

9.12.10

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Meeting
Thursday, December 16, 1999
11:00 o'clock a.m.

Fourth Floor Conference Room
645 G Street
Anchorage, Alaska

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF LAW: (Chairman)	MR. CRAIG TILLERY Trustee Representative for the Attorney General
STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME: (Telephonically)	MR. FRANK RUE Commissioner
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR:	MS. MARILYN HEIMAN Special Assistant to the Secretary for Alaska
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - U.S. FOREST SERVICE (Telephonically)	MR. DAVE GIBBONS Trustee Representative
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE - NMFS: (Telephonically)	MR. STEVE PENNOYER Director, Alaska Region
STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:	MS. MARIANNE SEE for MS. MICHELE BROWN Commissioner

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

1	TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT:	
2	MS. MOLLY McCAMMON	Executive Director
3	MS. TRACI CRAMER	Director of Administration
4	MS. SANDRA SCHUBERT	Director of Restoration
5	MS. REBECCA WILLIAMS	Executive Secretary
6	DR. BOB SPIES (Telephonically)	Chief Scientist
7	DR. PHIL MUNDY	Science Coordinator
8	MR. HUGH SHORT	Community Facilitator
9	MR. JOE HUNT	Communications Specialist
10	MS. DEDE BOHN	U.S. Geological Service
11	MR. ALEX SWIDERSKI	State of Alaska
12		Department of Law
13	MS. GINA BELT	Department of Justice
14	MR. KEN HOLBROOK	U.S. Forest Service
15	MR. BUD RICE	National Park Service
16	MS. CAROL FRIES	Alaska Department of Natural Resources
17	MR. DAVID ROGERS	Alaska Department of
18	(Telephonically)	Environmental Conversation
19	MS. KELLY ZEINER	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

AGENDA

Call to order	03
Approval of Agenda	04
Approval of October 22 and November 30, 1999 meeting notes	05
Executive Director's Report (Investment Work Group Formation)	05
Public Comment	
Mr. Paul Panamarioff (via letter read by Ken Anderson)	12
Mr. Pete Kompkoff	21
Deferred FY00 Work Plan Projects	13/24
Adjournment	82

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

9
0
1
2
3
4
5

2
3
4
5

3
4
5

4
5

5

1 seconded that we approve the October 22nd and the November 30th
2 meeting notes; is there any discussion on that?

3 (No audible responses)

4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, all in favor of
5 approval say aye.

6 IN UNISON: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed?

8 (No opposing responses)

9 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, the meeting notes are
10 approved. The third item is the Executive Director's report.
11 Ms. McCammon.

12 MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
13 only item I have to report on today is to discuss a memo that
14 you should have received yesterday afternoon entitle "Joint
15 Trust Fund Financial Issues." As you know, we did get the
16 legislation through Congress this fall and it has been signed
17 by the President that allows the Council to remove the trust
18 funds from the Court Registry Investment System and the United
19 States Treasury and invest them elsewhere. Traci Cramer, our
20 Director of Administration, and I have had a number of
21 discussions with folks at the State Department of Revenue, with
22 private investors, such as Dave Rose and others, trying to
23 figure out exactly what the next process is in terms of making
24 some decisions on where to deposit these funds.

25 What you have in front of you is a draft time line in

1 terms of decision-making. We want to do this in a way that's
2 thoughtful, but also move fairly quickly on it, so we can take
3 advantage of any investment opportunities as they arrive. It
4 became clear in our discussions that the kinds of decisions
5 that need to be made are beyond our expertise and we really do
6 need a larger group to look at some of these issues before
7 coming back to the Trustee Council with a recommendation. And
8 for that reason I would recommend that we establish a working
9 group that would be comprised of Traci Cramer and myself at the
10 Restoration Office, a Federal Trustee or designee, a State
11 Trustee or designee and at least two external investment
12 experts.

13 We've had a number of volunteers who have offered to
14 assist us in kind of working through some of the issues in
15 terms of setting priorities, looking at some of the pros and
16 cons of various options and coming up with a plan of action.
17 These include Bob Storer at the Department of Revenue, Peter
18 Bushery who is with the State's Permanent Fund, but who is
19 retiring and has offered to give us some assistance and other
20 private investors also.

21 So I think we can -- it just seems like since this is a
22 major issue that we need a few more people involved in working
23 through some of these as we come to a final decision on this.

24 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, thank you. Do you
25 have questions from Juneau about this issue?

1 MR. RUE: I have one. This is Frank.

2 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Rue.

3 MR. RUE: I guess I would be concerned that if
4 we do get outside expertise, we be careful that it's obvious
5 not to include someone who might eventually bid on something or
6 compete to have the funds put in their.....

