of the discussion. There
11 was concern from some of the members of the PAG that projects
12 that came from communities were not able to compete fairly
13 against proposals that came from, say, the university or an
14 agency. There was concern, on the other hand though, that if a
15 specific amount was set aside for communities, there was also
16 concern expressed that then there might be a feeling that the
17 communities had been taken care of and that they didn't need to
18 be fully integrated into the overall program.

19 So there was a lot of discussion, pretty wide-ranging
20 discussion on that issue. And there was definitely no
21 consensus by the Public Advisory Group. Also, all of the PAG
22 members were not present. It's also clear from the discussion
23 that they're various views in terms of what a community-based
24 program would look like. There are some people who view it as
25 projects specifically geared towards a community like Valdez,

1 Cordova, Nanwalek, Port Graham, Chenega, some kind of a local
2 based project, like a crab fishery or a salmon enhancement
3 project, something like that. There are others who see it as
4 strictly a set-aside for the tribes and not necessarily the
5 broader range of communities. There is a lot of support from
6 the Chugach Regional Resources Commission to see the community
7 set-aside as being basically endowing or helping to endow a
8 long-term natural resource program within the villages.

9 So there's -- even though there seems to be a lot of
10 support among communities for a community set-aside, there's
11 certainly no common vision on what that would constitute. But
12 a lot of it does seem to stem from still this concern that the
13 communities are somehow not able to compete fairly against
14 others who are more well financed to submit proposals. This is
15 an issue that the Council has always been concerned about and
16 has put a lot of effort in the last five to six years assisting
17 with this. That was one of the reasons for having the
18 community involvement project begin with having Hugh Short as
19 the Community Involvement Coordinator. There's a lot of
20 technical assistance being provided to the communities now but
21 there's still that concern among the communities.

22 We also were fortunate to have the presence of
23 Representative Therriault at the meeting and discussed with him
24 a little bit about his resolution supporting the Council's
25 action in March and also urging the Council in the future to

1 still consider the possibility of endowing some chairs at the
2 university.

3 And then as we get into the FY2000 proposed budget
4 there were five projects that the Public Advisory Group, even
5 though they didn't take formal action on them, did ask, did
6 feel that they needed additional attention. And we did go back
7 through those five projects and looked at them once again. And
8 those are listed in here and they're also listed on the summary
9 of public comment. And we can go through those in more detail
10 as we get to the Work Plan.

11 And I'd be happy to answer any questions about the PAG
12 meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you, Molly. Any
14 questions?

15 (No audible responses)

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay, we'll move on. Molly,
17 you want to give the Executive Director's report?

18 MS. McCAMMON: Okay, yes. First of all, you
19 should have on your desk in front of you a copy of the
20 quarterly project status summary as of June 30th, 1999. This
21 summarizes the status of project reports, it lists reports that
22 are significantly behind schedule and it also summarizes
23 project activities conducted during the April to June quarter
24 for all of those projects underway in fiscal year 1999. I
25 think the good news is that there continues to be a significant

1 amount of progress made on getting old reports completed,
2 finalized and available to the public.

3 There are a number of projects that still do not have
4 reports submitted. There have been -- as you know, we've
5 discussed with various agencies making commitments to get those
6 in the process and getting them reviewed and available to the
7 public. There are several that we have not been able to meet
8 the deadlines that were committed to by the agencies. And in
9 the next month or so we'll do an individual memo to each of
10 those agencies summarizing which projects are still behind
11 schedule and seeing if we can come to some resolution of these.
12 Some of them there have been commitments to get them done for
13 at least two to three years, we still haven't seen those
14 reports. Some of them for good reasons, others, we're not
15 really sure exactly why they haven't been forthcoming. But
16 overall the status of our reports is looking pretty good.

17 But if you have any questions at all after you read
18 though this and see where we are and the number of projects,
19 just give me a call or Sandra Schubert a call.

20 You also have in your packet a financial report as of
21 June 30th, 1999, and this has been formatted a little bit
22 differently, and we hope will provide sufficient information to
23 you as you think about the future use of these funds. But
24 currently in the liquidity account we have over 33 million. In
25 addition, we have some adjustments to it, funds in the United

1 States' account and the state of Alaska account, and then there
2 is also a certain amount that's owed to the Restoration Reserve
3 that hasn't been paid into it yet because we've been waiting to
4 see what happens with our legislation with Senator Murkowski.

5 The Restoration Reserve has currently in it an accrued
6 value of over 47 million, if it were also to have the amount of
7 funds owed to it from the liquidity account it would be over 82
8 million. So as of June 30, 1999, the total trust fund value
9 was over 87 million dollars.

10 And, again, if you have any questions about our
11 financial statements as of this date, you can either ask myself
12 or Traci Cramer.

13 In your packet you also should have a copy of S711 as
14 it passed out of committee, the Senate Energy Committee, on
15 June 30th, 1999. The committee report has just been filed,
16 there's been no further action on this piece of legislation.
17 The original intent, I believe, of the Senator was to add it as
18 a rider to one of the appropriations bills this year and get it
19 moving that way. There's been some new or maybe some old rules
20 that are now being reinforced, seriously restricting what kinds
21 of riders can be attached to appropriation bills, so that
22 appears not to be an avenue available this year, which means
23 this may have to go as stand-alone legislation.

24 The Senator's staff has briefed Congressman Young and
25 he's apparently supportive of the legislation. It did pass

1 unanimously out of committee, it has the support of the
2 administration now so, theoretically, once it goes it shouldn't
3 be controversial and it should be able to pass, but it hasn't
4 moved yet. It's still our goal to see this move by the end of
5 this session, so that we can see it implemented as soon as
6 possible.

7 MS. HEIMAN: Molly.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

9 MS. HEIMAN: This is Marilyn Heiman for those
10 of you who are on the line. Did you hear from Senator
11 Murkowski's office that they didn't think it was an avenue this
12 year or is that an assumption that's been made?

13 MS. McCAMMON: No, I heard from them.

14 MS. HEIMAN: They're not going to try to do it,
15 okay.

16 MS. McCAMMON: Yes. I've also talked to John
17 Katz' office and they're also meeting with Senator Stevens
18 office just to make sure that they're -- and Senator Stevens
19 office is aware of it, too, so -- and they're supportive of it
20 and they'll try to figure out a way if at all possible. So if
21 somehow things loosen up over time, but it doesn't appear to be
22 an avenue this year.

23 MS. HEIMAN: I just wanted to say what a good
24 job Molly did working through this issue for all of us and
25 getting Senator Murkowski's office to agree to something that

1 we could all agree to, I thought it was an excellent job and it
2 couldn't have gone smoother. I know you may not think of it
3 that way, but to us it went very smooth.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Well, I'm not going to crack
5 open a bottle of champagne until I see it passed and signed by
6 the President. It's still -- these things still have a long
7 way to go.

8 MS. HEIMAN: Good job though.

9 MS. McCAMMON: But we're further along than we
10 ever have been.

11 MS. HEIMAN: Yep.

12 MS. McCAMMON: And in anticipation of that when
13 we go through the admin budget there is some -- we did include
14 some funding in there, \$5,000, to contract with an investment
15 firm to review the Restoration Reserve financial assumptions
16 upon which the March 1 decision was made, to evaluate various
17 investment management options including developing a list of
18 potential investment managers, and then assisting with the
19 selection of the appropriate investment manager. What we'd
20 like to do is have everything underway so that if this bill
21 were to pass we could immediately implement it.

22 The legislation, as drafted, allows -- gives the
23 authority to the Council to take the funds out of the United
24 States Treasury and invest them, basically, elsewhere in a
25 prudent manner. And this could include a state of Alaska

1 account, it could include private investors, there's a whole
2 range of options there. It could include another Federal
3 account if there were one outside of the United States
4 Treasury. And so I have included some funds in the admin
5 budget to get some additional outside assistance in this
6 process.

7 I gave you the Public Advisory Group report.

8 The other thing I wanted to make note of were a number
9 of personnel changes with the Restoration Office. In the last
10 few months we've had several employees leave and move on to new
11 things, one of them is Jeff Lawrence, who was head of our
12 computer support program here. He is now gone to Portland and
13 is working there. Eric Myers left in April to take a mid-life
14 sabbatical, I think. And then, most recently, Stan Senner has
15 left and is now the new Alaska Executive Director of the Alaska
16 Audubon Society office.

17 As a result of these changes, Jeff's replacement for
18 computer support we are now doing that by contract. Eric's job
19 has been divided up among existing staff. Traci Cramer is
20 doing some of his job responsibilities, a lot of them have been
21 taken over by Sandra Schubert. Sandra's job has been
22 reclassified and she is now Director of Restoration. She is
23 the person in charge of the Anchorage office when I'm not here,
24 continues to be in charge of the Work Plan process and overall
25 project oversight and also will be much more closely involved

1 in the Habitat Program. So she will know pretty much what's
2 going on when I'm not around.

3 For Stan's replacement we went through a recruitment
4 process and we had some excellent candidates, I think a number
5 of you met with some of the candidates and we have made the
6 offer and it's been accepted and the new Science Coordinator in
7 another week or so will be Dr. Phil Mundy who is right here if
8 you haven't met him before. Phil started out in this state
9 years ago when I first met him as Chief Scientist for the
10 Alaska Department of Fish and Game in the early '80s and after
11 a few years there left for Oregon and has done a lot of work
12 for the last 10 years with the Pacific Northwest salmon issues.
13 He has also served as one of our lead peer reviewers working
14 for Dr. Spies, he is very familiar with our program, almost for
15 10 years now, and I think will be an excellent addition to the
16 staff here. He decided it was too rainy, I guess, in Oregon
17 and wanted to come up and get drier weather.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Good luck.

19 MS. McCAMMON: So Phil will be starting next
20 week and he already has full plate assisting Bob in the
21 development of the GEM Plan and implementing the future of the
22 Restoration Program.

23 We have two certificates also that Rebecca will be
24 sending around just in appreciation of the work that Eric Myers
25 and Stan Senner did. They have contributed greatly to where we

1 are today, I miss both of them a lot, not only just because of
2 their professional assistance, but also just being good
3 friends. Stan, I think, will be in a good position to help us
4 in the future working with a non-governmental organization. He
5 still plans to remain actively involved in our science planning
6 in the future and any habitat aspects. And, hopefully, Eric,
7 over time, if we need any help also maybe we can drag him back.
8 So as we pass these certificates around, if you could get those
9 signed, we'd like to get them out to them, too.

10 Okay. Next habitat protection. I want to bring you up
11 to date on a few items there. In your packet under habitat
12 there are two reports, these are updated reports on the Large
13 Parcel Program and on the Small Parcel Program.

14 The Large Parcel Program, we'll be talking in executive
15 session about the status of our discussions with Koniag on
16 long-term protection of the Karluk and Sturgeon Rivers. I've
17 also had some discussions with counsel for Eyak Corporation and
18 they will be submitting, very soon, their request of
19 reimbursement of up to \$100,000 in costs for their second proxy
20 vote. I've seen some initial paperwork and they're doing some
21 revisions and we should be getting that probably this week.
22 We're getting ready to do some additional closing for Eyak,
23 Shuyak and others, but overall the Large Parcel Program is
24 pretty much moving along, nearly completed. The last final
25 major negotiation is with Koniag.

1 I did, also, make a phone call to Pat Norman, Port
2 Graham Corporation, at the request of the National Park
3 Service, recently, in the last few weeks, just to see if they
4 were still not interested in reopening discussions and he
5 emphasized that their position had not changed. So that's it
6 for large parcel.

7 For small parcels there's also a memo attached at the
8 very front. And what I tried to do with small parcels is go
9 through and look at those that had been completed and those for
10 which the Council has made some kind of commitment, whether it
11 is a specific commitment to purchase, but for some reason it
12 hasn't happened yet, whether it was authorization to go forward
13 and do an appraisal and to try to get additional information on
14 why it hadn't moved yet, and also to look at those commitments
15 with -- for Tatitlek homesites and also for the Kodiak tax
16 parcels and find out the status of those. And this memo,
17 basically, summarizes where we are on all of those.

18 Our goal is to keep this in line with the commitments
19 made in the March 1 resolution, and that resolution on the
20 Restoration Reserve was based on certain commitments and
21 certain assumptions about what would be spent on small parcels
22 and on habitat protection between now and October of 2002. In
23 the meantime, we do have some additional interest in new small
24 parcels, we're getting submissions now, we anticipate more in
25 the next few weeks. And I was hoping at this meeting to get

1 some direction from the Trustee Council in terms of how to
2 respond to those new applications. There was no decision made
3 and no direction given in March. What I'm asking for today is
4 to get some kind of direction.

5 As we go through this, we can go item by item, and I've
6 made recommendations in terms of what kind of direction, I
7 think, might be appropriate for the Council to consider. And
8 we can go through these one by one. I should also note that if
9 you look at what's in the March 1 resolution, there were four
10 parcels in there that aren't mentioned in this memo because
11 there are no issues related to those. Two of those are a
12 parcel at the mouth of the Ayakulik River and a parcel at
13 Karluk River Lagoon. And both of those parcels have been
14 completed and are completely done. There is a parcel, Kenai
15 1052 with Salamatoff Corporation, the purchase agreement has
16 been signed, but there was an error discovered in the original
17 survey and it has to be resurveyed, so that is why that one
18 isn't completed, but it's not an issue that the Council itself
19 has to deal with at this point.

20 And then Prince William Sound 1056, the Blondeau
21 parcel, the land owner has agreed to the price, they're
22 reviewing the purchase agreement. The survey and plat of the
23 50 acres that would be conveyed by the City of Valdez to the
24 State is underway now. So that one is underway, it just hasn't
25 been completed yet.

1 The first on was one the Baycrest parcel, Kenai 12, for
2 \$500,000. This offer expired on December 15th, 1998. Since
3 that time the land owner has sold off a portion of the parcel
4 and so it has been reconfigured, it's also been renominated by
5 the land owner and it's currently under review by the habitat
6 working group. My recommendation on this is to go ahead and
7 evaluate the reconfigured parcel, but at this point view it as
8 a lesser priority and perhaps consider it if other more
9 important parcels don't move forward but, in essence, to put it
10 on the back burner.

11 MS. HEIMAN: Molly.

12 MS. McCAMMON: This is a parcel that we had
13 before the Council for, at least, the last four years. Every
14 time we get close to reaching agreement, the landowner decides
15 maybe he could get a better price elsewhere and he pulls and
16 sells a little piece of it and then comes back and we've been
17 going through this for, at least, four years now.

18 Yeah, Marilyn.

19 MS. HEIMAN: So this isn't the first time he's
20 sold off a portion of this parcel?

21 MS. McCAMMON: No.

22 MS. HEIMAN: And with this most recent sale,
23 does it change the value, you know?

24 MS. McCAMMON: The habitat value.....

25 MS. HEIMAN: Yes.

1 MS. McCAMMON:or the purchase?

2 MS. HEIMAN: The habitat value.

3 MS. McCAMMON: The part that he sold off is the
4 part that's -- the value of this is that it's not immediately
5 adjacent to the Overlook Park parcel, but very close to it, and
6 it also has road access that you could use as a trail down to
7 the beach. And the part that he sold is the furthest removed
8 from that portion of it, so the habitat value is still -- and
9 the recreation value is still pretty strong.

10 Would you.....

11 MS. FRIES: (Nods in the affirmative)

12 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. KAP 145, Termination
13 Point. The Council made an offer on this last June, June 15th,
14 1999 [sic]. That offer was rejected by the landowner last
15 September and the offer terminated on June 15th. The appraisal
16 is at the landowner's request, the appraisal is currently being
17 updated. There still is a title issue that, before any final
18 land transfer could occur, would still have to be resolved.
19 And my recommendation on this -- this is probably the small
20 parcel that's received the most public comment of almost any
21 small parcel that's been in the process. It's at the end of
22 the road outside of Kodiak, it has strong support from the
23 Kodiak Borough and from the community of Kodiak. My
24 recommendation is to renew the current offer, continue to
25 update the appraisal and give the landowner the opportunity to

1 accept until January 15th, 2000 and if no agreement at that
2 time, let the offer expire. I think this is one of those
3 parcels that if it ever came to the point where we could agree
4 on a price and if the title issue was resolved, it is of such
5 high priority it would come to the attention of the Council and
6 the Council would want to take action, but at some point it's
7 not worth tying up two million dollars in anticipation of
8 something that may not occur.

9 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

11 MR. TILLERY: What are we -- we're going
12 through these, are we supposed to be giving guidance, we
13 voting? I'm not sure what's being asked of the Council on
14 these recommendations.

15 MS. McCAMMON: Some would take specific
16 motions, for example, renewing the current offer would take a
17 specific motion by the Council. Others, if you just want to
18 give me kind of generic guidance or do it by way of a motion,
19 it's up to you.

20 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chair, are we going to do
21 these as they come through individually or is this something we
22 want to wait until the end and go back through them? I'm just
23 not sure what the better.....

24 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: What's the wishes of the
25 Council?

1 MS. HEIMAN: I'd rather just do them as we go
2 through them, it's probably faster.

3 MR. BOSWORTH: I agree,

4 MR. WRIGHT: Individually, I think, would be
5 better.

6 MS. HEIMAN: Is that okay with you, Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Uh-huh (Affirmative).

8 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, in that vein, I
9 would say that with respect to the first one, I concur that
10 this needs to be viewed as a lesser priority. Regardless of
11 the habitat value I don't believe this parcel is worth
12 investing a whole lot more effort into because we've been
13 through this so many times, or at least twice, in the past.
14 And I just don't think it's something that's very likely to get
15 to a successful conclusion.

16 With respect to the second one, I support the concept
17 of renewing the current offer, but I do believe the deadline is
18 appropriate. I think the January 15th, 2000 deadline is an
19 appropriate one and I would move that the Council does renew
20 this offer to terminate on January 15th, 2000. The offer be
21 renewed at the appraised value, subject to further appraisal if
22 one should be done.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. Do I hear a second?

24 MS. SEE: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Second. It's been moved and

1 seconded, any discussion?

2 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Molly, how much does it cost us,
5 or does it cost us, to update the appraisal and to continue
6 this type of exercise?

7 MS. McCAMMON: That appraisal is being done by
8 the Department of Natural Resources and at what cost to update
9 the appraisal?

10 MS. FRIES: I don't know.

11 MS. McCAMMON: I don't know, we're using
12 current year funds to do that. The main -- well, there are two
13 elements to it, one is the commercial timber value, which I
14 anticipate is not going to go up, in all likelihood it's going
15 to go down.

16 MR. WRIGHT: I see.

17 MS. McCAMMON: And then taking that information
18 and putting it into the full blown appraisal, so there will be
19 a little bit of a cost, usually it's not that much to do it.

20 MR. WRIGHT: To update an appraisal?

21 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

22 MR. WRIGHT: A couple of thousand dollars?

23 MS. McCAMMON: Maybe 5,000, I don't know. Five
24 thousand?

25 MR. SWIDERSKI: Between five and 10.

1 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any other questions?

4 (No audible responses)

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Well, it's been moved and
6 seconded, all in favor?

7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Against?

9 (No opposing responses)

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Passed.

11 MS. McCAMMON: The next one is just an
12 informational item. In the March 1 resolution there was a
13 certain amount of money set aside for KAP 95, 126 and 134,
14 these are parcels on Sitkalidak Strait and Three Saints Bay.
15 It turned out, for various reasons, I guess, because the
16 Department of Interior are really tough negotiators, that the
17 actual cost turned out to be \$228,300 and this left \$35,700
18 that was not used for those three parcels. My recommendation
19 is that these be used to fund Kenai 1084, the Morris parcel,
20 which was approved by the Council for appraisal and was
21 inadvertently left off the March 1 resolution. And we can
22 actually get to that later on in the memo.

23 Number 2, there were funds identified in the March 1
24 resolution, but the Council hasn't made an offer, although the
25 Council has authorized appraisal and negotiation, and this is

1 for the Valdez Duck Flats/Jack Bay package. We have a million
2 dollars earmarked for this suite of parcels. There's only one
3 parcel in here, US 349, that is privately owned, the other
4 three parcels are owned by the University of Alaska. The
5 parcels owned by the University of Alaska, the university has
6 not accepted the appraisal as done by the Forest Service and
7 reviewed and approved by the State. They're currently
8 conducting their own appraisal for comparative purposes, which
9 is expected in mid-August.

10 The big issue on the appraisal of the university
11 parcels is that when the land was transferred to the university
12 it was transferred with a public easement along the shoreline,
13 and when that is factored into the appraisal it affects the
14 appraised value of those lands. And so there is -- the
15 university has not accepted their appraised value. And I'm not
16 sure a new appraisal, how they're going to address that, but
17 even if there is a new appraisal it still has to be reviewed
18 and approved by the Federal and State review appraisers.

19 But there is -- so the recommendation is if there's no
20 agreement with the university by January 15th, 2000, to take
21 these parcels off the list of consideration. These have been
22 on the list now for well over three years and there's been no
23 movement on them. I did recommend, also, that US 349, the
24 privately owned one, be evaluated as a single purchase for the
25 Forest Service to use in conjunction with its visitor facility

1 in Valdez. And this morning I was informed by the Forest
2 Service that they have actually talked to the landowner once
3 again, there is apparently the possibility of an actual counter
4 offer on that piece of property and they would like to bring
5 that forward for your consideration today.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you, Ms. -- yes, I'd
7 like to -- can we bring that up a little later, but I'd like to
8 bring up 349 for a motion to acquire.

9 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Moving on to Kenai 1086.
10 Stariski Creek, this is one that was being considered,
11 possibly, in lieu of Baycrest. The appraisal isn't quite
12 finalized, it's still being reviewed and considered. And the
13 recommendation is if an agreement is reached on the appraisal
14 and the price that the funds that were earmarked for the
15 Baycrest parcel be used for acquisition of this parcel. And
16 the recommendation is to set a day by which, if no agreement is
17 reached the parcel will be taken off the list for
18 consideration. I had originally suggested January 15th of
19 2000, just to be consistent with the other parcels. The State
20 has wanted to think about it some more before they thought
21 whether that date was appropriate. This is one that still is
22 rather new and, as most of you familiar with the process know,
23 it often takes just some time for things to work their way
24 through. But by the next -- I would say by December I should
25 be able to have a more firm date for you on that.

1 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

3 MR. TILLERY: Yeah. In the normal process of
4 things we would get the appraisal and then it would come before
5 the Council and we would approve an offer with an expiration
6 date?

7 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

8 MR. TILLERY: Are you suggesting something
9 different than that process in terms of having commencing on a
10 termination date?

11 MS. McCAMMON: Well, in the normal range of the
12 process, you get the appraisal, it's given to the landowner for
13 their review before it's finalized and if there's any
14 additional information that can be brought forward and that's
15 where we are in this process. So if we were to -- once the
16 appraisal is finalized it would come back to you.

17 MR. TILLERY: Okay. But in terms of a sort of
18 a date, a final date, that's just the termination date of the
19 offer; is that correct?

20 MS. McCAMMON: Well, I think it would also be
21 if it looked like there was no possibility -- if the difference
22 of value were so great that it looked like there was no
23 possibility of going forward with it, it would also be just
24 taking it off of consideration at this time, too.

25 MR. TILLERY: I guess my own view is when we

1 set a termination date or, say, an expiration date of offer,
2 that does take it off the consideration list and we may,
3 because of some factors, like Termination Point, that has a
4 title issue in it, renew that offer, but that, frankly, is
5 done.

6 MS. McCAMMON: The only difference,
7 Mr. Chairman, is that within this suite of commitments on the
8 small parcels there is \$500,000 set aside for Baycrest/Stariski
9 Creek. And if Stariski Creek, if the Council hasn't made an
10 offer, but it's not going forward for whatever reason, it seems
11 appropriate at some time to take it off the list of
12 consideration and not to have it there for the next three years
13 if it has no chance of moving forward for whatever reason, even
14 short of an offer.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Ms. McCammon, do we have any
16 idea when the appraisal is going to be ready? It says it's not
17 yet available.

18 MS. McCAMMON: I would say sometime in the next
19 month, two months. Probably two months.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: If I could follow up on
21 that.

22 MS. McCAMMON: The appraisal is being done by
23 the Conservation Fund, it's not being done by the State.

24 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I understand, like
25 Mr. Tillery does, that after the appraisal is approved, you got

1 a year from that time that it's valid.

2 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct, the offer is
3 good for that year.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Right.

5 MS. McCAMMON: But if we don't get to a final
6 approved appraisal and it looks like, for whatever reason, it's
7 not being pursued actively, then the Council -- I would come
8 back to the Council and ask for it to be taken off the list.

9 Number 3, as I've mentioned earlier in the March 1
10 resolution, the Kenai 1084, the Morris parcel on the Ninilchik
11 River was inadvertently left off. And my recommendation is to
12 use the \$35,700 in unspent funds from the Sitkalidak
13 Strait/Three Saints Bay for this acquisition, plus an
14 additional -- and here there's a map error, it's \$2,300 from
15 the Kodiak tax parcel fund, since this is the largest
16 relatively unearmarked amount of money for small parcels.

17 And you do have before you a copy of a map of the
18 parcel and also a copy of the habitat benefits analysis. And
19 the parcel actually extends across both banks of the Ninilchik
20 River for a distance of several hundred yards. It provides key
21 habitat for king salmon and Dolly Varden, it also -- the
22 Ninilchik has a lot of value for recreation. According to the
23 Alaska Sportfishing Association this section of the river
24 provides some of the best steelhead fishing to be found in the
25 Ninilchik River drainage. Other fish species using this

1 section of the river for spawning or rearing include chinook
2 and coho salmon. There's also brown bear, black bear, moose
3 ranging along this river corridor and can be found in the
4 upland portions of the parcel as well.

5 The property is accessed by Brodie Road, much of the
6 land and the river drainage is privately owned and has
7 experienced increased levels of timber harvest in recent years.
8 There's also been a lot of development of homesites and
9 recreational parcels. So protecting this stretch of the river
10 become increasingly important as that development occurs. The
11 property is completely undeveloped and provides access to the
12 river along a section line easement. If acquired, it would be
13 managed primarily for habitat protection with the possibility
14 of a small trail to facilitate enhanced recreation access. And
15 so this parcel is before you for your consideration.

16 MR. BOSWORTH: Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes.

18 MR. BOSWORTH: I move that we accept the
19 nomination that the 35.7 plus 2,300 be used to purchase the
20 property.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. Any second?

22 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any discussion?

24 Mr. Tillery.

25 MR. TILLERY: Yeah. Do we have a prepared

1 resolution on this?

2 MS. McCAMMON: We do have a prepared resolution
3 on this.

4 MR. TILLERY: I don't have a question. This
5 map, the way it looks to me, it looks like it indicates two
6 parcels, but the text only references one 40-acre parcel, what
7 is that sort of.....

8 MS. FRIES: It's bisected by the river.

9 MR. TILLERY: Well, yeah, the river bisects it
10 vertically and this red line is horizontal. I'm just not sure
11 what that.....

12 MR. SWIDERSKI: Can I see that?

13 (Pause - researching documents)

14 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: For you on the line, we're
15 researching the map on Kenai 1084, it appears from the map
16 there's two pieces of land, we're just trying to figure out the
17 accuracy of the map.

18 MR. SWIDERSKI: From this map it looks like
19 it's both pieces and I don't know why the line would be between
20 them. It's a 40-acre parcel.

21 MR. TILLERY: Okay, but it is.....

22 MS. McCAMMON: The map that he has is the exact
23 outline.

24 MR. TILLERY: Okay, and it is both then? It's
25 the.....

1 MR. SWIDERSKI: I think it's both. Also this
2 road, which is unmarked Brodie Road, does touch part of that
3 parcel. I have one other comment, too.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Swiderski, come up to
5 the mike, please.

6 MR. SWIDERSKI: I'm Alex Swiderski from the
7 Attorney General's Office, I've had several discussions with
8 Dorothy Morris who owns the parcel who is a retired woman in
9 her mid-60s. She has asked that I relay a request to the
10 Council that the Council authorize a purchase at \$40,000. I
11 told her that the Council never pays more than the appraised
12 value of 38,000, and she's willing to accept \$38,000, but asked
13 that I relay the request. And the resolution before you is for
14 38,000, but that's all I have.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you, Mr. Swiderski.
16 Any other discussion? Mr. Tillery.

17 MR. TILLERY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the resolution
18 does not go into sort of the funding aspects of this. And, I
19 guess, I think it's important that -- we're essentially
20 amending a prior resolution to take \$35,700 from the Sitkalidak
21 Strait and to take \$2,300 from the Kodiak tax parcel amount and
22 I think it's important that those be part of Council action, if
23 not necessarily this resolution. Is that part of the motion,
24 Mr. Bosworth?

25 MR. BOSWORTH: Let's make it part of the

1 motion, yes.

2 MS. HEIMAN: I just have a comment on that,
3 though, if we're going to make it part of the motion. And this
4 goes back to a conversation I had with Molly and Glenn. That
5 the amount of money that comes out of one parcel and is up for
6 grabs to use in another is -- or not the amount, but that be
7 sort of our approach to dealing with these monies. So, in this
8 case, we gave Federal monies, if you want to see it that way,
9 to the general pot, they were less than what we needed, but
10 that in the future that all of these parcels where there is
11 money left over that it will come back to the general -- the
12 Trustee Council to review, rather than it being seen as
13 somebody's pot of money. I guess that was my point. So I want
14 to make sure that there is no meaning in your making that point
15 that it be put in here that the money is definitely coming from
16 there.

17 (Ms. Michele Brown arrives)

18 MR. TILLERY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess my
19 point is that this is -- this essentially amends the resolution
20 that provided that additional 35,700, for example, and so that
21 money would no longer be available for that project, which is
22 fine, because it's not needed.

23 MS. HEIMAN: Right.

24 MR. TILLERY: But I certainly concur with, I
25 believe, your point, which is that these monies that aren't

1 going to be used for one land acquisition should be used for
2 the best land acquisition not a particular government's wish
3 list.

4 MS. HEIMAN: Right. I just want to make sure
5 we're clear on that.

6 MR. TILLERY: So as I understand, the motion
7 then is amended to adopt the resolution and provide that the
8 38,000 would be paid for and that 35,700 in unspent funds from
9 Sitkalidak Strait and Three Saints Bay that would be amended to
10 eliminate that money and this money would come from those funds
11 and that \$2,300 would be reduced from the Kodiak tax parcel
12 amount and that would also be used to make up this 38,000. Is
13 that what I understand the.....

14 MR. BOSWORTH: That would be the amended
15 motion.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. We have an amended
17 motion on.....

18 MR. TILLERY: Second the amended motion.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any further discussion?

20 (No audible responses)

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I'd like to go on record to
22 say that Michele Brown is now here from the Department of
23 Environmental Conservation, welcome, Michele.

24 All in favor of the amended motion say aye.

25 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Opposed?

2 (No opposing responses)

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Motion carried.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Okay, the next item, number 4.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Ms. McCammon, if I
6 could.....

7 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: So we'll get an amended
9 resolution?

10 MS. McCAMMON: Does the resolution need
11 amending or just because it's in the motion is the.....

12 MR. TILLERY: The motion was to adopt the
13 resolution and then have the following caveats, so I don't
14 believe the resolution would need to be changed.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

16 MS. McCAMMON: As long as it's clear in the
17 motion?

18 MR. TILLERY: As long as it's clear in the
19 record.

20 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Okay, number 4, the March
21 1 resolution also identifies funds for the Kodiak tax parcels
22 and Larsen Bay shareholders' parcels. If you'll recall in
23 December of 1995 the Council agreed to provide up to a million
24 dollars for lands held by the Kodiak Island Borough that were
25 forfeited for tax delinquency and are in the Kodiak National

1 Wildlife Refuge. In June of 1999, the Council authorized the
2 use of \$645,000 within that million dollar fund for 42 small
3 parcels in Uyak Bay owned by Larsen Bay shareholders, leaving
4 the balance, 355,000 for tax parcels.

5 To date there have been purchase agreements signed, the
6 offer is under review for eight parcels, the Kodiak tax parcels
7 and four parcels from the Larsen Bay shareholder parcels.
8 We've also been given a list of two additional tax parcels and
9 24 additional shareholder parcels on which offers have been
10 made, but nothing further has happened on these. And the issue
11 with these funds is whether there's enough potential parcels to
12 warrant the entire amount of this commitment, of this
13 set-aside. The recommendation is to have Fish and Wildlife
14 Service provide a list identifying potential parcels by January
15 15th of 2000 and give some better indication on whether there
16 are enough potential parcels to warrant this fund.

17 MS. HEIMAN: I have no objection. Anyone else?

18 MR. TILLERY: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I agree that
19 we do need a date, I was actually looking to make sure that
20 Fish and Wildlife Service is comfortable with that date, it
21 sounds like they are.

22 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. No problem with the
23 January date?

24 MR. TILLERY: I don't believe we would need any
25 action, though, on this one.

1 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. The next item is a fund
2 that was identified for Tatitlek homesites. This was part of
3 the Tatitlek acquisition that authorized protection of lands
4 around Irish Cove, and committed Tatitlek and the Trustee
5 Council to pursuing acquisition of homesites lots in the Two
6 Moon Bay and Snug Corner Cove Subdivisions. The resolution
7 authorized expenditure of an amount of funds not to exceed the
8 amount previously authorized that were no longer needed for the
9 Tatitlek acquisition. This ended up being a total of \$205,600.
10 The Forest Service is currently in the process or has awarded a
11 contract to do these appraisals, they're using current year
12 funds to do the appraisals. There are 164 parcels and all but
13 20 are potentially for sale. The priority would be with
14 parcels adjacent to other purchased land and in blocks of six
15 or more.

16 The recommendation is to continue to monitor progress.
17 I don't have a deadline here, however, there was a question
18 raised earlier whether the deadline was October 1 of 2002 or
19 whether there was any deadline on this in order to move
20 forward. And at some point we probably should have some
21 deadline to this, but.....

22 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Ms. McCammon, I think we'll
23 have a better feel for that after we get the appraisals done.
24 We just awarded that and the shareholders have shown an
25 interest in selling and so it would be a matter of matching

1 those blocks up to the most convenient, you know,
2 configuration. So maybe at the next Trustee Council meeting we
3 can come back and give you more information on that.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. And finally number 6.
5 We've still been operating under what we have called the soft
6 moratorium. Small parcel nominations are not being actively
7 solicited, however, either through the general public or
8 through various land managing agencies certain parcels of
9 interest have been coming to our attention, a number of them
10 have been submitted through our process, formally nominated.
11 These include the reconfigured Baycrest, KAP 1256, the Erickson
12 parcel, the Hague parcel on Chinitna Bay. We also expect --
13 have been told that some additional parcels on the Ayakulik,
14 Sturgeon and Karluk Rivers are anticipated to be nominated. If
15 the land exchange between the State and Old Harbor moves
16 forward there are a number of in-holdings in that land exchange
17 that would be of great interest to the State. There's no
18 question that, over the next three years, additional parcels
19 will come to our attention that would be of strong interest
20 through the Habitat Protection Program.

21 What I would like is to get specific guidance from the
22 Council today on how to treat these new parcels nominations.
23 And what I am recommending is that we continue to accept and
24 review nominations and as these come forward, take them to you
25 for possible consideration as needed. Any additional financial

1 commitments would initially be in lieu of something currently
2 on the list for small parcels as attached to the March 1
3 resolution. If there was no funding available at that time
4 then it would be up to the Council to consider whether to go
5 ahead and use some of the 55 million dollars to be set aside
6 for habitat as of October 1, 2002.

7 Just a caveat with that is, based on the assumptions in
8 the March resolution, all of the interest that's generated by
9 these funds right now basically goes into the research fund.
10 So if there were to be any -- and we've talked about this, for
11 example, with the Koniag acquisition, if there were to be any
12 need for those funds prior to 2002, then we would also have to
13 take out of that fund the interest that would have been earned
14 by those funds over the next three years or two years or
15 whatever that time period is and account for that to the
16 research fund. But the goal would be to first use the existing
17 commitments that are there in the resolution for small parcels.

18 And I would appreciate this in the form of a motion,
19 just so I'm clear on my guidance.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Bosworth.

21 MR. BOSWORTH: Well, maybe we can do the motion
22 first and then discuss that, I have a question.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

24 MR. BOSWORTH: So I would move to accept the
25 recommendation.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is there a second?

2 MS. BROWN: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. It's been moved and
4 seconded. Is there any discussion?

5 MR. BOSWORTH: My question is what it means
6 that you would bring them to the Trustee Council, as needed;
7 what would compel you to bring a particular parcel forward?
8 Are there criteria that you routinely use for that purpose?

9 MS. McCAMMON: Typically, in the past, if a
10 parcel goes through the evaluation process and was either ranked
11 high or moderate, it automatically went forward for appraisal
12 and Council consideration. Because of the soft moratorium,
13 everything comes back to the Council for approval on going
14 forward for an appraisal or not. And so I would say "as
15 needed" would be, for example, they have to pass threshold
16 criteria. And the threshold criteria are they have to in
17 the spill region, they have to have a land management agency
18 willing to take on the management of those parcels, and that
19 often is in some of these because they're in a location that it
20 doesn't make sense for either a State or Federal agency to take
21 over management or there's no local government who's willing to
22 manage them. And then, thirdly, they have to have some kind of
23 restoration value, they have to have either value for the
24 particular resources injured by the spill or recreational
25 services or something of that nature. So if they didn't pass

1 that threshold criteria they would not come before you for
2 approval to go forward for an appraisal. But if they did pass
3 that criteria they would come to you.

4 MR. BOSWORTH: And you have the capability of
5 reviewing these as part of your existing program, existing
6 staff?

7 MS. McCAMMON: Yes. Although this does raise
8 another question or another issue, actually, which is on the
9 entire small parcel nomination and review process. When this
10 was developed in 1994 the Council, at that time, did a major
11 solicitation process and received over, I don't know, three or
12 400 parcels. And a lot of the whole process for evaluating
13 them was done in order to compare those parcels within that
14 suite. And since we're just getting them in now, several at a
15 time, and they basically are coming to -- for the most part
16 coming to the Council's attention because there's something a
17 management agency really knows of and is very interested in or
18 because there's a lot of public interest in it or something of
19 that nature.

20 I think it's time for us to look at the whole
21 nomination and evaluation process and possibly consider a new
22 approach. And what I would like to do is, this fall, have
23 staff look at that, talk to the various agencies involved in
24 this process and possibly come back with a recommendation to
25 change that process. And that might be something if we do have

1 a work session in October on the Gulf Ecosystem Monitoring Plan
2 that we also consider the small parcel process at that time.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

4 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, just to make
5 sure I understand, the motion is to allow us to continue to
6 accept and review the small parcel nominations and they can be
7 brought to the Council, which I support because I think it's --
8 stuff does come on line, you get stuff that comes in that
9 wasn't available before. Secondly, I'm pretty convinced that
10 there is going to be some kind of a small parcel program after
11 2001, and to the extent that we received and evaluated
12 nominations that would be a head start on that program. What
13 I'm not sure about is this last sentence, which I assume is
14 part of the motion, any additional commitments would have to be
15 in lieu of something currently in the March 1 resolution. Are
16 we saying that -- when you use the word "initially" it
17 basically seems to be a meaningless sentence. I'm not sure if
18 we want to make that meaningful by saying, it would have to be
19 and then requiring the Council to change it by unanimous vote
20 or -- but, again, the Council can always do that, so I'm not
21 sure why that last sentence is in there.

22 MR. BOSWORTH: As far as I'm concerned the
23 motion speaks primarily to the clear recommendation in the
24 first two sentence.

25 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

1 MR. BOSWORTH: So I'll, with the concurrence of
2 the second, delete the third sentence from my motion.

3 MR. TILLERY: I would note, by the way, that I
4 concur with that thought in the third sentence, I just don't
5 think it's necessary for the motion.

6 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Ms. Brown.

8 MS. BROWN: And I would concur with changing
9 that, I just wanted to -- if you just have the first two
10 sentences, does that give you enough of a direction that you
11 feel you need or is there some other point in that last
12 sentence that you need clarification on?

13 MS. McCAMMON: I think it's fine. I mean when
14 things come forward it's up to the Council to decide where the
15 funds are coming from.

16 MS. BROWN: Right.

17 MS. McCAMMON: I mean we know, pretty much,
18 everyone's agreed on what the options are in terms of
19 additional funds for the habitat program.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah, another question, does
21 this motion also include Molly's comments about coming back in
22 the fall with a new look at how we're going to accept small
23 parcels and review that process?

24 MR. BOSWORTH: With the concurrence of the
25 second I would include that in the motion.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay?

2 MS. BROWN: (Nods affirmatively)

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: The motion's been amended
4 and seconded, all in favor say aye.

5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Opposed?

7 (No opposing responses)

8 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: It passed.

9 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, that concludes the
10 section on habitat protection, other than US 349 and I don't
11 know when you wanted to take that up.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: If I can I'd like to bring
13 that up now.

14 Going back to item number 2, the Valdez Duck Flats and
15 Jack Bay parcels. I would like to move that the Trustee
16 Council authorize the purchasing of Valdez Duck Flat parcel
17 US 349, it's 20.5 acres in size, the appraised value is
18 \$120,000 and the current landowner, the Galena Nicholi Holding
19 Company has accepted that. This has been on the Trustee
20 Council radar since 1996, it's a very valuable piece,
21 Mr. Holbrook can come up and perhaps tell you a little bit
22 about the restoration values of it, but it's been here and I
23 think it's a very valuable piece of property with links to the
24 injured resources.

25 Ken, can you.....

1 MR. HOLBROOK: Sure. Mr. Chairman, as you can
2 see, I put together a short maps report on the parcel, it has
3 been of interest to the Trustees for quite a few years,
4 including sponsoring a Trustees approved Project 97230,
5 Conceptual Plan for the Valdez Duck Flats which was completed
6 by Dames and Moore under contract to the Valdez Economical
7 Development Corporation. This parcel is integral within that
8 plan. And I have the final report here if anybody wants to
9 look at that. The parcel would be appropriate, there's five
10 and a half acres of uplands, most of the area is title
11 wetlands, but there's about five and a half acres that could be
12 used for a visitor center and the State and the Forest Service
13 have had interest in this.

14 Any questions specific to the parcel or.....

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: You might, perhaps, discuss
16 the resource links.

17 MR. HOLBROOK: Well, it's title wetlands and
18 salt marsh, has use by virtually any and all of the resources
19 that use the wetlands on the duck flats, anadromous fish, birds
20 of many species. And as we know, title wetlands, especially
21 salt marshes are quite important to Prince William Sound, it's
22 a very limited resource.

23 MS. HEIMAN: And I understood you said
24 something about a visitor facility, but this is just to protect
25 the lands, not to build anything on it?

1 MR. HOLBROOK: There's a possibility that
2 something might be built on it. There has been a proposal to
3 the Valdez City Council to fill most of this parcel for an RV
4 park. The plan that we had developed for the Trustees actually
5 recommended that some facility, small facility be built on this
6 parcel.

7 MS. HEIMAN: So it would be up to the Forest
8 Service, it would be.....

9 MR. TILLERY: Well, we're going to get to that.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

11 MS. HEIMAN: We are? Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any other questions?

13 MR. BOSWORTH: Ken, on the aerial photo, what
14 are the buildings that are just.....

15 MR. HOLBROOK: That's the DOT yard.

16 MS. HEIMAN: Of course.

17 MR. HOLBROOK: And they have built considerable
18 amounts of wetlands there.

19 MR. BOSWORTH: Is the wetland and marsh area
20 considered pristine at this point or is it -- it's not
21 contaminated?

22 MR. HOLBROOK: What remains of this parcel, the
23 majority of the parcel was condemned by the State for the
24 highway and the DOT lot.

25 MR. BOSWORTH: But I mean it's not a

1 contaminated area or anything?

2 MR. HOLBROOK: No, it's not, not that we're
3 aware of and I will finish a final inspection on it once we get
4 a contract, but I'm not aware of any problems and I have done
5 research and been on the site.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: The only thing that I'm
7 aware of, on the upper part of the aerial photograph there's a
8 sewer line that runs through the -- just up by the top of the
9 little wedge, and that's the only thing that I'm aware of.

10 MR. HOLBROOK: Yeah, there is a State easement
11 for a sewer and telephone line on the north end of the parcel.

12 MR. WRIGHT: So is there a sewer outfall?

13 MR. HOLBROOK: No, it's a line that runs to the
14 treatment plant.

15 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, okay. The land manager, if we
16 purchase this property would be.....

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Would be the Forest Service.

18 MR. WRIGHT:would be the Forest Service.

19 And, Dave, do you think the Forest Service is interested in
20 building a visitor facility?

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: No, the only -- the thing
22 that we're interested in on the Project 97230 there was a plan
23 set up for the duck flats area that had a boardwalk and we have
24 an existing small facility just above the Y in the road there,
25 it's a little pull off area there, we have an existing small

1 facility there and the plan, as I understand it from the
2 Project 97230 was to connect -- there's an existing boardwalk
3 down by Valdez, connect the boardwalk into that small facility
4 there.

5 Mr. Tillery.

6 MR. TILLERY: The draft resolution is unusual,
7 to say the least. Can I inquire if it's been reviewed by
8 counsel for the Forest Service?

9 MS. McCAMMON: It has not.

10 MR. TILLERY: It, among other things, contains
11 no provision for an easement to the State of Alaska, there's no
12 direction to the attorneys to go get the money, there's no
13 reference to a hazmat survey, title approval or anything else,
14 it's -- it seems to have some issues in it.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah, Mr. Tillery, that's
16 why I'm just having a motion now and the resolution will follow
17 because we need to do some work with the resolution as it
18 stands.

19 MR. TILLERY: I guess what concerns me is I
20 would think the -- well, one of the things the resolution would
21 address and particularly an easement would address would be
22 what kind of things could be built on a parcel like this and so
23 forth, and I'm not sure how a motion could be worded that would
24 deal with that at this time. I guess what I'm saying is it
25 looks a little premature to me, although I'm certainly not

1 against the parcel itself, but I'm not sure that the parameter
2 has been established for it.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Well, what we can do is we
4 can go back and look at some of the similar State resolutions
5 on some of the similar type parcels where there are perhaps
6 some encountered developments, you know, proposed and we'll use
7 that as a guide and come back.

8 MS. HEIMAN: Mr. Chair, can we, in concept,
9 approve the sale and then have the Council agree to the
10 specifics of -- or you don't think we can do that without
11 having all the details in front of us?

12 MR. TILLERY: I guess I'm not sure how you
13 would do it. I mean, I'm not against the concept of having a
14 structure on it, I think a lot of times that would tend to
15 enhance it, the kind of stuff you described, but I just think
16 it ought to be spelled out before we approve it. And I
17 certainly would be willing to indicate my preliminary view that
18 this seems to be an appropriate parcel at this price, but I
19 guess I would like to see the details of it before approving
20 it.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. So in concept the
22 Trustee Council supports the idea, you just need the ideas, you
23 know, fleshed out a little bit more; is that what I'm.....

24 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh (Affirmative).

25 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, is there a time

1 issue on this why this wouldn't wait?

2 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: There is. There's a
3 possible development that could occur on this site. If you've
4 been to Valdez you'll see the little trailer park that's just
5 down the road on part of 447 and the individual has approached
6 for developing the same type of facility here.

7 MS. HEIMAN: Can we.....

8 MR. TILLERY: I've seen the development and I
9 approve of what we're trying to do.

10 MS. HEIMAN: Being new to this process, I'll
11 just propose something and see if it will work. Can we just
12 approve the concept of this, but it will not go forward until
13 we each sign it and then -- but we wouldn't have to come back
14 for another meeting to sign it.

15 MR. TILLERY: Well, we're going to have to
16 approve it ultimately anyway, whatever comes through, but we've
17 done this a number of times where we simply had a telephonic
18 conference. We'll not adjourn the meeting, we'll recess it and
19 then we can just pick it up on fairly short notice if
20 that's.....

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Right.

22 MS. HEIMAN: Okay. If we can get the attorneys
23 to work on this quickly, that would be great.

24 MR. TILLERY: And Mr. Swiderski would have time
25 from the State's perspective to.....

1 MR. SWIDERSKI: I do actually have an
2 electronic copy of the motion, I (indiscernible - away from
3 microphone) with me, so maybe we can work on it today.

4 MS. HEIMAN: Is it possible we can do it by the
5 end of the day?

6 MR. SWIDERSKI: It's possible.

7 MS. LISKOWSKI: As long as you're being clear
8 as far as what is being proposed as far as any facility that
9 you want built on it. (Indiscernible - away from microphone).

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is that reasonable? Bring
11 this up later in the day?

12 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, we also need to
13 clarify what it's being called because I think -- I don't have
14 a copy of it, but I think it's referred to as Prince William
15 Sound 1028, I thought it was Prince William Sound 05 and -- or
16 06 and we got to clarify where it is.

17 MR. HOLBROOK: It actually 1028, 05 is for
18 (indiscernible - away from microphone)

19 MS. McCAMMON: Well, it needs to be clarified.
20 Something is wrong then, our small parcel report, something's
21 wrong somewhere, so.....

22 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any other questions?

23 (No audible responses)

24 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Ms. McCammon, are you going
25 to continue on with research monitoring and general restoration

1 discussion?

2 MS. McCAMMON: I can either do that or we can
3 take a break.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Why don't we take a
5 10-minute break, yeah.

6 (Off record - 11:03 a.m.)

7 (On record - 11:18 a.m.)

8 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Trustee Council is back, so
9 I'd like to call the Council back to order. But before we get
10 on with some more presentations, I'd like to introduce a
11 special guest, to me anyway, my new boss, Rick Cables, the new
12 Regional Forester for the Alaska Region and he's here observing
13 the meeting and will probably give me some feedback.

14 MS. HEIMAN: Welcome.

15 MR. CABLES: Thank you.

16 MS. BROWN: Welcome to Alaska.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Molly.

18 MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm
19 going to finish up my section on briefing before we get into
20 consideration of the FY2000 Work Plan.

21 The first item I wanted to call to your attention is in
22 your packet, it is the final version of House Joint Resolution
23 which was adopted by the House in March and then by the Senate
24 in May and signed by the Governor. This resolution started out
25 -- it was sponsored by Representative Therriault from

1 Fairbanks, it started out as a resolution asking that the
2 remaining funds go to the university for endowed shares. In
3 discussions with the resolution sponsor and his learning about
4 the March resolution and where the Council was in the planning
5 process it was subsequently amended so that it basically
6 supported the recent action of the Council creating the long-
7 term research and monitoring fund using 115 million of the
8 expected reserve. I am encouraging the Council to consider
9 using a portion of these funds to established endowed chairs at
10 the University of Alaska. The resolution also supports the
11 Council's efforts to remove the trust funds from the United
12 States Treasury and try to maximize earnings.

13 And this ties into the next item, which is GEM
14 planning. And GEM is our acronym for the Gulf Ecosystem
15 Monitoring Plan and this would be for future use of the 115
16 million dollar fund. We have been working on this since the
17 spring -- well, actually for the last year or so we started
18 some preliminary work with a number of the key researchers, our
19 peer reviewers and a number of agency and university personnel.
20 We did have an initial draft that was prepared about a year
21 ago, this went through some additional input. We had a meeting
22 in May of just a very informal group of folks looking at it and
23 providing some additional input. We had some very preliminary
24 stakeholder contacts. And have developed a preliminary concept
25 plan, we're planning on revising that again, having an

1 additional meeting and revising that before bringing it to you.
2 The schedule has it for September of this month [sic], although
3 I have a feeling with the Public Advisory Group field trip and
4 some other field trips it may -- it will probably be
5 mid-October before it comes to you. And at that time what we
6 would like to do is present it to you in a very detailed
7 workshop setting to get feedback from you on all the various
8 components.

9 The goal is to -- then if it is going along the path
10 that you had envisioned, to then do a more extensive public
11 process with meetings with stakeholders groups, communities,
12 just all of those who might be involved in this in the future
13 this fall. Get a revised version together, hopefully by
14 January, have that version be the basis for a National Research
15 Council review which will probably take a year and a half to go
16 through that kind of a review.

17 It's also -- what we're portraying now is a concept
18 plan, it's not at the level of detail for actual
19 implementation. But, at the same time, we're trying to get all
20 the necessary pieces in place in the next two years that we
21 need for actual implementation of this beginning in 2002.

22 So in your packet you see the preliminary timetable
23 with implementation scheduled for October of 2002, the list of
24 folks who are in this informal group who will probably meet one
25 more time and then after that it will go through more of a

1 public stakeholder process. And then also the outline of the
2 latest working draft, which shows kind of where we're going
3 with this, which is basically -- we're looking at the program
4 as being twofold, one is -- the first part is providing some
5 long-term monitoring in kind of the Northern Gulf of Alaska.
6 And the idea -- we have Joe Sullivan on contract right now and
7 he is identifying what all the existing agency commitments are,
8 and the idea is to fill in the holes of existing agency
9 commitments, not to duplicate or take the place of anything the
10 agencies are currently doing.

11 For example, if Fish and Wildlife Service is monitoring
12 seabird colonies, say they're monitoring three seabird colonies
13 every three years. What we would look at is, is there a need
14 to pick up on more seabird colonies or do it every other year
15 instead of every three years in order to get a complete picture
16 of long-term trends in the Gulf. Obviously, we're looking at a
17 program starting out initially at five to six million dollars,
18 we can't be everything to everyone and so we have to be very
19 selective, very targeted on what does get monitored. But the
20 goal is to monitor key oceanographic trends, climatic trends
21 and bird, fish, marine mammal population trends, to actually
22 see what's happening over the longer term.

23 This is also based on a working hypothesis that a lot
24 of the changes we see are climatically driven right now. And
25 so in order to monitor those changes you have to see what's

1 going on in terms of the ocean. And if you want more detail
2 now, Bob Spies is here and he can provide that.

3 The second portion of the program would be targeted
4 research. So the monitoring program is intended to be long
5 term, to be able to see trends over decades. The research
6 would be intended to answer questions that are generated though
7 the monitoring program, respond to specific management needs,
8 help refine the monitoring program, as needed, but basically
9 the two are intended to compliment each other, but the research
10 would be much more shorter term, it would be more targeted.
11 The monitoring would be a longer term program.

12 So that's kind of, conceptually, what we're looking at.
13 We also have sections on approaches to traditional knowledge,
14 community involvement, there's also some proposed policies in
15 here in terms of peer review, scientific leadership, the
16 process of reviewing and implementing projects, coordination
17 with other programs, how we would deal with data management,
18 synthesis, things of that nature. So the goal is to have a
19 comprehensive program. It's -- just some of the feedback we're
20 getting, a lot of people are concerned that it might be overly
21 ambitious and so we'll take a look at that as we develop it and
22 make sure that it is something that is doable, and that has
23 payoffs to the public and to management agencies over the
24 longer term.

25 And if there are any additional questions I'd be happy

1 to answer them or have Bob answer them.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Has the Trustee Council had an
5 opportunity to comment on the mission and goals so far? The
6 draft of the mission and goals of the GEM Plan? I don't think
7 we've had that opportunity.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Not specifically as drafted.
9 What the resol -- our guidance has been the resolution in
10 March, which is -- basically focuses on a long-term research
11 monitoring and general restoration program, including elements
12 of community-based efforts.

13 MR. WRIGHT: If we're going to have a workshop,
14 a Trustee Council workshop on the GEM Plan, and we haven't even
15 interacted at the level of the basis for this plan, it just
16 seems like it might be a nice thing to spend a few minutes
17 going through some of the objectives of the plan, in case
18 there's any big problems with the very foundation of this
19 program. I think this needs to be brought up before the
20 workshop for the Trustee Council, I don't think it would be a
21 big deal to go through, there's a few draft goals, there's a
22 mission statement, I think they're right on line, but I think
23 I'm the only one on the Council that's had an opportunity to
24 look at them. Before we sit down as a group and go through
25 this, if there's some goals that are.....

1 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not -- I
2 wasn't prepared to do that today, I can certainly do it. I'd
3 have to pull the material out and put it together. I had
4 promised, at least, one Trustee that we would be adjourned by
5 3:00 o'clock so he can catch a 4:00 o'clock flight back to
6 Juneau. And I'd be happy to do this and bring it up at the end
7 if we have time or do it in a separate session or however you'd
8 like, but that would be my only concern is that it would extend
9 on and we wouldn't be able to get the Work Plan done, which is
10 the one that actually needs action today.

11 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, that's the big one, I agree.

12 MS. HEIMAN: Are you talking about goals that
13 are right here listed in this outline or the mission.....

14 MS. McCAMMON: The goals aren't listed, the
15 mission is there, that is the mission, but the goals aren't
16 listed.

17 MS. HEIMAN: And is it that we don't have it in
18 this packet anywhere?

19 MS. McCAMMON: Correct, you don't. I mean, I
20 have it in my office, but you don't have it in the packet.

21 MR. WRIGHT: There's, right now, seven
22 overriding goals, and I think they're very good. One of them
23 is track lingering oil, spill injury. Another one is detect
24 and understanding annual long-term changes in the marine
25 ecosystem distinguishing natural variability from human

1 influences. It's those types of things that -- I mean, if
2 there's some problems -- if the Council has some problems with
3 those type of things, that's what we're building, that's the
4 foundation of the GEM Plan.

5 MS. HEIMAN: Yeah. This is Marilyn for those
6 of you on line. The only reason why I ask is I'm very
7 interested in this project and very interested in those goals.
8 And, being new, I haven't yet seen those or been involved in
9 them, but I mean, I think there's some excellent people been
10 working on the plan, glad to hear that you think the goals are
11 good, that even reinforces it.

12 Maybe, just by the end, if we could just get a copy of
13 that page, so we can just take a look at it and see if we have
14 any questions or anything like that.

15 MS. McCAMMON: Uh-huh.

16 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

18 MR. TILLERY: This -- your outline, your
19 timetable says that a concept plan will be presented to the
20 Trustee Council in September?

21 MS. McCAMMON: It will probably be October,
22 but, yeah.

23 MR. TILLERY: Okay. And is that an appropriate
24 time to comment on such things as -- fundamental things as
25 goals and mission statement or is that too late?

1 MS. McCAMMON: That was our intent at that
2 time, yes. But, I mean, if you would like it.....

3 MR. WRIGHT: But then there will be lots of
4 detail at that time.

5 MS. McCAMMON: I mean, the concept plan is,
6 like, this thick so far.

7 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, it's 45 pages long.

8 MS. HEIMAN: At this work -- Mr. Chair.

9 MS. McCAMMON: But a lot of this is background
10 material too.

11 MS. HEIMAN: At the workshop, will it just be
12 for us or will it be for general public or how does the
13 workshop work?

14 MS. McCAMMON: Well, it's advertised and
15 whoever wants to attend is available to it, but it would be
16 intended for the Council.

17 MS. HEIMAN: Oh, okay.

18 MS. McCAMMON: And I should mention that all of
19 the liaisons are actively involved in this and are aware of
20 meetings and have copies of the drafts and it is -- I would
21 expect that they are representing the agency's views on these
22 things, too, as this get developed.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Ms. McCammon -- this is Dave
24 Gibbons, I'd like to get a copy of that so I can look at it and
25 study it a little bit, you know, before I, you know, make

1 any comments about if they're adequate or not adequate or
2 whatever, but that would be my proposal to get a copy of it and
3 to look at it.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Today or.....

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: In the near future.

6 MR. WRIGHT: It's just page eight of the
7 existing draft.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, I can just run that off
9 for you, I can get copies of the whole thing for everyone.
10 We'll have a new draft of this in another couple of weeks and
11 so I wanted to make sure we had a draft that was, you know,
12 could pass the red-faced test and wasn't embarrassing before we
13 gave it to you.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I can wait a couple of
15 weeks.

16 MS. HEIMAN: I can too.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah, I'm not saying today,
18 something you're willing to give us when you're ready.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Oh, yeah, absolutely.

20 MS. HEIMAN: And is the date not yet scheduled?

21 MS. McCAMMON: Not yet scheduled.

22 MS. HEIMAN: Because I would like to really
23 come and I know I may have some conflicts in October, so I want
24 to work with you on the date of that.

25 MS. McCAMMON: We'll make sure the date works

1 for everyone.

2 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to
3 sort of wrap all this up, I think if you can get us the copy in
4 a couple of weeks and then I think what we should probably do
5 is leave it if any Council member has any particular issue with
6 some of the concepts we could call you and say we need to have
7 a Council meeting and discuss that before the bigger meeting
8 so, you know, if there's an course correction that needs to be
9 done; would that be acceptable?

10 MS. McCAMMON: Okay.

11 MR. WRIGHT: I think that's fine.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Thank you, that's fine with
13 me. Rest of the Council?

14 MR. BOSWORTH: Okay.

15 MS. McCAMMON: Well, as part of this
16 Restoration Reserve planning in March when the Council took
17 action on the reserve there was also a -- "be it further
18 resolved that in developing long-term implementation options
19 for consideration by the Council, the Executive Director shall
20 investigate possible establishment of new or modified governing
21 structures to implement long-term restoration efforts, explore
22 alternative methods to ensure meaningful public participation
23 in restoration decisions and report back to the Council by
24 September 1st regarding these efforts."

25 I'm hearby reporting back. The first of these, is

1 investigating possible establishment of new or modified
2 governing structures to implement long-term restoration
3 efforts. When this was put in there was some thought, at the
4 time, that at some point in the future the Council, especially
5 for the long-term research and monitoring fund, might consider
6 some governing structure. Following -- the resolution was done
7 on March 1st and then we also had the 10th Anniversary of the
8 oil spill and it became very clear in looking at that status of
9 recovery of those species that were injured by the spill that
10 recovery has still not occurred. And that there is still a
11 definite mission and purpose for the Council related to the
12 effects of the oil spill.

13 And in discussing this with a couple of Trustee members
14 and some others it would be my recommendation that we still
15 consider this as we go along in the next three years, planning
16 for the Gulf Ecosystem Monitoring Program, but that there are a
17 number of things that have to happen before any final decision
18 would be made. First of all, we really need to get the
19 financial -- the future financial system underway, so we need
20 passage of S711, we need to get the funds into a situation
21 where we actually can have a long-term fund.

22 Secondly we need to complete the story of oil spill
23 effects, and that is going to take at least three to five
24 years, if not longer than that to really know what has happened
25 with injury and recovery.

1 In Senator Murkowski's bill there's actually is a
2 section that requires -- that if this were to be past requires
3 the Council to come back and report to Congress on future
4 management of the fund. And I can't remember the exact date
5 here, but that is written in, and so, at some point, the
6 Council has to consider this again. But it seems, at this
7 time, that it's a little premature to think about changing a
8 structure until some of these other things have occurred. The
9 report in this is due to Congress by September 30th, 2001. And
10 it's recommending the structure the Trustees believe would be
11 most effective and appropriate for the administration and
12 expenditure of remaining funds and interest received.

13 So on that one I would recommend that we basically punt
14 on it at this point until some other things are in place and
15 until we know where we are in terms of actual injury and
16 recovery in the next couple of years.

17 The second one, on exploring alternative methods to
18 ensure meaningful public participation in restoration decision,
19 we're looking at this in terms of what kind of public advice
20 for a long-term research program and also I had some
21 preliminary discussion with the Public Advisory Group and they
22 want to take a closer look at this entire issue and possibly
23 also come up with a recommendation themselves. And so this one
24 is underway, but I think it's going to take a little bit longer
25 in terms of coming back to you with an actual recommendation on

1 whether the Public Advisory Group should be reconstituted, say
2 in existence as it is, have new memberships, looking at various
3 thing in terms of making sure there is good public
4 accountability and involvement and also at a cost that's
5 affordable over the longer term. So this is something that we
6 actually have on the front burner, but it will take some time
7 to come back to you with anything definitive.

8 So if there are any questions on that, I just wanted to
9 let you know where we were in the planning process on this.

10 And the last item is on archaeology. I think, as most
11 of you know, we were negotiating with Chugachmiut and Chugach
12 Alaska for a contract to implement the archaeological
13 restoration, the repository and community display facilities.
14 The negotiations had appeared to be going well when we received
15 a letter from Chugachmiut and Chugach Alaska saying that due to
16 certain constraints and liabilities that the project was now no
17 longer viable as originally conceived and that they could not
18 implement it.

19 I responded back to them that in order to respond to
20 that we needed to know what the problems were. We didn't hear
21 back from them for almost two months, we finally did last week
22 and we have a little bit better idea what some of the issues
23 are and they seem to be things that we can work with, so we're
24 hoping to now get moving on that and get that project underway.
25 In order to do that we have to get the grant agreement where

1 it's agreed to by both sides and reviewed by the attorneys.
2 The Department of Law has provided a lot of excellent advice,
3 Alex has been wonderful working on this and reviewing the
4 agreement. But it looks like we should be able to resolve
5 those issues. I don't really think they were that major. We
6 should be able to resolve the, hopefully, in the next couple of
7 weeks and get that underway. But it has been delayed,
8 probably, just by delaying through the summer we probably
9 delayed the project by maybe as much as a year, but it does
10 appear to be underway.

11 And that concludes my briefing today. Was there any
12 other questions?

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I see none. I think we have
14 a decision to make, should we dive into the 2000 Work Plan,
15 should we dive into lunch, or what's the wishes of the.....

16 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, we can get started
17 on the Work Plan and then break at noon for lunch.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. In your packet you have a
20 number of items and then you also have a number of items on the
21 table in front of you. You have a memo explaining the
22 Executive Director's recommendation, a numbers spreadsheet,
23 which is the primary document we'll be working off of. The
24 numbers spreadsheet is done by cluster, the text spreadsheet is
25 done in numerical order and it has the project abstract, the

1 Chief Scientist recommendation, the Executive Director's
2 recommendation. In your binder you also have a project history
3 for each project that the Council has funded since 1991, with
4 totals. You also have a summary of the public comment that has
5 been received so far and also the Public Advisory Group
6 comments on the Work Plan, and as we go through each cluster
7 we'll also mention those again and how we address concerns that
8 have been brought up.

9 And then before you today there are three additional
10 comments or, at least, additional information, one is some
11 comments from Patty Brown-Schwalenberg at Chugach Regional
12 Resources Commission, one is a letter from Gary Thomas on his
13 project and then another is an update on the Harriman project
14 which was also submitted as a proposal. You also have before
15 you this packet of pink sheets and this describes the changes
16 from the August 2nd spreadsheet as of last Friday, and we can
17 go through those project by project, too. It also has a list
18 of what new projects are being proposed, the list of potential
19 deferred projects, a breakdown of bench fees for projects that
20 are being done at the SeaLife Center and then also a proposed
21 motion for the Work Plan at the end.

22 In looking at the Work Plan, we received this year a
23 total of 133 proposals for 16.4 million dollars. This compared
24 to last year, last year we had 142 proposal for 25 million
25 dollars. So about the same number of proposals but for a lot

1 less money, so the proposals came in for significantly less
2 overall than they did last year, but about the same number of
3 proposal, which means the administrative costs of reviewing,
4 having peer review, going through the staff review, and the
5 time it took to go through all of those was probably comparable
6 to last year, even though our target number was a lot less and
7 the proposal total totaled less.

8 After going through all of the reviews, and this
9 included reviews by the Chief Scientist, the core reviewers,
10 it's included legal review, staff review, the Public Advisory
11 Group review, the recommendation to you today for consideration
12 to fund/fund contingent for 64 projects totaling \$7,430,300. A
13 total deferred of 15 projects for \$1,610,700. So if all of
14 those go forward, and the deferred ones wouldn't be acted on
15 until December, but if all of them go forward the total would
16 be just a little over nine million dollars. And if you recall
17 the target that you set for this year's Work Plan was eight to
18 nine million dollars, so we're at the very upper end there in
19 terms of reaching that target.

20 What we'd like to do now is have Bob Spies start going
21 through, we have overheads, going through cluster by cluster
22 and, as in the past, we can take these focusing on those
23 projects that are being recommended to go forward, but
24 answering any questions if there are any about specific
25 projects that are not recommended to go forward. Sandra

1 Schubert is also up here and Sandra has been very actively
2 involved in the staff review and can answer details on a lot of
3 these projects also.

4 DR. SPIES: Well, good morning, I'm pleased to
5 be here to talk about the Work Plan and go through in some
6 detail, although I'll try to keep it brief. I apologize for my
7 tie, I hope somebody at Alaska Airlines is enjoying it as much
8 as I did.

9 Let's start with the pink salmon. There's several
10 subcategories of work here, one is to research and monitor the
11 toxic effects of oil and we're starting on a new project there,
12 Project 454, which is kind of closing in scientifically on the
13 remaining oil out there. As you'll recall we looked like we
14 had evidence of the pink salmon were fully recovered and then
15 we had a reoccurrence of the higher mortality in the pink
16 salmon eggs in oiled streams over unoiled streams several years
17 ago and that brought up the question, well there might still be
18 damage out there. So this project is going to go out into the
19 environment and look for indicators of oil exposure in the
20 embryos themselves and do some work on the hydrology of these
21 streams to get a better idea how to interpret the past
22 assessment work on oil effects on these (indiscernible -
23 cough). So that's recommended for a start.

24 The other project in this subcategory, research and
25 monitoring for toxic effects of oil is to continue Project 476,

1 effects of oil incubation on reproduction of pink salmon. This
2 project that is coming towards a close, I think closes out in
3 2001.

4 The second subcategory provide management information,
5 we're going to continue Project 190, which is the genetic
6 linkage map, the pink salmon genome, this work is being done at
7 the Alaska SeaLife Center, it's being done by a world famous
8 fish geneticist, Fred Allendorf, University of Montana. He has
9 completed, essentially, a genetic linkage map and we're asking
10 him to apply this to look at survival of different -- value of
11 different parts of the genome, so he rewrote the project to
12 focus on the peer review comments, agrees that that's a
13 productive way to do the project, so that's been recommended
14 for funding.

15 And we're recommending deferring action on Project 366
16 today, which is the remote video monitoring of escapement,
17 which is being on the outflow from -- is it Desire Lake, and on
18 the Kenai Peninsula and we're still waiting to look at the
19 information from this year's video monitoring going on right
20 now to see how successful that project will be, so that's the
21 only reason for deferral is to see how things worked out this
22 year before we go ahead with a second year of the project.

23 And in the subcategory of supplementing populations,
24 we're looking at one more year on the Port Dick spawning
25 channel. This has had five or six years of funding now and

1 this is the final year of monitoring to look at stream beds and
2 hydrology in Port Dick, it's been a very successful project so
3 far and we just need to follow up and get, I think, all the
4 information that's available from that project and to wrap
5 things up with a nice publication and final report in 2001.

6 That's the pink salmon cluster. Now.....

7 MS. McCAMMON: Why don't we see if there are
8 any questions?

9 DR. SPIES: Yeah, are there any questions on
10 this? Do we want to -- is the Trustee Council going to take
11 action on the entire package or.....

12 MS. McCAMMON: I think in the past we've taken
13 action at the very end.....

14 DR. SPIES: Yeah.

15 MS. McCAMMON:but go cluster by cluster
16 and if there are any questions or comments or concerns or
17 issues that we need to address.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes, Bruce.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Bob, on the genetics linkage map
21 for pink salmon genome, which I guess that's to provide
22 management? Input into managing pink salmon in Prince William
23 Sound? This is a big ticket item, over the next several years
24 this will be over an \$800,000 project. It's not real clear to
25 me how this will fit into managing pink salmon in this region.

1 And I'm not sure if this is Prince William Sound or.....

2 DR. SPIES: Well, what's being done in 2000,
3 what's being proposed to be done, is to look at -- apply the
4 map that we have constructed already to look at survival
5 potential of different genetic combinations in the genome and
6 this is kind of a very powerful application to questions like
7 potential interactions between hatchery raised fish that may be
8 genetically different from wild stock fish. And it's going to
9 have a lot of basic applications in that particular area.

10 MR. WRIGHT: So there are management
11 applications that would result from this type of research?

12 DR. SPIES: I think so. There's some basic
13 questions that come up with manipulations of the populations.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

15 MS. McCAMMON: Bob, this is one of the
16 questions brought up by the Public Advisory Group, was on this
17 proposal and 487, Tim Joyce's strain of hatchery released pinks
18 in Prince William Sound.

19 DR. SPIES: Uh-huh.

20 MS. McCAMMON: And they wanted to make sure
21 this whole issue of hatchery strain and the interaction between
22 hatchery and wild stocks was being addressed, if not through
23 Tim Joyce's project, as least through this one. And this is
24 one of the new objectives that's being -- that was added as a
25 result of the peer reviewer comments. I think Mr. Allendorf

1 has also gotten some additional funding from the National
2 Science Foundation and is also looking at some other aspects of
3 that, too, with other funding.

4 DR. SPIES: It's not going to be focused
5 directly on hatchery/wild stock interactions because the
6 permits are not available to Fish and Game to transfer fish,
7 but they will be looking at survival -- comparing the genetic
8 composition of the various kinds of crosses made at the Alaska
9 SeaLife Center and then looking at various parts in the life
10 cycle, including the returning adults, looking at genetic
11 composition, so they can make some pretty profound statements
12 about survival benefit from various parts of the genome and
13 various gene combinations.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Sounds like this research will be
15 appropriate for the Columbia River system as much as to here.

16 MS. McCAMMON: It probably has national
17 implications, but it's focused on here.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah, Bob, I've got a
19 question. I was just reading the Director's recommendation
20 that says, in manuscript for publication in peer review journal
21 prepared this year, final report next year. Is that out of
22 sequence, shouldn't we have a final report, then the manuscript
23 or how is that?

24 MS. McCAMMON: Which one?

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: On 139A.

1 MS. McCAMMON: I think it's because the final
2 report is after all the monitoring has been done, but the
3 manuscript -- there was a lot of.....

4 DR. SPIES: I think they're going to write up
5 what they already have found and there may be other
6 publications that come later, but the final report is kind of,
7 in this case, come after the manuscript has been written. It's
8 been very successful and we've encouraged them to publish the
9 results of the study so far.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. The reason I brought
11 that up is normally we have a final report, then we look at
12 manuscripts afterwards and that's the reason.....

13 MS. McCAMMON: Well, often manuscripts end up
14 being -- making up the base of the final report, too. And, in
15 this case, I think they're doing the manuscript first because
16 there's a lot of desire to get this information out into
17 publication because others are -- this is one of the few cases
18 where an enhancement project has been monitored like this over
19 a number of years. There's a lot of interest in this project,
20 not only within the state, but outside of the state. But then
21 this will be the basis for the final report which will be done
22 then the next year.

23 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes, Bruce.

25 MR. WRIGHT: You'll find that a lot of the

1 long-term projects will have several publications that will
2 come out, as they're learning new things, they'll publish this
3 material. We've seen that with the three ecosystem projects
4 which have been long-term there's been, you know, probably 30
5 or 40 publications that have come out of those three project
6 already, even though we've just recently received a final
7 report for only one of them. And then the final report will
8 probably incorporate many of those manuscripts and then
9 subsequent to the final report will be another suite of
10 publications.

11 DR. SPIES: We'll go on to herring. We've got
12 two subcategories here, investigate the causes of the crash, or
13 we should say crashes now, because the population was starting
14 to come back and then slipped back down in terms of total
15 biomass.

16 Project 462 is the ongoing project to look at disease
17 of herring and look at the role of disease in the population
18 crash and since we have still a significant occurrence of
19 disease in the population that may be linked to some of the
20 things that the herring are doing in Prince William Sound, in
21 terms of population recovery, we're recommending to continue
22 that project.

23 Project 562 is one of two projects that we're
24 deferring. This project and this one in the next cluster,
25 there was a lot of really good herring proposals put in, but

1 the reviewers felt, overall, that these projects were not
2 coordinated to the extent that they should be. Once the SEA
3 Program has completed its work, it was kind of the scientific
4 oversight of the herring thing that everybody has been kind of
5 on their own, so they submitted a lot of good projects, but
6 they're independent, so we need to look at some greater degree
7 of coordination between the projects, we're going to go forward
8 with them next year, so we're deferring this one, which is a
9 very good project put in by Dick Kocan, University of
10 Washington. And we funded him before in connection with the
11 disease program.

12 And then the next subcategory, investigate ecological
13 factors, this deferred one of the regional analysis of
14 juveniles in Prince William Sound as an extension of some of
15 the concepts developed in the SEA Program looking at
16 differences in the various parts of Prince William Sound that
17 allow certain cohorts of juvenile herrings to survive better
18 than others. So we're going to have the workshop sometime in
19 November, it hasn't been scheduled yet, to deal with that and
20 then move forward. And then there's one other project in the
21 SEA related one that's also is being deferred for the same
22 reason.

23 And finally Project 375 which looks at the historical
24 data. There's a tremendous amount of historical data, mostly
25 in Juneau in file cabinets, that goes back years and years in

1 Prince William Sound, looking at the distribution of eggs and
2 distribution of adult herring and sizes of different year
3 classes. And this is an attempt by Evelyn Brown, a long-
4 established research biologist, to go through this data to try
5 and see if there is correlations between egg deposition areas
6 and success of the various cohorts of the population over time.
7 Perspective analysis can be very valuable.

8 MS. HEIMAN: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes.

10 MS. HEIMAN: Bob, I was just curious about
11 these first studies at UAF by B. Norcross and, based on my
12 understanding, what you just said after the herring conference
13 that this second project is likely to be reassessed or how will
14 that work, can you go into that a little more specifically?

15 DR. SPIES: Well, we're in the workshops, like
16 we normally do, and kind of look at the basic issues, how
17 they've been addressed so far, what are the unanswered question
18 that remain, how can we attack those questions in a reasonable
19 manner, balance those against the other needs in the program
20 and move forward on a coordinated basis. And there would be
21 probably some recommendation coming out of the workshop.

22 MS. HEIMAN: And so we'll.....

23 DR. SPIES: We'll bring those back to you in
24 December.

25 MS. HEIMAN: That workshop will discuss these

1 particular projects, though, and see how they all fit together
2 and coordinate?

3 DR. SPIES: Right.

4 MS. HEIMAN: Okay.

5 DR. SPIES: Exactly. Any further questions on
6 the Pacific herring cluster?

7 (No audible responses)

8 DR. SPIES: We'll move on to the Sound
9 Ecosystem Assessment cluster. This is SEA and related
10 projects. The final report from SEA is just being completed
11 now, but there's an additional year proposed for -- in the year
12 2000 here to produce a super synthesis of the entire project.
13 We've got the bits and pieces and now we need an even --
14 another layer on top of this to really pull it all together and
15 so there's a small amount of funding being proposed to close
16 out 320 in the year 2000.

17 Project 389 is another one of these project that we
18 want to defer, this is a three-dimensional ocean states
19 simulation in Prince William Sound, until after the herring
20 workshop in November. The three-dimensional ocean state
21 simulation model was put together by Christopher Moore and Jang
22 Wang now at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks and he is
23 proposing to apply this once again to do some additional years,
24 there's only a couple of years that were modeled in the SEA
25 Program and he wants to do some additional years. And I think

1 that project might best be considered in the context of the
2 other herring work that may go forward, so he's going to come
3 to the workshop along with the other herring proposers and see
4 how we can integrate that work if it appears the logical thing
5 to do as a result of the workshop outcome.

6 And, finally, a small amount of money in 541 for
7 publication on Prince William Sound isotope ecology and this is
8 part of the SEA Program that has been relatively successful and
9 there's funding for publication requested and recommended.

10 The other subcategory here, develop monitoring
11 techniques, Project 195, Pristane Monitoring of Mussels, we've
12 been funding that for some time and we're waiting on analysis
13 from the principal investigator to be submitted this year in a
14 project report that's due and to see whether the -- how good
15 this pristane monitoring works as indicator of the success of
16 pink salmon populations in Prince William Sound, so we're
17 recommending deferral of that until we get the final report and
18 make some evaluation of how good that pristane monitoring is in
19 connection with pink salmon success.

20 Project 393, Food Webs: Structure and Change, is being
21 recommended to you. This is going to be looking at stable
22 isotopes and mussels shells on Middleton Island and going back
23 retrospectively, again back to about 1989, and trying to see
24 what those stable isotopes can tell us about how conditions on
25 the shelf for a whole variety of injured species may have

1 changed over that period, so another retrospective study that
2 could be quite good, so we want to continue funding that. They
3 got their money late in this year and the project is just
4 underway.

5 Project 493, this comes under a whole category of
6 projects in which we want to do some kind of basement work for
7 the future GEM monitoring. We think it's quite likely that we
8 will be wanting to continue, in some way, the trawl surveys,
9 the small mesh trawl surveys, that we have such a long record
10 of on the northern shelf and around Kodiak Island and on the
11 Alaska Peninsula. And this project will look at the existing
12 data to try to understand how often we need to sample what the
13 power of the various sampling strategies is in order to go
14 forwards with the cost effective monitoring program for trawl
15 caught organisms in that part. We know now that there have
16 been huge changes in these communities and we need to probably
17 track those changes and understand what the Northern Gulf
18 ecosystem is doing.

19 Project 552 is another one of these projects that we
20 want to use as a basement or foundation for the future GEM
21 Program and it looks at oceanographic exchange between the Gulf
22 of Alaska and Prince William Sound. We are almost sure that
23 this is going to be very, very important process, the renewal
24 of nutrient between the deep waters in the Gulf and in Prince
25 William Sound occurs in the fall of the year, late summer and

1 fall, and we need to follow that process. We got a pretty good
2 record from the SEA Program, we'd like to continue that.

3 Is there any questions on the SEA package here?

4 (No audible responses)

5 DR. SPIES: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I believe it would be a good
7 time to break for lunch.

8 DR. SPIES: Okay.

9 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Trustee Council, would you
11 like to break.....

12 MS. McCAMMON: You need a motion for executive
13 session.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah, we need a motion to go
15 into executive session.

16 MS. HEIMAN: I move we.....

17 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

19 MS. HEIMAN:go into executive session.

20 MS. McCAMMON: For the purpose of.....

21 MS. BROWN: You need to say for the purpose
22 of.....

23 MS. McCAMMON:discussing habitat
24 protection negotiations.

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: For discussing habitat

1 acquisition, yeah.

2 MS. HEIMAN: I move that we go into executive
3 session for the purpose of discussing habitat acquisition.....

4 MS. McCAMMON: Negotiations.

5 MS. HEIMAN:negotiations.

6 MR. WRIGHT: I'll second that.

7 MS. HEIMAN: Pretty good, huh?

8 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: It's been moved and
9 seconded, all in favor say aye.

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Opposed?

12 (No opposing responses)

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

14 MS. McCAMMON: Until about 1:15 or.....

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: 1:15, okay, we'll be back
16 about 1:15.

17 (Off record - 12:03 p.m.)

18 (On record - 1:31 p.m.)

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I'll bring the Trustee
20 Council to order and I'd like to report that the Trustee
21 Council did meet for an hour and 15 minutes and discussed
22 habitat issues in executive session.

23 And we're now joining the public again on the open
24 Trustee Council meeting. And I think we're going to continue
25 on with the Work Plan proposals and I see up on the screen,

1 sockeye.

2 DR. SPIES: Sockeye salmon, not what it used to
3 be, just one project and that is to publish the results of a
4 very successful project of historical analysis on sockeye
5 salmon growth, that was the project where we got independent
6 confirmation on the effect of overescapement due to the spill
7 on a number of different systems around the Northern Gulf of
8 Alaska in the spill area, so that is to write that material up,
9 that's support for publication on the modest funding there.

10 Any questions on this project?

11 (No audible responses)

12 DR. SPIES: Move on to the next cluster, which
13 is cutthroat trout, Dolly Varden and other fish. There's one
14 new project here, Project 478, and it is basically to provide
15 technology that could be very useful in managing fisheries in
16 the Gulf of Alaska. The halibut is one of three species that
17 was originally proposed, we're not interested, per se, in
18 halibut biology here, although we can learn something new.
19 We're really trying to test these pop-up satellite tags. These
20 are tags that are put into fish as they swim around and then
21 released and come to the surface and they send a signal to a
22 satellite so they can be located. So this will be quite
23 helpful then in looking at habitat issues in the Gulf of Alaska
24 and where fish spend their time. Halibut is a large fish that
25 can be brought into the SeaLife Center, these tags can be

1 fitted on the fish and they can be tried out and it's a
2 technology development type project.

3 MR. WRIGHT: What's the target for that
4 information? I mean, you know, so we know the halibut is, you
5 know.....

6 DR. SPIES: Well the Magnuson-Stevenson [sic]
7 Fisheries Authorization Act deals with the importance of
8 habitat information in managing fisheries and this will really
9 help locate where the fish are and crucial habitats. There's a
10 lot of applications, and having the satellite tags provides --
11 a typical tag in a fish you have to recover the fish, and this
12 is pop-up tag that actually comes to the surface when the fish
13 is out in -- can be out in very deep water, you don't have to
14 recover the fish to get it, so it's a step forward
15 technologically.

16 MS. McCAMMON: It could be used for salmon,
17 rock fish, Dolly Varden, trout, so the goal is to do it in a
18 large fish this year and then -- it's been used on blue fin
19 tuna in the Atlantic coast and then used on -- it'll probably
20 be tested on a smaller fish next.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Molly, is this normal
22 management or, I mean, you know.....

23 MR. TILLERY: This is not an injured species
24 that we're dealing with.....

25 MS. McCAMMON: Right.

1 MR. TILLERY: So all you're doing is testing
2 out a technology.

3 MS. McCAMMON: Right.

4 MR. TILLERY: Is there a proposal to use it on
5 an injured species next?

6 MS. McCAMMON: It could be used on an injured
7 species, such as salmon, rock fish, and the -- I think the
8 linkage is trying to define critical habitat area with, maybe,
9 down the road even a possibility of marine reserves.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes.

12 MR. WRIGHT: So are we -- we're really not
13 interested in halibut here, we're interested in this pop-up
14 tag; is that correct?

15 MS. McCAMMON: Uh-huh (Affirmative).

16 MR. WRIGHT: There were three pop-up tags,
17 these same tags deployed on sharks this year, they were -- the
18 tuna -- the people that do the blue fin tuna research donated
19 them.

20 DR. SPIES: Is this Barbara Block's group?

21 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, Barbara Block's group
22 deployed three of those tags that you're -- they'll pop up in
23 about two weeks and then another one in six week and another
24 one in 10 weeks and so, I mean, we've already deployed three on
25 sharks in Prince William Sound, same technology. And, of

1 course, the interest there is if the sharks -- the movement of
2 the sharks relative to herring and salmon.....

3 DR. SPIES: Right.

4 MR. WRIGHT:because of the predation
5 effect. If we're not interested in halibut, but we still --
6 and we want to continue to deploy more than just these three
7 tags, maybe we should think of a different species that we
8 would be gleaning some information that might be useful,
9 because I'm not sure if we're interested in halibut at all. I
10 mean that -- if it easy to catch sharks.....

11 DR. SPIES: The idea would be to get the
12 technology in the state and on a viable species that, you know,
13 that the information can be useful and can test the technology.
14 I'll be interested to see, you know, this is the first I heard
15 of results with the salmon shark. Was that correct, salmon
16 shark?

17 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, salmon shark.

18 DR. SPIES: Reviewers are very strong on this
19 thing, it's -- and the Trustee Council has had, you know, quite
20 a significant role in developing technology in the 10 years and
21 kind of handing it back for management purposes, so I think
22 that would fit. To answer your question, Dave, I think it
23 would fit well within the philosophy of the Council. It was
24 done in the past. Not to support this on a continuing basis
25 but to support the technology on occasion.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Bruce has got kind of an
2 interesting idea though, you know, the salmon sharks are really
3 starting to become prevalent in Prince William Sound and
4 there's big schools of them now, you know, following in the
5 pinks and they're in -- some people think they stay in there in
6 the wintertime, it would be nice to know some information on
7 real predator on an injured species, such as pink salmon.

8 MR. WRIGHT: And we know we can deploy them
9 because we did and salmon sharks can handle the large size tags
10 with no problem.

11 DR. SPIES: Uh-huh.

12 MR. WRIGHT: And with those three out there,
13 and we'll know in two weeks if it works.....

14 DR. SPIES: Right.

15 MR. WRIGHT:for salmon sharks. And if it
16 works for salmon sharks and we still want to deploy more tags,
17 which I think to help understand what's happening with salmon
18 sharks we should deploy more tags for longer periods of time,
19 it's a big species, they're easy to handle, I think I would
20 rather see them deployed on salmon sharks than halibut.

21 DR. SPIES: Uh-huh.

22 MS. McCAMMON: Dede, do you want to respond to
23 that?

24 MS. BOHN: Well.....

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

1 microphone.

2 MS. BOHN: This is Dede Bohn with USGS. We
3 have a proposer in our agency for this project. Basically what
4 happened was she did want to propose it with salmon and.....

5 MR. WRIGHT: Salmon?

6 MS. BOHN:and originally had
7 conceptualized it that way.

8 MR. WRIGHT: With salmon?

9 MS. BOHN: But the price for doing it on salmon
10 is at least three to four times as high as if she uses a larger
11 species. So as it came through review she had to reduce the
12 funding down to a third of what the original was, and that was
13 at the point where she said, well, halibut would be the species
14 to test it as long as we're looking at technology. And that's
15 how we evolved to this state.

16 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I'm not -- I wasn't
17 proposing salmon, I was proposing the salmon shark.

18 MS. BOHN: Right, I understand that and perhaps
19 we can go back we can go back to the proposer and see if that
20 fits other criteria.

21 DR. SPIES: Well, you know, I've forgotten the
22 principal investigator's.....

23 MS. McCAMMON: Jennifer Nielson.

24 DR. SPIES: Yeah, Jennifer can work with --
25 Bruce, if you can contact Jennifer and see if there's a way the

1 things that you're doing in salmon shark might fit in with her
2 plans on halibut. She's planning to use a larger number of
3 fish, eight fish, and I think she's going to definitely put
4 them in fish captive, they're caught in the Gulf of Alaska,
5 brought back to the SeaLife Center and it's a question of
6 timing and survival of fish and so forth. So it's a little
7 more involved than just, you know, getting several fish,
8 putting tags on them and so.....

9 MR. WRIGHT: Why would you want to bring them
10 back to the SeaLife Center when you can just tag them and dump
11 them in ocean and find out where they go?

12 MS. BOHN: She has several other ongoing pieces
13 to this, why don't we contact her and discuss species?

14 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah, I'd be interested in
15 finding some more, too, you know, because just last week I was
16 in Prince William Sound and there were a couple of hundred
17 salmon sharks right at the surface.

18 MR. WRIGHT: That's just what you see at the
19 surface, you drop.....

20 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: That's right.

21 MR. WRIGHT:a camera down and you're
22 seeing 10 percent.

23 MS. BOHN: Okay.

24 MS. HEIMAN: I've never seen one before.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Do we want to defer this until

1 December then, is that.....

2 MR. WRIGHT: That's a good idea, I think.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

4 MR. TILLERY: My other question was the funding
5 thing on this is that it started out as \$180,000 project and
6 then it was revised to 75,000, but you're recommending 106.
7 Why the increase?

8 MS. BOHN: That includes the bench fees.

9 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, that includes the bench
10 fees for the SeaLife Center.

11 MR. TILLERY: But it sounds like what they're
12 doing -- the halibut has nothing whatsoever to do with us at
13 the SeaLife Center besides putting tags on them.

14 MS. McCAMMON: It's using a fish as technology,
15 yes.

16 MR. TILLERY: I mean, we're just boarding them,
17 we don't even care. For our purposes it works just as well if
18 you tag them out in the ocean and drop them back in the water,
19 doesn't it?

20 MS. McCAMMON: No, there's a reason for doing
21 it at the SeaLife Center, technology.

22 MR. TILLERY: I thought she just said it was
23 because there were other experiments they wanted to do with
24 halibut.

25 MS. McCAMMON: In this project, in part of this

1 project.

2 DR. SPIES: We want to do it under controlled
3 conditions and we look at the timing of the pop-up tag, whether
4 it's accurate, you know, if it's released on time, what's the
5 survival of the fish once the tag is put in, that sort of
6 thing.

7 MS. McCAMMON: It sounds like there's enough
8 questions, it should be a deferment until December and we can
9 bring back some additional information for you and look at
10 other species.

11 DR. SPIES: Okay, are there any further
12 questions?

13 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, I have a question on 396,
14 which is sharks, salmon sharks, sleeper sharks, dog fish. Part
15 of the recommendation says that these species are not on the
16 injured species list and there's a weak link to restoration,
17 but the Chief Scientist's recommendation talks about the
18 species could exert important influence on commercial fish
19 species. And otherwise sounds like there is a link -- assuming
20 -- I don't know what species you're talking about, but if it
21 were salmon or one of the others it could be a link to that,
22 but it certainly should have a link to services injured, so I'm
23 not sure why is there a weak link to restoration on this one?

24 MS. McCAMMON: In terms of our active
25 restoration objectives right now, there's nothing that this

1 strongly fits into. In terms of just a generic working towards
2 commercial fishing and knowing more about the ecosystem, you
3 could make a link that way, but in terms of any of our other
4 things, just a direct strong link, it doesn't have it. I think
5 when we looked at this, this was something that -- there are a
6 number of species in the overall ecosystem that weren't
7 directly injured by the spill but you could spend time learning
8 about them and finding out more about them and it would
9 benefit, probably, everyone ultimately. You could do the same
10 thing with jelly fish, I suppose, I mean there's just a number
11 of things you could do this for. This didn't rise completely
12 to the top and, in addition, NOAA said they were pursuing
13 funding elsewhere, so kind of helped ease that a little bit.

14 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

15 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Bruce.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, and just to add a
18 little bit to what Molly is saying, when we first were looking
19 at salmon sharks out there, and there's lots of salmon sharks
20 and it make sense that there's probably a top down thing
21 happening with the ecosystem out there in the species, my
22 thought was, okay, you've got these 400-pound sharks out there,
23 maybe they're eating harbor seals, right? And I thought that
24 until I sat on the back of the first one and looked down its
25 mouth, it's got these tiny little teeth, you know, they're --

1 they don't have a very big mouth and there's no way they could
2 handle a harbor seal. So we were doing some herring surveys
3 last -- about two weeks ago in the Sound and we were with the
4 APEX Project, we were seining in a small mesh seine, we were
5 seining up herring, younger than year herring, this long, just
6 small guys and we start catching salmon sharks. And so we
7 said, well, let's bring them on board, let's measure them, tag
8 them, Fish and Game brought tags out. They had a bilge pump, a
9 boat bilge pump, I said, well, let's pump a couple of stomachs.

10 (Laughter)

11 MS. HEIMAN: With a boat bilge pump? Geez, how
12 was the fish by the -- I mean the shark by the time you were
13 done with him?

14 MR. WRIGHT: A meter long -- well, this is --
15 actually my knees are pretty beat up, they're pretty strong
16 and.....

17 DR. SPIES: It takes a biologist to think of
18 this.

19 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. And we pumped their
20 stomachs and then -- we pumped four stomachs and in two of them
21 we found salmon, one of them was empty and then one of the ones
22 we found salmon, we found herring this size and another one we
23 found just herring this size. So we were surprised by this.
24 Here's a picture. We were surprised by -- the bottom right
25 picture shows stomach contents and you can see the partially

1 digested herring, yum. So they're eating herring and you can
2 watch them feed out there in schools and feed on the herring.
3 There's a fair amount of interest and so we had -- like Bob
4 said, Barbara Block, she's a tuna researcher, she's a professor
5 at Stanford, she came up with three -- she stole from her
6 project three satellite -- these pop-up tags, archival tags and
7 we deployed those tags and hopes to find out where these guys
8 go over the next 90 days.

9 Well, since then I've talked to several fishermen, some
10 of which have said that they -- they're fishing the winter
11 pollock fishery using trawls, so they're catching sharks in the
12 wintertime, too, so these sharks are there all year round.
13 What's interesting about the sharks is that they're warm
14 blooded so that they have a real high metabolism, they're about
15 80 degrees Fahrenheit body temperature, so they have a real
16 high metabolism. You bring them up on deck, you know, wow,
17 this is not a cold fish. So they're a high energy animal, they
18 can use the entire water column. We deployed some tags and
19 that shows that they go up and down, they're feeding on salmon,
20 they're feeding on herring, they'll probably -- and if you look
21 at their long-term diet they'll eat anything that's small.

22 MS. HEIMAN: So are you saying we don't know
23 much about these salmon sharks right now?

24 MR. WRIGHT: We know very little about these
25 salmon sharks. It's interesting that 95 percent of the salmon

1 sharks that people catch in Prince William Sound or come across
2 are all females, you know, we don't know what's going on there.
3 What's interesting is that 20 years ago commercial fishermen
4 that worked this region might have seen one or two a year.
5 And, like Dave says, I'm trying to get an idea how many are --
6 everybody is asking how many are out there and, you know, you
7 go -- well, I go for a quick plane trip and I see a hundred.
8 So I asked Evelyn Brown who is doing aerial surveys for salmon
9 sharks to look at some of her historical data. She went back
10 through some of the tapes and she says this summer she did a
11 two-hour transect and you could see 500 sharks in a two-hour
12 transect at the surface from an airplane doing 100 miles an
13 hour.

14 So there's a lot of sharks out there, they're out there
15 year around, they're mostly females, they're high energy fish,
16 they can impact, I think, a lot of the commercial and injured
17 species.

18 MR. TILLERY: And injured species, that's what
19 I'm -- they're eating herring, they're eating salmon

20 MR. WRIGHT: Herring and salmon.

21 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

22 MR. TILLERY: We don't know much about them,
23 here's a study in 396 to find out more about them, but we don't
24 want to do that because you're going to find other money for
25 that?

1 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I'm having a real tough time
2 finding other money and I think that the.....

3 MS. HEIMAN: You just opened the door wide up,
4 Craig, why don't you?

5 MR. WRIGHT: I mean I thought.....

6 MS. BROWN: Need a break, Molly?

7 MR. WRIGHT:I thought that Dinkum-Sands
8 might come through, right? The university got 6.6 million
9 dollars.

10 MS. HEIMAN: Oh, you didn't get any of that?

11 MR. WRIGHT: Didn't get any of that.

12 MS. HEIMAN: Did you try?

13 MR. WRIGHT: Absolutely.

14 MS. HEIMAN: And they didn't give you any of
15 that.

16 MR. WRIGHT: Didn't get any of that. I have
17 a.....

18 MS. HEIMAN: No peer review, you know.

19 MR. WRIGHT: You don't have to talk -- we don't
20 want to talk about that right now.

21 MS. McCAMMON: Well, he didn't get any of this
22 and we have peer review.

23 (Laughter)

24 MR. WRIGHT: I guess maybe that's why we're
25 talking about this now.

1 MS. HEIMAN: How do we deal with these type of
2 things if there's a high level of interest that we might want
3 the scientists to reassess? I mean, do we have to wait until
4 the next whole cycle or is there any chances in between or.....

5 MS. McCAMMON: You can say, reassess, and come
6 back and look at it again for December.

7 MR. BOSWORTH: Could defer it to December and
8 have him provide more information.

9 MS. McCAMMON: And offer up another DOI project
10 or NOAA project in exchange.

11 MS. HEIMAN: Right, because it's zero sum game
12 at this point.

13 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, it is.

14 DR. SPIES: Our problem is that the funding is
15 going down and there's a lot of things that are going on,
16 there's out-year cost and so forth associated with that and
17 there's a small amount of funding that's going forward for new
18 projects, we'd really like to see those connected in a kind of
19 a convincing way to what's going on. I can't disagree with
20 Bruce that these things are potentially quite important.

21 MR. WRIGHT: Let me -- let's try this and see
22 what you think about this. If we come back with a proposal
23 that has partners in it, Fish and Game is interested. Fish and
24 Game doesn't have resources, but they have personnel that are
25 willing to work with us and they have tags, so we can use Fish

1 and Game personnel, hopefully. I think we can do that, we'll
2 have to ask Fish and Game about that. The.....

3 MS. HEIMAN: DOI.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, the DOI would possibly work
5 with that project. If we can get 20 tags out on these sharks
6 next year that would be great, so we need a platform. National
7 Geographic is real interested in deploying their critter-cam
8 and so they may be able to help us out with a platform. And
9 Barbara Block with Stanford is real close with the Packard
10 Foundation and she thinks she may be able to get some funding
11 there. What we really need is funding for two platforms and
12 pop-up tags.

13 MR. TILLERY: Well, you'll find the pop-up tag
14 money.

15 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

16 MR. TILLERY: Why don't we defer this project
17 and suggest that you come back in December with some proposed
18 partnerships.

19 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I think that's a good idea
20 and so forth.

21 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, because I
22 know there are reasons -- the proposal originally was a much
23 more expensive, longer term proposal, dealing with things first
24 at the SeaLife Center, doing some experimental studies and then
25 in the open ocean, and there were reasons, legitimate reasons,

1 for doing some work in the tank to begin with and I'd like to
2 go back to the proposer and make sure we have that well
3 documented before just jumping into this open ocean testing.

4 MR. WRIGHT: They won't live, they can't.....

5 MS. McCAMMON: Sharks can't?

6 MR. WRIGHT: They've never -- no, a salmon
7 shark.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Salmon shark.

9 MR. WRIGHT: These warm blooded sharks won't
10 live in tanks, they've tried.

11 MS. McCAMMON: But maybe there's a reason for
12 -- if you want valid information from tags that you do put in
13 sharks in the future, you want to have it well calibrated and
14 tested in advance so that then whatever information when you do
15 deploy them on sharks whatever information you get you know is
16 accurate. And I don't know enough about it, if that's the
17 reason for it. I think that's the reason, though, for the
18 laboratory work.

19 MR. TILLERY: You're right we would want to
20 know that. So why don't we bring both of these projects back
21 in December?

22 MS. McCAMMON: Sure.

23 MR. BOSWORTH: Are we talking 396 and 478?

24 MR. TILLERY: Yeah.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Right.

2 MR. BOSWORTH: Okay.

3 MS. HEIMAN: So that does mean that we do or do
4 not go forward with the USGS testing?

5 MS. McCAMMON: It would be deferred until
6 December.

7 MS. HEIMAN: So instead of fund now, that would
8 be deferred?

9 MS. McCAMMON: Deferred, right.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Deferred and come up with a
11 cooperative project.

12 MS. HEIMAN: Is that okay, Dede?

13 MS. BOHN: Yeah.

14 DR. SPIES: Okay, why don't we move on to the
15 next cluster if there's no further questions or comments.
16 Marine mammals. There's two aspects of this, one is research
17 and monitoring of the populations and the second is develop
18 monitoring techniques.

19 We have one killer whale investigation that's ongoing,
20 012, and the core of this project has been for quite some time
21 to track killer whale pods and what's happening with their
22 offspring and the growth of certain pods, particularly AB pod.
23 It took quite a dip at the time of the spill and it's still not
24 fully recovered, so that's still the heart of this program and
25 there's also a proposal which was reviewed -- part of the

1 proposal reviewed fairly carefully by the peer reviewers was to
2 look at -- put some acoustic monitoring equipment in
3 Resurrection Bay and get those signals transferred back into
4 the Alaska SeaLife Center. So the killer whales are spending a
5 lot of time in the Kenai Peninsula area, so it does make sense
6 in terms of doing something over in Resurrection Bay area for
7 acoustic monitoring. And the hope is to be able to use some of
8 the acoustic signals from the whales that can be specific for
9 certain pods, they have their own call, so we can tell what pod
10 is out there, so it's kind of a remote sensing type of
11 application.

12 Continue 341 which is the health and diet study being
13 carried out at the Alaska SeaLife Center.

14 And then 371, which is looking at harbor seal
15 metabolism and stable isotopes. We talked about that proposal
16 quite a bit in the past.

17 And also 441, which is dealing with the harbor seal
18 diet with the metabolism and health. And this has to do with
19 testing the so-called junk food hypothesis, how these marine
20 mammals subsist and benefit from various sorts of food sources.
21 For instance, the pollock, which doesn't have a very high
22 amount of fat in it, versus the herring which does have quite a
23 bit of fat, so there's controlled studies that can only be done
24 at the SeaLife Center that'll get at that sort of thing and it
25 has wide application to other marine mammals and also has

1 implication for bird populations.

2 The second subcategory here, monitoring. This is
3 Project 509, they're recommending go forward and it's being
4 proposed by Bob Small along with a lot of the harbor seal
5 investigators doing work in the Northern Gulf of Alaska as to
6 make recommendation that there be another one of these
7 foundation blocks for the GEM Program in the Gulf of Alaska.
8 What is the best design for monitoring harbor seal populations?
9 What kind of approach do we want to use? Accounting
10 techniques? What sort of things should we be measuring?
11 There's a lot of data available, both from the National Marine
12 Fisheries Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
13 which we can draw on to be able to assign a good part of the
14 sampling program for harbor seals in the GEM Program.

15 Are there any questions on the marine mammal cluster?

16 MR. WRIGHT: No question, just a quick comment.
17 Craig Matkin, who's the PI on the killer whale work, just
18 recently published this book, which he had to scrounge for
19 funds, but it's one of the most excellent publication I've ever
20 seen. I'm going to buy some copies and I'll send you guys
21 copies.

22 MS. HEIMAN: Don't send me one, I have it. I
23 bought it from our wildlife refuge, actually from the Kenai
24 Fjords National Park, we have those books down there and he
25 does recognize the EVOS Trustee Council.....

1 MR. WRIGHT: Several times.

2 MS. HEIMAN:in the book, it's very --
3 it's really a cool book, it's like the family genealogy of all
4 the whales in Cook Inlet -- not Cook Inlet, but Resurrection
5 Bay and over in.....

6 MR. WRIGHT: Prince William Sound.

7 MS. HEIMAN:Prince William Sound.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, it's a superb book and it
9 talks about the injury from the oil and diet and it's a really
10 good book, so.....

11 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Did Steve tell you to say
12 that?

13 MR. WRIGHT: No, Steve always laughs when we
14 bring up killer whales. He shakes his head and laughs, but
15 this is turning out to be some of the best research. Anyways,
16 I'll get copies to you guys, I think you'd really enjoy looking
17 at it and reading it.

18 MS. HEIMAN: Can I ask a question about this
19 00533, the Effects of Boat Traffic on Harbor Seal? Have we
20 all, in the past before I was here, done any studies on boat
21 traffic on some of these marine mammals and.....

22 DR. SPIES: We haven't done any in this
23 program.

24 MS. HEIMAN: Or tour ships and.....

25 DR. SPIES: We have generally looked at other

1 questions, after the spill because the question came up,
2 particularly species like harlequin ducks which appear to be
3 sensitive to a lot of human interference and so forth. We have
4 looked at those general kinds of questions after the spill, not
5 specific for harbor seals. There have been studies done with
6 harbor seals looking at disturbance effects and how close boats
7 should be and then those have been the basis for recommend --
8 or some recommendations to be in the Marine Mammal Protection
9 Act that give guidelines for not being, for instance, within a
10 -- I think it's 100 meters of a marine mammal colony.

11 We looked at this and thought maybe the existing
12 information was sufficient, there was also some questions about
13 some of the methodology that was put forward in this particular
14 one, so we didn't see it as a high priority right now. There
15 certainly is no question it could be revisited in the future.

16 MS. HEIMAN: We just have -- there's a lot of
17 interaction in the Kenai Fjords with -- and it just keeps
18 growing and growing and growing with boats in that area, and --
19 I mean it's on the road system, people are going there and I
20 just want to raise it as something that I have some interest in
21 and concern.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Bruce.

24 MR. WRIGHT: I think that's a legitimate
25 concern. National Marine Fishery Service has not written

1 regulations relative to the Marine Mammal Protection Act,
2 basically because they don't have -- at least biologists I've
3 talked to, feel they don't have the research to back them up,
4 to say, no, you can't approach within 200 meters instead of 100
5 meters.

6 MS. HEIMAN: Uh-huh.

7 MR. WRIGHT: But I -- actually when this
8 proposal was being reviewed the National Marine Fisheries
9 Service's researchers were talk -- entered the discussion and
10 there is really no resolution. I don't think that this is the
11 right proposal, but it is an area of concern, I'm not sure how
12 best to address it. I know my.....

13 MS. HEIMAN: Right now those boats that are
14 operating in the Kenai Fjords, I hope I'm not out of line, but
15 are operating using their best judgment within the law, as far
16 as how close to come, how many boats to come up to a pod of
17 whales at the same time, and I've been out there a couple of
18 times this summer just watching this interaction. You know,
19 how close those boats were going to the haul outs and it just
20 seems -- and really it is based on their judgment now, there's
21 no real guidelines that are given out there at all.

22 MR. WRIGHT: It depends on the captain and how
23 much of thrill.

24 MS. HEIMAN: And do you know who they listen
25 to? Craig Matkin. I mean, he basically says, here what I

1 think and they do based on what he's saying to them.

2 MR. WRIGHT: He has guidelines in that book
3 actually.

4 MS. HEIMAN: Oh, he does?

5 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Every boater should have
6 that book with them and read those guidelines. That's for
7 killer whales.

8 DR. SPIES: The 100-yard guideline has been an
9 informal thing that has gone along with the Marine Mammal
10 Protection Act, to my understanding, it's not part of the law,
11 as Bruce said, but as you get more and more people -- I mean,
12 you go to California and see the.....

13 MS. HEIMAN: And they have a lot stricter.....

14 DR. SPIES: Just where I live there's people
15 chasing harbor seals off the rocks all the time.

16 MS. HEIMAN: Well, I know that they have people
17 out there in Hawaii, both there and on the east coast, actually
18 enforcing and we don't have anything like that at all. And we
19 don't really -- I mean, because we're not enforcing any
20 specifics. That's my understanding.

21 MR. WRIGHT: That's the problem. It's a big
22 issue.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I don't have a question on
24 it, but on 371.....

25 DR. SPIES: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I think we need to
2 continue it, but maybe I'm wrong, but I think the principal
3 investigator is late on a report. Can we put in there the
4 investigator -- I think it's the octopus report, that.....

5 DR. SPIES: Sandra is tracking that one.

6 MS. McCAMMON: Don Shell

7 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

8 MS. SCHUBERT: Oh, you're thinking of David
9 Shield.

10 MS. McCAMMON: This is Don Shell.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: This is Don Shell, okay.

12 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, different PI.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

14 MS. SCHUBERT: Yeah, different person, similar
15 name.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

17 MS. HEIMAN: Can I ask one more question? Go
18 ahead.

19 MS. SCHUBERT: No, I'm done.

20 MS. HEIMAN: You are. I asked about this the
21 other day, about the contaminate levels in killer whales and,
22 Molly, I think you mentioned that there were -- there was some
23 other money for contaminates in this.....

24 MS. McCAMMON: There's another proposal in here
25 to do a synthesis of contaminate work that's being done in the

1 Northern Gulf and so the view on this proposal is that it was
2 premature until we have an overall synthesis first.

3 MS. HEIMAN: Okay, great.

4 MR. WRIGHT: This particular proposal, they
5 have samples that they've archived, they just want them
6 analyzed for contaminants.

7 MS. HEIMAN: This one right here, 461?

8 MR. WRIGHT: Four -- yeah, 461. And they can
9 just stay in the freezer, right? I think that's.....

10 MS. HEIMAN: Thanks.

11 DR. SPIES: Good anticipation. Okay, the
12 Nearshore Cluster. Three subheadings here, Research Mechanisms
13 Limiting Recovery, Research and Monitoring Recovery and
14 Developing Monitoring Techniques.

15 Under the first subheading here, close out 025 with the
16 Nearshore Vertebrate Predator Project. This has been ongoing
17 for a number of years and 2000 is going to be the year where
18 they draw it altogether in a final report.

19 The next project is Project 290, continuing the
20 Maintenance of the Hydrocarbon Database, this is done in the
21 NOAA Auke Bay laboratory. And that needs to be continued until
22 we've completed all the information that's out there on
23 hydrocarbons and we're doing some hydrocarbon sample analysis,
24 just a fraction of what we did previously. We need to continue
25 that activity because it ensures quality assurance and ensures

1 a good interpretation of data and orderly keeping of the
2 database.

3 Project 348 is a close out of the project which has
4 looked at the effects of oil contamination on river otters.
5 Those river otters have now been released from Alaska SeaLife
6 Center in Prince William Sound mainly and some of them are
7 being followed with radio tags. And there's going to be some
8 publications that come out of the 348 project in the year 2000,
9 six or seven publications are being proposed.

10 And Project 379, which is the Assessment of Residual
11 Oiling and Using This Reducible Enzyme in Fish; P450. The only
12 reason that's being deferred is we need to get the results from
13 this year's field effort to see, in fact, if there is an
14 indication that this enzyme is being induced from oil exposure
15 and then we can decide whether we want to go ahead and do a
16 second year of the study.

17 In the second cluster, we're going to close out 090,
18 the Oiled Mussel Bed Monitoring. Those samples are being
19 collected and analyzed this year and this is the close out in
20 2000.

21 Start Project 407, which is some harlequin duck
22 population dynamics monitoring. We haven't been monitoring the
23 population for a couple of years in harlequin ducks, except
24 during the boat surveys and this is a survey technique that's
25 designed specifically for harlequin ducks. And we're focusing

1 on the March surveys. We had a choice between March and
2 autumn, we're doing both, and we decided to go with March
3 surveys because under Project 423, which is the next one, it
4 looks at the winter survival of harlequin ducks in the Sound,
5 so it makes more sense to monitor them in March.

6 Project 423 is a continuation that's being recommended,
7 we're not only doing the harlequin duck survival work, but
8 continuing to monitor sea otters. These are the two population
9 of nearshore vertebrate predators that we want to keep an eye
10 on until we achieve full recovery.

11 Project 459 is a close out of the Residual Oiling of
12 Armored Beaches in the Gulf of Alaska, mainly along the Alaska
13 Peninsula.

14 466 is the close out of the small project on Barrow's
15 Goldeneye Recovery Status.

16 Project 598 is Publication of the Exxon Valdez Oil and
17 Regional Background Hydrocarbons, this work has mainly been
18 done by Jeff Short and his associates at the Auke Bay
19 laboratory.

20 And Project 599 is a new project which will be
21 evaluating the congregation of coal and natural seeps, which go
22 to the Yakataga seep south and east of the spill area to look
23 at the source of background hydrocarbons. And the significance
24 of this that the -- if it's -- there's a background of oil
25 hydrocarbons in Prince William Sound, those could be

1 biologically available. But if the background which Exxon
2 claims to be true in Prince William Sound is mainly of coal,
3 then a little bit of oil has a lot more significance that's
4 left over from the spill, so it's a matter of sorting those two
5 sources out and this is a pretty definitive project to do that.
6 And it's, again, being proposed by the chemist at the Auke Bay
7 laboratory.

8 And the final cluster is Develop Monitoring Techniques,
9 Project 510 is one more of the projects that's going to form
10 the foundation for the GEM Program and that's going to be
11 looking at the two recovery studies we've done on the
12 intertidal invertebrate communities throughout the Sound and
13 looking at how to best design something for future monitoring
14 of intertidal communities. We had the Coastal Habitat Program
15 we supported for a long period, University of Alaska, we also
16 had NOAA Hazmat Study that's been carried off independently
17 with some of the criminal settlement. Those projects were
18 designed differently, so we're asking the investigators to look
19 at both of those projects and make recommendation to what we
20 can do cost effectively in the future on the GEM Program.

21 Are there any questions on this cluster?

22 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

24 MR. TILLERY: I would like just to note that on
25 one of them, 537, I believe, there's a reference that --

1 category for planning for future oil spills, which is not
2 relevant to EVOS restoration recovery and that is contrary to
3 the State's position, but we understand that it's consistent
4 with the Department of Justice's view. Just for the record.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Bob.

6 DR. SPIES: Dave.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Question. The Yakataga oil
8 seeps, is that going to look at, maybe, the Katalla area also
9 that has oil, you know, surface oil?

10 DR. SPIES: They've done some work under the
11 previous project to work on Katalla, but kind of the focus of
12 the -- it's gone broader geographically to look at the Yakataga
13 oil seeps. And if they can nail down that situation we'll have
14 a much better idea how important those two systems are down
15 there for supplying -- I mean, Jeff Short has got a photo of
16 the Katalla River, I think, in which the seeps go into, it's
17 either a river or a creek, which Exxon claims to be the source
18 of oil and it's got a band of coal that you can see from the
19 air in the photograph, so it's an interesting situation with
20 the.....

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Maybe we'll have a road in
22 there.

23 DR. SPIES: Okay. We move on to the next
24 cluster, Seabird, Forage Fish and Related Projects. Three
25 subcategories, Research the Mechanisms for Limiting Recovery,

1 Research and Monitoring of the Populations and then the third
2 category is some Restoration Work Populations.

3 Project 163, which has been the multi-year large
4 ecosystem Project APEX that's been quite successful. We know
5 already it's being closed out in the year 2000. It's a large
6 close out and involves a lot of activity and preparation of the
7 final report and publications and it'll probably spill over
8 into 2001 as well with the publication work, much as SEA had
9 done.

10 Project 169 is closed out and this is the study that
11 we've done of genetics of seabirds in the Northern Gulf of
12 Alaska, including murrelets, guillemots and murrelets.

13 Project 287 is the Seabird Oceanographic Relationships.
14 This is a new start. This was proposed last year, if you
15 remember, by Bob Day of ABR in Fairbanks and he has been
16 voluntarily going on the GLOBEC's cruises on a quarterly basis
17 out to the GAK line and other places on the Gulf of Alaska and
18 gathering seabird data in relation to oceanographic conditions.
19 And so by buying in one year of study here, we essentially get
20 pretty much three or four years of data. And the reviewers
21 recognize the importance of this sort of data in trying to
22 understand what's going on with seabirds in the Gulf of Alaska.
23 That program will continue to be of interest to us in the GEM
24 Program, which it probably will be.

25 Project 306 is the Sandlance Ecology Program, that's a

1 close out.

2 Project 327 is the Guillemot Research at the Alaska
3 SeaLife Center, it's been recommended for continuation and that
4 has both the objectives of establishing the pigeon guillemot
5 colony and also looking at the effects of oil on pigeon
6 guillemots.

7 Project 338 is the Adult Murre and Kittiwake Survival
8 that is looking at tagging data and relationships between
9 colonies and over-winter survival of those two key species.
10 That's being recommended for continuation.

11 Close out of 347, which is the NOAA-based project on
12 fatty acid profiles in forage fish and their prey. It involves
13 looking at lipids.

14 Project 479 is being recommended for continuation,
15 that's the effects of food stress. Dr. John Piatt and his
16 co-workers have very successfully looked at corticoid steroids
17 as an indicator of food stress in seabird colonies and this
18 may, in fact, achieve quite a bit efficiency in the future of
19 being a monitoring tool.

20 And then Project 516 is the publication on murrelet --
21 Kittlitz murrelet habitat use.

22 Under Research and Monitoring Populations, 144A, is the
23 common murre population monitoring that's gone on for quite a
24 few years and that's being closed out. We're committed, at
25 least tentatively, to doing tri-annual marine boat surveys. And

1 159 is the continuation of that, it's been a couple of years
2 since we've done that, 2000 will be the third year.

3 And start Project 501, which is the protocols for
4 long-term monitoring of seabirds. Again, this is another
5 foundation block potentially for GEM looking at the massive
6 amount of seabird colony data that we have and identifying the
7 most efficient ways to design a cost effective program in the
8 future of seabird monitoring in the Northern Gulf of Alaska.

9 And, finally, under Restoring Populations, Project 453,
10 Removal of Introduced Foxes, which is a follow-up on work that
11 the Trustee Council previously did in the Semidi Islands is
12 being deferred. Not that it's not an important project, it's
13 just considered a little bit lower priority than some of the
14 other ones. We were down to where we were really making some
15 hard choices here.

16 Are there any questions on that cluster?

17 MR. TILLERY: I have.....

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

19 MR. TILLERY:several, I think. This 163,
20 am I correct that it's going to cost 1.2 million dollars to
21 write a report?

22 DR. SPIES: This is the close out of the.....

23 MS. McCAMMON: They wanted two and a half
24 million.

25 DR. SPIES: In fact, one of the members of the

1 Trustee Council is intimately involved in making up a budget of
2 that particular project.

3 MR. TILLERY: How many people do the -- how
4 does it take 1.2 million dollars to do a report? And you don't
5 even get -- that doesn't even include the synthesized report
6 for publication in an appropriate journal? That's more money?

7 DR. SPIES: This is -- we've gone back and
8 forth quite a bit on this project, the original amount that was
9 put in was -- this year for consideration was quite a bit more
10 and we've worked back and forth with Bruce and other members of
11 the APEX Project to try to get this down to as reasonable
12 number as we could to get this whole thing tied up. It's got a
13 lot of different components to it, I think, was it 13 different
14 studies?

15 MR. WRIGHT: Fourteen.

16 DR. SPIES: Yeah.

17 MS. SCHUBERT: But there's a lot of data
18 analysis, too.

19 DR. SPIES: A tremendous amount of data
20 analysis left, it's not just writing.

21 MS. SCHUBERT: Yeah, right.

22 MS. McCAMMON: This is the last field season,
23 this summer, so it also includes the data analyses from this
24 field season. It's one of the reasons that we couldn't fund
25 salmon sharks.

1 (Laughter)

2 MR. WRIGHT: Well, I don't care, let's just cut
3 this sucker out, man, put all this into salmon sharks.

4 MR. TILLERY: I'm wondering how many people do
5 you get for 1.2 million dollars?

6 MS. McCAMMON: The primary reason is because it
7 is the data analysis, they're doing lots of cruises this summer
8 and it's the completion of that, and that data analysis is very
9 expensive. And when you have 13 or 15 people finishing their
10 data analysis and then also writing manuscripts that go into
11 the final report, it's expensive. The original request was
12 well 2.....

13 MR. WRIGHT: 1.7, wasn't it?

14 MR. TILLERY: According to this thing it was
15 1.7, yeah.

16 MS. McCAMMON: It was a -- yeah, we got it down
17 quite a bit by focusing on just kind of synthesis efforts to
18 compile and put together all of the information rather than --
19 I mean, originally the proposers wanted to do a lot of
20 individual manuscripts, kind of spinoffs from the research that
21 they've done over the past few years, but we got it down this
22 far. This kind of synthesis is expensive.

23 MR. TILLERY: But you put a sharp pencil.....

24 MS. McCAMMON: We put a very sharp pencil to
25 this. If you want to put a sharper one it's up to you.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: We can put the sharks in
2 here or something.

3 MS. McCAMMON: I think it's a reasonable
4 request just given the fact that they do have to do so much
5 data analysis with this field season.

6 MR. WRIGHT: A lot of the data that's being
7 collected this summer will be analyzed and synthesized through
8 this budget here and then the write-up, the individual
9 synthesis. You don't know how many times I've gone through
10 this budget and I've tried to reduce it more and more and it's
11 basically, look it, you cut me any more, I can't do the data.
12 You can just -- I'll give you all the data and I'll walk away
13 from the project. So we tried to use -- yeah, I've gone
14 through the budget several times with these characters and I do
15 believe this is a just -- I think we'll get good bang for the
16 buck, there's a lot of money, but I think we'll get good bang
17 for the buck.

18 Unlike the SEA Project, the APEX Project has picked up
19 additional projects as we've gone, so we'll include in the
20 final report some of the projects that have ended and closed
21 out.

22 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

23 MR. WRIGHT: And then all these -- I think
24 we've picked up -- well, we picked up aerial surveys, jelly
25 fish, a modeling exercise.....

1 MS. McCAMMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the
2 things we looked at closely, the SEA Project close out funding
3 was \$850,000, the Nearshore Vertebrate Predator was about
4 500,000, so when the initial request came in we had anticipated
5 I think about eight or 900,000 for close out, something like
6 that.

7 MR. WRIGHT: Nine, I think, yeah, nine or one.

8 MS. McCAMMON: So when we saw the original
9 request we were shocked and asked them several times to go
10 through and reduce it and justify it and I think they've done a
11 decent job of doing that.

12 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes.

14 MR. TILLERY: Another question. On 287, in the
15 Chief Scientist's recommendation it talks about how the
16 proposer is already funded two years -- basically obtained two
17 years of funding -- of seabird data already, and for one year
18 of Trustee Council support we get three years of data. Does
19 that mean they wouldn't give the two years of existing data
20 unless we give them money?

21 DR. SPIES: Well, he will probably publish it,
22 but he's been doing this, essentially, for free. He works for
23 a consulting firm in Fairbanks, so -- he's essentially been
24 doing it on his vacation time and so.....

25 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

1 DR. SPIES: We buy into this project -- I mean,
2 not that he wouldn't -- the data wouldn't be hidden away
3 anywhere, but we do kind of buy into this project for one year.

4 MR. TILLERY: Okay. So he.....

5 MS. McCAMMON: And his firm has also indicated
6 they're not very supportive of him doing it again this year
7 unless he gets funding for it somewhere else, because he also
8 not only does vacation time, but puts in time analyzing the
9 data.

10 DR. SPIES: Right for some donated time from
11 his firm, so.....

12 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

13 MR. BOSWORTH: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

15 MR. BOSWORTH: Bob, there's a Project 557
16 that's recommended not be funded and there was testimony on
17 that earlier. The testimony sounded credible to me, but I
18 wanted -- but there are good reasons in here for the decision,
19 but I wanted to know if you had heard anything in the testimony
20 that would suggest that we should revisit this question of not
21 to fund?

22 DR. SPIES: Well, I'm glad you brought it up
23 because I did want to mention it because there has been quite a
24 bit of public testimony, as you say, and the proposer here was
25 this morning in front of the Trustee Council trying to convince

1 you it's a decent project. I think the reviewers thought it
2 was a good project in general. There were some things about it
3 that made it difficult to draw real firm conclusions in terms
4 of what these congregations of predators are really feeding on
5 and trying to get that -- make that link is somewhat difficult,
6 but overall it's a good project. One of the things we would
7 have liked to have seen is a little stronger tie in with some
8 of the ongoing EVOS projects. For instance, we have harbor
9 seal work down in that area for the last four or five years
10 that looked at the populations of harbor seals and looked at
11 fatty acids as an indication of what they're feeding on and the
12 satellite tag animals down in that region of the Sound and that
13 wasn't drawn together into this, so I think it has a way to
14 evolve and one of the things we did do is invite Dr. Thomas to
15 come to the herring workshop that I talked about earlier here,
16 as a place to kind of interact and see what might be done in
17 the future, so I think it's probably worth revisiting, but
18 again, it's another one of these cases where we kind of
19 hesitate to start something that's out there on its own that's
20 not connected to the rest of the scientific program kind of
21 this late in the Restoration Program.

22 MR. BOSWORTH: Are you suggesting that this be
23 a deferral as opposed to do not fund?

24 DR. SPIES: We weren't suggesting it be a
25 deferral, we may want to look at it next year. Dr. Thomas, if

1 he does come to the herring workshop may get some ideas as to
2 how to repropose it next year, I think we can look at it fresh
3 again next year.

4 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

6 MR. TILLERY: This was a proposed two-year
7 study, what would the second year cost on this?

8 MS. McCAMMON: We would have to get the
9 proposal out and.....

10 DR. SPIES: On 557? I don't have that number.

11 MS. SCHUBERT: I'd have to go look, yeah. I'd
12 have to go look, which I could do.

13 MR. TILLERY: One of the comments we got was
14 from North Pacific Processors, who indicate that -- as I
15 understand their letter, it would indicate that this study
16 could end up saving them hundreds of millions of dollars. And
17 I guess I'm wondering for a couple hundred, \$300,000 why they
18 don't fund this study? Is there some reason that.....

19 MS. McCAMMON: You'd have to ask them.

20 MR. TILLERY: I mean, why is an industry -- it
21 seems like somebody else could do this if it's that important
22 to.....

23 DR. SPIES: Well, I think the -- what I
24 understand is it potentially involves sea lions, it potentially
25 involves pollock, that's a real important question that -- not

1 only in the Northern Gulf of Alaska, but also in the Bering
2 Sea, so I think that's probably where they're coming from on
3 this.

4 MR. TILLERY: Maybe someone -- if they do bring
5 this back next year, someone ought to explore with them the
6 idea of partnering on the program since it's going to make them
7 a lot of money.

8 DR. SPIES: We could certainly pass that
9 comment on to Dr. Thomas.

10 MS. SCHUBERT: It's 200,000 for next year.

11 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

12 DR. SPIES: Next cluster is Archaeological
13 Resources. Just one project, 007, which is a monitoring
14 project for site index monitoring. That's a close out in the
15 year 2000.

16 Any questions on that project?

17 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

19 MR. WRIGHT: What's the contingency on that
20 one? This is the archaeological one.

21 MS. McCAMMON: That is actually now a fund,
22 it's been changed.

23 DR. SPIES: Yeah, it's been changed.

24 MS. SCHUBERT: We were waiting for a revised
25 DPD which we now have and have reviewed, so it's on your pink

1 change sheet.

2 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. Same budget level?

3 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

4 DR. SPIES: Okay, the next cluster is the
5 Subsistence cluster. First subcategory is Enhance or Replace
6 Injured Resources. Project 222 the Anderson Creek cleanup,
7 that's the creek that goes through the Chenega Village that has
8 some problems with garbage in it and the Forest Service -- I
9 understand that the Forest Service is conferring with DEC and
10 Chenega over the next appropriate steps to deal with that
11 problem before we consider any kind of restoration action with
12 regard to putting -- supplementing fish populations.

13 There's also another stream in the area that's being
14 looked at, it's the O'Brien Creek Enhancement and that's being
15 deferred for a number of reasons, I'm trying to recall them
16 all, but this O'Brien Creek will probably not support coho
17 salmon and -- but there are some chums in there, but the data
18 are a little bit -- taken at the wrong time to really assess
19 the chum population, certainly making more pinks in O'Brien
20 Creek since there's a pink salmon hatchery next door, it
21 doesn't seem to make a lot of sense though. And it also ties
22 in with the questions on Solf Lake as another subsistence
23 source for fish. Enhancement and replacement of resources for
24 the local people there.

25 Continue with 225, this is the enhancement program at

1 the Port Graham pink salmon hatchery.

2 Continue 247, another supplemental program for us.
3 Rearing coho salmon in the Kametolook River, mainly using egg
4 boxes and pretty low tech kind of -- but very successful
5 community project in that area.

6 Project 256, the Solf Lake stocking is being deferred.
7 Sandra, if you could just jump.....

8 MS. SCHUBERT: We are waiting for information
9 now on the cost effectiveness.....

10 DR. SPIES: Right.

11 MS. SCHUBERT:of the enhancement.

12 DR. SPIES: Right. And Project 416, I
13 mentioned already -- excuse me, 263, the Port Graham Stream
14 Enhancement Improvements. We -- there has been a fish ladder
15 put in there, there have been improvements, stream side
16 vegetation put in and so we need one more year of following up
17 on the success of those particular efforts.

18 I mentioned 416 already.

19 482, the Optimization of the PSP Test Kit. This is a
20 really interesting project, it had been proposed previously and
21 we went through quite a bit of work between now and when the
22 original proposal was put in, in May, we'd like to do something
23 with PSP, but the ASTF was involved and some of -- the Alaska
24 Science and Technology Foundatin was involved and funding some
25 of the development of the test kits and we were trying to

1 straighten out the relationship between what we might do in the
2 field and what Alaska Science and Technology Foundation might
3 do supporting laboratory work. We finally identified a role
4 for the Trustee Council that would be essentially participating
5 in the field testing of the kit once it was optimized for the
6 toxins that are in shell fish in Alaska. So ASTF is going to
7 be looking at the optimization of the kit to match the
8 particular profile of toxins that are in shellfish in Alaska.
9 So recommending conducting that study next year. I think
10 that's something the people of Kodiak Island really like,
11 there's been, as you know, a number of deaths from shellfish
12 poisoning in the last few years.

13 The next subcategory is Enhancement, Replacement of
14 Lost or Reduced Services, it includes Project 273, which is a
15 continuation of the surf scoter life history and ecology. And
16 we're recommending work at the SeaLife Center because we had
17 essentially a very unacceptably high rate of mortality for
18 implants of tags in surf scoter in the wild and we want to do
19 this under controlled conditions at the SeaLife Center to try
20 to reduce that problem.

21 Project 401, which is the spot shrimp survey that
22 supplements, this is done by some Native group in Valdez and it
23 supplements some of the Fish and Game work with pot surveys of
24 spot shrimp in Prince William Sound. There's a lot of concern
25 about what the spot shrimp populations maybe doing. It crashed

1 just before the spill and during the time of the spill, so
2 quite a bit of interest to continue to do that by the local
3 people.

4 And the last category here is Increased Involvement of
5 Subsistence Users in the Restoration Process. We're
6 recommending continuation of Project 052, the Community
7 Involvement and Traditional Ecological Knowledge and the
8 project continues to evolve and there's a little bit stronger
9 accountability even in this next year, which I think is quite
10 good.

11 Project 210 is the Prince William Sound, Lower Cook
12 Inlet Youth Area Watch, we're recommending continuation of that
13 very successful program.

14 Project 245 is the Community-Based Harbor Seal
15 Biosampling. Again, a very, very successful program, people in
16 the communities out there are very much interested in harbor
17 seals for subsistence resource and being able to go out there
18 and obtain samples at the same time that they are harvesting
19 the resource. It not only involves them, but provides some
20 valuable source of tissues and information for the biologists
21 that are studying harbor seals.

22 Project 481 which is the Documentary on Intertidal
23 Resources, that is being deferred and, Sandra, you'll have to
24 fill in here again, if you might. Do you know the reason for
25 the deferral?

1 MS. McCAMMON: It was priority.

2 MS. SCHUBERT: It was really just a question of
3 priority.

4 DR. SPIES: Yeah, right.

5 And then, finally, Project 610, which was a proposal to
6 extend the Youth Area Watch that was so successful within
7 Prince William Sound, Lower Cook Inlet to Kodiak Island is
8 being recommended for starting.

9 Are there any questions on the Subsistence cluster?

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I got a couple of questions.
11 On 225, I was just reading your recommendation that says, it is
12 disappointing that the promised thermal marking did not occur
13 in fiscal year 99, but fund. So.....

14 MS. McCAMMON: It didn't occur as a result of
15 the fire at the hatchery. They were not able to successfully
16 do it, but they do plan doing it this next year.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. And this would be a
18 one year, that's what I see in here or -- I don't anything for
19 01 or 02.

20 MS. SCHUBERT: I think this is the last year.

21 MS. McCAMMON: I think this is the last year of
22 it, with the idea that it was through a certain number of
23 cycles and then they would get fish returning at that time or
24 seek funding elsewhere.

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. And I got a question

1 on 256, it says defer. We've -- ongoing stocking program there
2 and we're doing work, you know, to modify the access and it
3 says it's deferred pending more detail, engineering drawings,
4 evaluation of sustainable. Shouldn't it be fund contingent upon
5 this information rather than defer because we initiated the
6 project, we have one or two years of stocking in there. And
7 the cost effectiveness, I think, has already been done and the
8 maintenance will be conducted by the Forest Service, so the
9 maintenance isn't a question, but -- so that's the question I
10 got.

11 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yes.

13 MS. McCAMMON: All along the recommendation
14 from the Council has been just to do the feasibility study and
15 the Council made clear that there was no commitment to actually
16 doing any construction afterwards, so there was no commitment
17 from the very beginning that this would be funded by the
18 Council. And the reason for deferring it is that we got a
19 drawing last week or the week before which was a very simple
20 drawing of what the fish ladders would like. And when we asked
21 for additional information we were told it was in the detailed
22 project description, but it's not, and we need additional
23 information to do that, in order to analyze whether it's worth
24 expending the money on this. Information needs to be provided
25 in terms of what is the maintenance cost of this, how many fish

1 are expected to be produced at what cost? Just so under the
2 procedures for supplementation projects, that's the kind of
3 analysis we have to go through, and that information hasn't
4 been provided to us.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. But the question is
6 between defer and fund contingent on this information or is
7 that.....

8 MS. McCAMMON: Well, until this information is
9 provided, I mean it's certainly up to the Council, if you want
10 to change that, but my recommendation would be to defer until
11 the information is provided, it can be analyzed and then a
12 recommendation on whether or not to go forward.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. There's just lots
14 of.....

15 MS. McCAMMON: But if the Council wants to
16 change that, that's up to you.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS:support by Chenega and
18 Tatitlek for the project and I'd just like to see it. Because
19 it's referenced, I think he referenced it in the Anderson
20 Creek, the subsistence fishery would be right there at Self
21 Lake for them.

22 DR. SPIES: Yeah, there's three projects that
23 all bear on that, you know, supplementing the locally available
24 salmon and.....

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Right.

1 DR. SPIES: It doesn't seem to make sense to
2 fund all of them, I think when you put them all alongside each
3 other.....

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Right, and I'm not saying
5 fund all of the, yeah. Because, you know, when you look at it,
6 you know, you look at Port Graham, you're right, it's not big
7 enough to support silver salmon in the sustainable, so it's not
8 a logical project, but.....

9 MR. BOSWORTH: Maybe -- excuse me, maybe I'm
10 not familiar enough with the process, but is it more likely to
11 be funded under one alternative than the other, I mean,
12 deferral as opposed to it being resubmitted or -- is that
13 concern?

14 MS. McCAMMON: No, this is just a deferral, so
15 I anticipate the information will be provided and it'll be
16 reviewed and it'll be before you in December.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Defer until our December meeting.

18 MS. McCAMMON: And it was.....

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Well, I just see some fund
20 contingent and some deferred and I'm just trying to figure out
21 what's the.....

22 MS. McCAMMON: Fund contingent it doesn't come
23 back to the Council again.

24 MR. BOSWORTH: Oh.

25 MR. TILLERY: It's Executive Director.

1 MR. BOSWORTH: And you're asking it to be fund
2 contingent?

3 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Well, upon additional
4 information.

5 MS. McCAMMON: The only problem is the Chief
6 Scientist can't make a recommendation until that information is
7 provided. We did ask, I think, Ken Holbrook when he was here,
8 whether this would have any problems deferring a decision until
9 December and he said, not.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is that true?

11 MR. HOLBROOK: It doesn't change the approach.

12 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

14 MR. TILLERY: I have, I guess, a question about
15 127, the Tatitlek coho release, it's for \$11,000. We've done
16 this for five years and I think my hope in all of these, and I
17 thought the idea was that these would become self-sustaining,
18 they would basically make money off the returns and pay for
19 future. Apparently this hasn't become self-sustaining, yet,
20 but Mr. Kompkoff has, in his letter, indicated that he is
21 searching out ways of making funding available for the future
22 for this project, other kinds of funding. My own view would be
23 to put this in the deferred category to see if between now and
24 December Tatitlek can come up with a way to deal with this in
25 the future, to fund this in the future. And if they can come

1 up with a viable way of funding it in future years, beyond this
2 year, then I would certainly be amenable to spending \$11,000
3 this year.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, this is very
5 similar to the Chenega Chinook Remote Release Project where the
6 Council committed to doing the entire -- funding the entire
7 cycle and from the very beginning has said, we'll only fund the
8 one cycle, if you want to continue, look for additional
9 funding. So they've been aware that this has been an issue all
10 along. And, in fact, before the Council started funding it,
11 Valdez Fishery Association donated tags and the project was
12 done gratis, prior to when the Council started assisting with
13 the funding. And we did look at this and I guess the view was
14 that between Tatitlek Corporation and something through VFDA
15 and the fact that notice had been given for the past five years
16 and that this was consistent with the Chenega remote release,
17 that it was appropriate to go ahead and not fund it this year.
18 But it's certainly up to you.

19 MR. TILLERY: Well, again, I wouldn't be
20 inclined to fund this based upon "we're going to look for
21 funding next year" but if by December they can come back and
22 say, hey, we found some funding in here for the next three,
23 four, five years or something and they can sort of show us that
24 it's going to be there, can you help us bridge this year, then
25 for \$11,000 I think that would be in -- to me it's worth the

1 incentive it might provide for them to do it.

2 MR. WRIGHT: I think that's a reasonable idea.
3 You're saying that if we would make funding available for one
4 year, contingent upon their showing us evidence that they'll
5 line up.....

6 MR. TILLERY: Well, if they show -- I guess I'd
7 do it the other way, if they show us evidence that they've got
8 funding lined up for a number of years down the road.....

9 MR. WRIGHT: But they can't.....

10 MR. TILLERY:but they can't get that
11 funding, for whatever reason, they can explain why they can't
12 get that funding for this year, then I would be willing to
13 approve \$11,000 for this year.

14 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, what I would
15 suggest, perhaps, is we keep it as do not fund, but indicate to
16 Mr. Kompkoff that if by December they haven't found funding
17 that I would bring the issue back up to the Council. Because
18 we have done this with a lot of projects where we have given
19 notice years in advance that, you know, this is going to be the
20 last year and in almost all cases people have, if they take it
21 seriously, they start looking for additional funding and
22 they're able to find it. This is such a small -- it's such a
23 small amount either way, you think, ah, it's no big deal, but
24 it's also a small amount that they really -- Tatitlek
25 Corporation, for example, should be able to fund something like

1 this or they should be able to find funding for something.

2 MR. TILLERY: But, to me, it's not just the
3 fact that they can't find funding for this year, but that
4 somehow they convince us that they do have funding for the
5 future years, so we don't see this request in next year's Work
6 Plan also. So, yeah, I don't think there's any particular
7 magic in saying defer as long as we could communicate to them
8 that if they can come up with future funding and if they can
9 demonstrate why the funding is not available this year, that we
10 will look at this again.

11 MS. McCAMMON: Chenega, again, and I don't - I
12 mean it is a small amount and I don't want to argue over this
13 or anything. Chenega chose not to -- their funding was ended
14 this year, they didn't resubmit the proposal, they are not
15 doing it on their own, the project was just ended.

16 MR. TILLERY: Uh-huh.

17 MS. McCAMMON: And I guess it's a choice
18 that.....

19 MS. SCHUBERT: Well, the other example is the
20 Clam Restoration Project, which the Council put a lot of money
21 into over a number of years, but always with this notion that
22 '99 would be the last funding and, sure enough, they didn't
23 come back to us and they got funding from other sources. So I
24 think that our approach to Tatitlek was trying to be consistent
25 with how we handled other community projects of this type.

1 MS. McCAMMON: It's always hard to be serious
2 about looking for additional funding when you know that you can
3 come back.

4 MR. TILLERY: Okay. And -- yeah, that's why I
5 think it would be important to make it clear that they're not
6 going to get any funding unless they cannot just demonstrate
7 that funding is not available this year, but demonstrate that
8 it will be available in the future.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah, my understanding of
10 the project, it's not a sustainable fishery though, is it?

11 MR. TILLERY: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: It's just that you put in
13 rearing pens, release them and then you harvest them when they
14 come back.

15 MS. McCAMMON: It's a put and take, yeah.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

17 DR. SPIES: It's a put and take.

18 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, it's got to be sustainable
19 from -- just because somebody else is giving the money or you
20 take fish from it and sell them, you know, some kind of a cost
21 recovery fishery.

22 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. Any other comments?

23 (No audible responses)

24 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: What's the Trustee Council's
25 wishes here?

1 (No audible responses)

2 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I'll propose to go back to
3 him and say, if you can find, you know, additional sources that
4 my feeling is that we would support it this year and you need
5 to take it on from there in perpetuity or as long as you want.
6 But that may open the door for Chenega to come back and
7 say.....

8 MR. TILLERY: But if Chenega can come back and
9 say, hey, we will -- you know, this is important to us and we
10 will find a way to fund it for the next five years and, geez,
11 can you get us through this year, and it's a relatively small
12 amount of money, I'd be inclined to do that too, it's.....

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Let's treat them both the
14 same then.

15 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, if they can do that.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

17 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Michele.

19 MS. BROWN: Well, isn't the answer -- I mean,
20 the door is always opened for somebody to come back in, so if
21 we send a consistent message to all these people who are on
22 that edge, you know, if there's some compelling reason why you
23 couldn't get over the hurdle this year, but here's the
24 long-term picture, you can come back and propose it. That
25 would be a more consistent message to all of them than to just

1 pick one now and say, you know, come and prove to us that you
2 got funding, because there's others in the same boat that we
3 said no to.

4 MR. TILLERY: Well, we haven't said no, they
5 just didn't come back.

6 MS. BROWN: Because they took us seriously.

7 MS. McCAMMON: No, we also -- because they took
8 us seriously when we said no that it was going to be no.

9 MS. BROWN: Your problem is you don't have
10 teenagers yet.

11 (Laughter)

12 MS. BROWN: And I predict problems for you.

13 MR. TILLERY: That's fine, I think that's.....

14 MS. BROWN: Is that a way to go? To sort of
15 send out the same message to everyone?

16 MR. TILLERY: Yes, I think that's good.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay.

18 MS. McCAMMON: So this becomes what? What is
19 the message? Is it a do not fund or a defer or what?

20 MS. BROWN: Well, what I was proposing is it's
21 a do not fund, but then to all -- to the similarly situated
22 projects the word is if -- you know, if there is some
23 compelling way you can get funding, but you couldn't do it this
24 year, we will entertain revisiting these if you resubmit for
25 December. What do you think about that?

1 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, it's.....

2 MS. McCAMMON: Okay.

3 DR. SPIES: What's the Council's pleasure at
4 this point? My understanding is you wanted to be finished by
5 3:00 o'clock; is that correct?

6 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

7 DR. SPIES: Then I can speed it up.

8 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Bruce.

10 MR. WRIGHT: I have one comment on the last
11 one, that last -- on the Surf Scoter Life History and Ecology.
12 It show -- this is 273. This has been some real interesting
13 findings that we've had even though we've had a fair amount of
14 mortality, we've had some success with these satellite tags in
15 these birds. So for this proposal we're going to take the
16 birds to the SeaLife Center and see if we can install these
17 things and the bird won't die, but we're not going to any.....

18 DR. SPIES: Try to do it under controlled
19 conditions. As you know, they did -- last year they were done
20 out in the open and released and there was a very high rate of
21 mortality, I don't know what it was, but the principal
22 investigator thought it was unacceptably high to continue with
23 the project as it had been conducted that year, so the idea was
24 to bring them into the SeaLife Center and a vet do it under a
25 sterile condition and have them recover in a more controlled

1 environment and see if we can improve their survival rate for
2 the birds. And I believe that the plan was to take those birds
3 out and release them in wild once they.....

4 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

5 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, okay, great. This is just
6 fascinating, because these scoters can be found from the North
7 Slope all the way down to San Diego Bay.

8 DR. SPIES: Yeah.

9 MR. WRIGHT: And they're highly susceptible to
10 picking up contam -- this is a really interesting story, but my
11 real question is, there's not funding indicated for 01; is that
12 true?

13 MS. SCHUBERT: It was submitted just as a
14 two-year project with 2000 being the second year, so.....

15 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Interesting research.
16 Okay, that's all I have.

17 DR. SPIES: The Habitat Improvement cluster.
18 Protection and Restore, close out of 180, Kenai Habitat
19 Restoration Program, a long successful project.

20 Project 339, we're proposing funding completion of the
21 human use of wildlife disturbance model, but defer the
22 publication until their final report is completed, as I
23 understand.

24 And Project 563, which is the Kenai River Stream Bank
25 Rehabilitation Evaluation, there is a recommendation to defer

1 that until more information is provided about the methodology
2 employed in that particular project.

3 Any questions on the Habitat Improvement cluster?

4 (No audible responses)

5 DR. SPIES: Ecosystem Synthesis is next. First
6 subcategory, Developing Models for Research Results. Project
7 330 is a close out. This is a mass-balance model that's been
8 very successfully done by Dr. Pauly, University of British
9 Columbia and Dr. Pimm at the University of Tennessee. Dr. Pimm
10 had to wait until Dr. Pauly provided some additional
11 information and so that part of the project is a little bit
12 behind, but we're expecting the whole thing to be closed out in
13 2000.

14 The next subcategory, Integrate and Synthesize Project
15 Results. Project 278, which is the -- it's going to be
16 completed next year and that's the Kachemak Bay Ecological
17 Characterization Study.

18 There's a deferral on 391, which is the Cook Inlet
19 Database, until a prototype is developed and evaluated. That's
20 the only reason for that deferral.

21 Project 530, which is the Evaluating Scientific
22 Sampling of Oil Spill Effects and that is a project that is to
23 go through. What we've learned in the last 10 years about how
24 to design and sample after an oil spill and try to distill that
25 information and make it available in a report and publications.

1 The next subcategory, Preparation for Long-Term
2 Program. I've referred to a number of these particular
3 projects before, but here's another group of them. Project 340
4 is to do Long-Term Oceanographic Monitoring, this is the
5 maintenance of the GAK line out of Seward which has 27 years of
6 continuous oceanographic data. And we're partners with NSF in
7 this program and we're recommending continuation of that.

8 Project 360 is the Guidance for Future EVOS Activities,
9 and this is the NRC Polar Research Board, a review of the
10 Long-Term Monitoring Program and we're recommending starting
11 that as soon as we have the plan completed later on this year.

12 We're recommending conducting Project 455, which is an
13 Evaluation of the Data System Needs for Support of Long-Term
14 Monitoring Program. We want to have the system in place before
15 we move forward with the GEM Program, we need to plan and start
16 that now.

17 Project 567 is being recommended for deferral. This is
18 the Monitoring Plan for Environmental Contaminants and we've
19 had one meeting to evaluate how we're going to move forward on
20 this and there's going to be an RFP developed and sent out and
21 as soon as the firm that is identified for doing this work then
22 we can move forward with reconsidering this project.

23 And, finally, Project 630 is the starting of the
24 planning for GEM and this is the -- it's the internal project
25 that we're doing right here, so that's support for staff and

1 some of my time to continue the GEM planning process in the
2 year 2000.

3 I'm just going to turn it over to you at this stage.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Okay, yeah. Any questions on
5 any of those?

6 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Bob, I've got one. The only
7 question is on 360. I read in here that it's the sole source,
8 is that what that is, rather than, you know, contract or.....

9 MS. McCAMMON: With the National Resource
10 Council.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: All right.

12 MS. McCAMMON: Research Council, yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is there a -- I'm just
14 curious, you know, why there and not do it out for contract?

15 DR. SPIES: Well, they're kind of the premier
16 organization in the U.S. for giving stamp of approval to a
17 scientific project, they're probably kind of the highest
18 authority in the country for doing this sort of thing. I think
19 that their endorsement of this program, which I would predict
20 is fairly likely, in general terms, would be a real plus for
21 the program.

22 I'm just going to turn it over to Molly to deal with
23 the last three clusters, Public Information, Science Management
24 and Administration Project Management and anything else.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. On this next cluster what

1 we did was put -- just for negotiation purposes and contracting
2 purposes with the Alaskan SeaLife Center, put all of the bench
3 fees for all of the proposed projects together there and they
4 totaled 429.8 thousand dollars. But the projects -- then we
5 took it out and put it in the individual project, so it's not
6 this on top of what the individual projects cost. The
7 individual projects already have it plugged into their total
8 number. But that's full funding this year except for funding
9 for any rent or use of the facility, but that's the actual
10 costs for feeding, for all of the animal care, for utility
11 costs. And as you can see by the breakdown it's expensive to
12 keep marine mammals in captivity. So that's where the highest
13 costs go to.

14 The next one, 414.....

15 MS. HEIMAN: So, Molly, just for.....

16 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

17 MS. HEIMAN: You're in the Project Management
18 250 line, right?

19 MS. McCAMMON: No, I'm up here on 350, Alaska
20 SeaLife Center bench fees.

21 MS. HEIMAN: Oh, okay, so bench fees -- can you
22 explain to me a little bit?

23 MS. McCAMMON: Bench fees, it's the cost of
24 using the SeaLife Center facility, it's the cost of -- if
25 you're doing harbor seal research it's the cost of feeding the

1 harbor seals and having vets take care of them, having people
2 there 24 hours a day taking care of the animals. The utility
3 cost of keeping them in a tank.

4 MS. HEIMAN: So we might fund something
5 earlier, but then there's some bench fees associated with it?

6 MS. McCAMMON: The bench fees -- these are all
7 broken down and included in the individual projects, but if you
8 want to look just total what it costs.....

9 MS. HEIMAN: I see.

10 MS. McCAMMON:what we're paying them for
11 all those projects.

12 MS. HEIMAN: Great, thanks.

13 MS. McCAMMON: Although I think we're having
14 one project deferred now, so we'll have to adjust it.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Molly, you mentioned these
16 are the bench fees, is there also space fees, then, on top of
17 this?

18 MS. McCAMMON: No. That others are paying for,
19 but not us. So if some other private group were using the
20 SeaLife Center they would pay additional above and beyond this.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: This would be the total cost
22 to the Trustee Council?

23 MS. McCAMMON: Yes. And I only pulled it out
24 here for two reasons, one is Fish and Game, again, is doing the
25 direct contract for all of the bench fees for all of the

1 agencies on behalf of the Trustee Council rather than each
2 agency doing a separate contract with the SeaLife Center. And
3 then, secondly, there was interest just seeing what the Council
4 was actually paying for this, so it helps to pull it
5 altogether.

6 The second project, 414, Ecosystem Research Results,
7 this is a proposal by Jennifer Allen who's been doing a lot of
8 work with the SEA Project and the Science Center. It's to take
9 the results of the SEA Project, NVP Project and APEX Project
10 and do some work at putting this on our website in a fashion
11 that makes it interesting and informative to the general
12 public.

13 MS. HEIMAN: Will you just say what those
14 letters are one more time for me?

15 MS. McCAMMON: I beg your pardon?

16 MS. HEIMAN: NVP, you just read a whole bunch
17 of letters and.....

18 MS. McCAMMON: Nearshore Vertebrate Predator.

19 MS. HEIMAN: Okay.

20 MS. McCAMMON: The three major ecosystem
21 projects.

22 MS. HEIMAN: So what is.....

23 MS. McCAMMON: And actually taking some of that
24 information and putting it in an interesting informative way on
25 the web.

1 MS. HEIMAN: Okay. So can you start over
2 again, what is this project?

3 MS. McCAMMON: This project by Jennifer Allen
4 who does a lot of work at the Science Center and is very
5 creative, her original proposal was to take the three major
6 ecosystem projects and put them on kiosks on various places
7 around the state, so you could push a button and find out what
8 these projects had learned. When we looked at it we thought it
9 would be better to develop something that went directly onto
10 our website where it could go to a larger audience, you could
11 update it more easily and it's cheaper. And so we -- this
12 proposal would do that.

13 The next proposal, 605 is kind of complementary to the
14 other proposal and it's Information Transferred to Managers,
15 Stakeholders and the Public. This would be done -- a lot of it
16 would be done with in-house staff and it would be working on
17 our web page again, reorganizing it, making it more accessible
18 to the public. It would be holding a workshop, putting
19 together a publication of all the research results important to
20 managers and putting it in a way that they could see what was
21 potentially of use to them. Hold a workshop, an open house
22 type workshop and paying to have managers from various agencies
23 in Fairbanks, Juneau, Cordova, Kodiak come to this workshop and
24 learn more about the kinds of information that's being
25 developed through the program and making them aware of how it

1 might be of use to managers.

2 And the next project here, Project Management, \$487,600
3 and this is for all the Trustee agencies, this provides that
4 extra level of coordination, oversight, public information that
5 our program has that a lot of the other programs funded through
6 Federal dollars or others aren't able to do. So we ask our
7 project agencies to actually do a lot more than is typically
8 asked of them in terms of coordination, integration and
9 responding to the public.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Molly, I see 487.6, but then
11 under fiscal year 2000 I see 401.9, is.....

12 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, 401.9 is the.....

13 MS. McCAMMON: Did we get those one number off?

14 MS. SCHUBERT: Wait, I'm not sure.

15 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, your revised request is for
16 487, you got 401. Yeah, 401 is the recommended.

17 MS. SCHUBERT: Yeah, the 487 is the.....

18 MS. McCAMMON: I'm sorry, so 401 is the
19 proposal, I'm sorry. Yeah. And these numbers go down as the
20 overall program, yeah.

21 And then outside the Work Plan or the annual funding
22 level are a number of projects, one of them, we can come back
23 to the 100 project. The 126 budget is for Habitat Protection
24 Support and this has now been changed to a fund and the actual
25 number is, 373.5 thousand is the final number. It is possible

1 in looking at this budget that sometime during the fiscal year
2 there may be a need for additional funds depending on if Koniag
3 goes forward, if the Old Harbor exchange goes forward, some of
4 these things, but this is best guess in terms of what the needs
5 are in this fiscal year, but there is the possibility there may
6 be a need for additional funds for this one.

7 424, the Restoration Reserve, we do have -- this would
8 be to continue the Council's policy of putting in 12 million
9 dollars into the Restoration Reserve, but actually transferring
10 it depending on when those funds are actually available and not
11 being needed for additional commitments in the fall. And we do
12 have a motion in -- yeah, when you get ready to do that, just
13 specific for the reserve.

14 And the, finally, defer 514, the Lower Cook Inlet Waste
15 Management Plan Implementation. The plan is -- actually it's
16 taken some changes and it's being coordinated with some other
17 efforts and it's taking longer than originally anticipated.
18 And so the proposal to fund the actual implementation probably
19 won't be ready until the spring, so that was deferred, probably
20 beyond December.

21 The other one, the 100 budget is for Public
22 Information, Science Management, Administration. The proposal
23 there is for \$2,033,900, this is down about a half a million
24 from the current year's budget. It reflects decreases in the
25 Restoration Office staff and travel, and contractual items.

1 The liaison funding is reduced from six months per agency to
2 four months per agency and cost reductions throughout. And
3 we'll be reducing that again next year and the year after
4 trying to get to a level that is sustainable for a five or six
5 million dollar program which include administrative costs.

6 I guess that's it. Is there any questions?

7 MS. HEIMAN: Is there somewhere I can look just
8 to understand what all is involved in project management in
9 that line?

10 MS. McCAMMON: In the -- would it be in the
11 project abstract? Yeah, project management it involves doing
12 quarterly reports -- Sandra.

13 MS. SCHUBERT: We -- what I was going to say,
14 we do have a detailed project description, just a few pages
15 long, that I could give you.....

16 MS. HEIMAN: Let me just ask this.

17 MS. SCHUBERT:that kind of lists the
18 things that the project managers are expected to do.

19 MS. HEIMAN: Project managers meaning within
20 the staff of the Trustee.....

21 MS. McCAMMON: No.

22 MS. SCHUBERT: No, each agency has project
23 managers on staff that oversee the implementation of the
24 restoration project funded though your agency. So in your
25 agency.....

1 MS. HEIMAN: So that's you guys?

2 MS. BOHN: (Nods in the affirmative)

3 MS. SCHUBERT:Dede -- Dede.....

4 MS. HEIMAN: But I only have like one-tenth and
5 three-tenths and four-tenths, I don't see how it adds up. I
6 guess it.....

7 MS. SCHUBERT: Well, there's also some money in
8 the 100 project for the agency liaisons, which in most case
9 now, as the program has shrunk, are the same people, so people
10 are funded half in the -- or part in the liaison budget, part
11 in the part in the project management budget and.....

12 MS. HEIMAN: So let's say we have -- everybody
13 has about 50,000 or something like that, each agency? Is it
14 equally divided?

15 MS. SCHUBERT: No.

16 MS. McCAMMON: No, it varies a lot by how many
17 projects you have. A lot.

18 MS. SCHUBERT: I got it. Actually DOI and NOAA
19 and Fish and Game have more than the other three agencies
20 because you guys have most of the projects.

21 MS. HEIMAN: And where -- your budget just for
22 overall operation doesn't even show up in this; is that
23 correct?

24 MS. McCAMMON: That's the 100 budget, continue
25 100, and that's on a separate tab back here, 00100, and the

1 actual.....

2 MS. HEIMAN: Oh, I see.

3 MS. McCAMMON: We've given you the entire
4 budget.

5 MS. HEIMAN: I got you. Okay, it just took me
6 a minute to follow along.

7 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. What we've found with
8 project management is that some agencies were putting in -- we
9 didn't originally have this as a line item, but some agencies
10 were -- in their individual projects would be this one month of
11 someone for project management.

12 MS. HEIMAN: Right.

13 MS. McCAMMON: Or two months of someone and it
14 became very -- and it was done in a very inconsistent manner
15 and it was hard to judge what the actual effort was in terms of
16 overseeing these projects. Now, typically, an agency gets
17 funding from lots of different sources and your regular agencies
18 management staff oversee all of those projects and wouldn't
19 get, necessarily, additional funding to do that. But we do ask
20 for a higher level of cooperation, integration, follow-up on
21 reports funding, response to the public and to some of these
22 other demands than other funding sources. And so the Council
23 has chosen to support those costs, but as long as they're
24 proportionate to the number of projects and the amount of
25 funding that's coming in.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

2 MR. TILLERY: You just mentioned a separate
3 resolution for the reserve?

4 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

5 MR. TILLERY: You anticipate a separate vote on
6 that one?

7 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

8 MR. TILLERY: Okay. I just wanted clarify.....

9 MS. McCAMMON: And you do have a separate
10 motion on the Work Plan, that's one of your pink sheets.

11 MR. TILLERY: This contemplates interest rate
12 five percent, in the past we've done that sort of based on the
13 actual liquidity account.

14 MS. McCAMMON: It's averaged out at five
15 percent, so for Traci's accounting it's much easier just to do
16 it at a flat amount.

17 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

18 MS. McCAMMON: It's difficult enough.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: So, Molly, we have two
20 resolutions in draft.....

21 MS. McCAMMON: There are two resolutions and I
22 have some suggested changes for the first one, on the Work
23 Plan, which would be to take the resolution, move the Trustee
24 Council adopt the recommendations for FY00 projects as outlined
25 in spreadsheets A and B and as amended by spreadsheet C adding

1 -- dated August 6, 1999, along with the changes agreed to by
2 the Council at today's meeting. And those would be changing
3 the halibut satellite tags and the salmon shark proposals from
4 do not fund to defer. And then continuing on with the
5 following conditions, if a principal investigator has an
6 overdue report from a previous year no funds may be expended
7 involving the PI, unless the report is submitted or schedule
8 for submission is approved by the Executive Director. And,
9 two, a project's lead agency must demonstrate that requirements
10 of NEPA are met before any project funds may be expended. And
11 these are conditions that have been -- we've had in the past.

12 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh. I move that.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: You're not going to repeat
14 that, Michele?

15 MS. BROWN: Do you want me to? No.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is there a second?

17 MR. BOSWORTH: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any discussion?

19 (No audible responses)

20 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Hearing none, all in favor
21 say aye.

22 IN UNISON: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: All opposed?

24 (No opposing responses)

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Motion carries.

1 And the second motion in front of us is concerning the
2 Restoration Reserve for 12 million; is that correct?

3 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Mr. Tillery.

5 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I would move
6 that the Trustee Council approve the transfer of 12 million
7 dollars from the CRIS liquidity account into the Exxon Valdez
8 oil spill settlement account CRIS reserve fund. Pending the
9 event the transfer is not completed by September 15th, 1999,
10 interest against these funds shall also be transferred.
11 Interests shall be accrued from September 15, 1999, until the
12 time of transfer into the CRIS liquidity account. Interest
13 shall be calculated at the rate of five percent. These funds
14 shall be invested pursuant in the investment policy in the
15 reserve fund. The Executive Director shall certify when these
16 funds are available for transfer and the applicable of
17 investment policy approved by the Trustee Council.

18 MS. BROWN: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: We have a motion and second,
20 any discussion?

21 (No audible responses)

22 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: All in favor say aye.

23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: All opposed?

25 (No opposing responses)

1 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Motion carries.

2 MS. HEIMAN: So what this just means that we
3 just passed is that when the bill passes we get to move money
4 or what is this? I'm not really sure what we just voted on. I
5 have no idea what that means, sorry. I know we just voted on
6 it, but I would like to understand it even though we're trying
7 to get Rob out of here.

8 MR. TILLERY: We transferred money into the
9 reserve account, but we recognize that it's not going to
10 probably be physically transferred into the separate reserve
11 account in the CRIS right away, so during the interim before
12 it's transferred it begins to accrue interest at a rate of five
13 percent, so that when it does get transferred into that account
14 instead of 12,000,000 it'll be like 12,200,000 or something
15 like that. It's basically holding it harmless for the fact
16 that we're not transferring it because we lose money on fees,
17 absorbent fees.

18 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, also, this started
19 in 1994 when the Council started the reserve account and
20 actually setting money aside in it. I actually think as a
21 result of the March resolution this action probably isn't
22 necessary because that basically made a decision on the
23 disposition of the future funds, but it continues to show the
24 public that the Council still is committed to setting funds
25 aside for the future, so it's probably a duplicative action in

1 a way, but I think it's important to kind of carry on that
2 practice.

3 MR. TILLERY: Uh-huh.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Okay. Any other activities?

5 MS. McCAMMON: Did you want to do.....

6 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I've been looking for Maria,
7 I don't see her here.

8 MS. SCHUBERT: Let me go see.

9 MR. SWIDERSKI: No, she's got it.

10 MS. McCAMMON: While we're waiting for her, one
11 other item is you notice in the back of your packet you don't
12 have a tab for newspaper clippings. Because you haven't had a
13 meeting for a while and these are all the clippings that we've
14 received since January in here and rather than just copy
15 everything, we made a packet here and then a packet for the
16 Juneau office and if you want to look through them, you're more
17 than welcome to. This one is of particular interest because it
18 is the 10-year anniversary media coverage and it's interesting
19 looking at all the newspapers across the country, yeah, mostly
20 outside the state, and how they covered the same event. And
21 it's kind of interesting to see who they talked to and what
22 spin they put -- each paper put on it. And, again, we have
23 copies here and we have copies in Juneau and if you just want
24 to check it out for a while, we can circulate it around.

25 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: We'll wait a minute and see

1 where they are and if not we'll, I guess, recess. I don't like
2 that word, but.....

3 (At ease - waiting for Ms. Liskowski)

4 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I think better than me
5 reading it, I think I'll just give everybody a chance to read
6 it. Is that.....

7 MS. HEIMAN: Yeah.

8 (Pause)

9 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Has everybody had a chance
10 to review it?

11 (No audible responses)

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I move to authorize the
13 purchase of the Duck Flats parcel, Prince William Sound 1028,
14 for \$120,000 as identified with the stipulations in the
15 resolution dated 8/9/99. It's been read by the Trustee Council
16 and I will ask for a second and then we'll open it up for
17 questions.

18 MS. HEIMAN: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Is there any questions?
20 Comments?

21 MS. HEIMAN: Does this take care of the access?

22 MR. TILLERY: Yes.

23 MR. WRIGHT: Does this take care of who's going
24 to manage it? Does it say that the Forest Service -- or do we
25 put that in here or something like this here?

1 MR. TILLERY: Well, it's.....

2 MR. WRIGHT: Is that something we don't have to
3 put in the resolution? I guess I thought I had seen it in past
4 ones.

5 MS. LISKOWSKI: The sale has to go to the
6 United States by our title standards, so it would just go to
7 whatever the appropriate agency for management.

8 MR. TILLERY: Providing funds to the United
9 States to purchase it, that's all we.....

10 MR. WRIGHT: That would be the Forest Service,
11 okay.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any other questions or
13 comments?

14 (No audible responses)

15 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: All those in favor say aye.

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any opposed?

18 (No opposing responses)

19 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Motion carries.

20 Is there any other business for the Trustee Council
21 today?

22 (No audible responses)

23 CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Do I hear a motion to
24 adjourn?

25 MR. WRIGHT: No.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. BOSWORTH: So moved.

CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: There's a motion to adjourn,
do I hear a second?

MR. WRIGHT: No, not to adjourn.

MR. TILLERY: Second.

MS. HEIMAN: We're not adjourning, right?

MR. WRIGHT: We're not going to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I heard a motion to adjourn
and a second, all those in favor say aye.

MR. TILLERY: Aye.

CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Any opposed?

MS. HEIMAN: Oh, this was the reason for
recessing?

CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: Yeah.

MS. HEIMAN: Okay. So why are you saying that,
you just giving him a hard time?

MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

MS. McCAMMON: So he can chair it next time.

CHAIRMAN GIBBONS: I didn't hear any opposed,
the Trustee Council is adjourned.

(Off record - 3:21 p.m.)

(MEETING ADJOURNED)