7 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

8 MR. RUE: Now, does the Permanent Fund Board,
9 does that put us in that dilemma, because one option would be
10 to have the Permanent Fund Commission (phone cut out) that to
11 manage.

12 MS. McCAMMON: Well, the Permanent Fund is not
13 a realistic option unless we -- it would take State legislation
14 to have the Permanent Fund Board do it, so it's not one of the
15 options we're looking at, certainly in the near term.

16 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Now, obviously having the
17 Department of Revenue is a potential option for
18 investments.....

19 MS. McCAMMON: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY:and Bob Storer would be a
21 member of that. I don't know how other people feel about this
22 and I have less of a problem with having a government agency
23 essentially have two hats, that is, give us some advice and
24 perhaps later be one of the groups that might be a candidate
25 for investing the fund, but I don't know how other people feel

1 about that, it certainly is an issue.

2 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, as long as you
3 have really broad representation on the committee and we all
4 make the final decision, I'm not sure that's a real concern.
5 What are you looking for here, an actual motion on the people
6 or just a sense that the Council to proceed in that fashion and
7 let the Executive Director go with it?

8 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I think it probably needs to
9 be in the form of a motion that we establish this working group
10 but, you know, it doesn't have to be -- it's not like a
11 resolution, but just an oral motion would be.....

12 MR. PENNOYER: I would move that we establish
13 the working group and expect them to function along the time
14 table of that the Executive Director has put forward, with us
15 meeting again in January to discuss and February to decide.

16 MS. SEE: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, it's been moved and
18 seconded; is there discussion about this?

19 MR. RUE: This is Frank again in Juneau. I
20 think it's a good idea, I would suggest that you, Craig, be the
21 State rep.

22 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay.

23 MS. SEE: DEC endorses this as well.

24 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there a suggestion
25 for a Federal representative?

1 MR. PENNOYER: Gibbons is shaking head, he
2 doesn't want to, I'm shaking my head, I don't want to.
3 Marilyn?

4 MS. HEIMAN: I'll do it.

5 MR. PENNOYER: I can't see you.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, Marilyn is saying she
7 will do that. And should we essentially leave the selection of
8 the, at least, two external investment experts up to the other
9 people in this working group?

10 MR. RUE: Fine with me.

11 MR. PENNOYER: Fine with me.

12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay.

13 MR. GIBBONS: Same here. Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes, sir.

15 MR. GIBBONS: I was approached by our legal
16 counsel yesterday and one thing that this group needs to look
17 at is the FACA implication, so just, you know, start it early.

18 MR. RUE: The committee, you mean, or the
19 subcommittee, the committee of the.....

20 MR. GIBBONS: I mean this group just needs to
21 look at what the FACA implications would be of setting up a
22 group to invest money for the Trustee Council.

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, I concur that that's
24 something that we need to look at, I'm not sure if FACA is
25 implicated but it might be and so we would actually ask --

1 probably Maria has more help or has probably given more thought
2 to this than anybody else. We would get up with her and Gina
3 to talk about the FACA.....

4 MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, that's just what I'm
5 requesting. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there other
7 discussion on the motion?

8 (No audible responses)

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

11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed?

13 (No opposing responses)

14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, the motion carries.

15 Ms. McCammon, is there anything else to your report?

16 MS. McCAMMON: That's it for today,
17 Mr. Chairman, other than just to remind the Trustees that the
18 next meeting is scheduled for January 31st here in Anchorage.
19 It's anticipated to start once the plane arrives from Juneau
20 and it could be an all day meeting, but there's quite a few
21 items on the agenda.

22 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, Molly, can you
23 give us a little smattering of what those items are?

24 MS. McCAMMON: We'll be discussing -- the next
25 GEM draft will be a major item of discussion. We'll also be

1 discussing investments in more detail at that time and then the
2 third major item is further discussion of small parcels and
3 habitat protection program.

4 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anything
6 else?

7 MS. McCAMMON: That's it, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. It would appear that
9 it is time for the public comment period. We have several
10 people that have signed up to comment from the -- actually we
11 have one person from other areas and we'll start with that.
12 Chenega Bay, Pete Kompkoff. Chenega Bay, are you on line?

13 MR. SHORT: I think he's here in person, he's
14 running a late.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Oh, this is here. Oh, I'm
16 sorry, never mind. Let me find out who is -- okay, is Chenega
17 Bay -- they're supposed to be on line. Gail Evanoff, are you
18 there?

19 (No audible responses)

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is anybody from Chenega Bay
21 on line?

22 (No audible responses)

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. How about Ouzinkie?

24 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Ken Anderson.

25 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Does anybody in

1 Ouzinkie have any comments they'd like to make?

2 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, I was -- Paul Pan [sic] is
3 at another meeting in Kodiak, so he left a note for me to read
4 for you guys.

5 The EVOS Trustee Council (indiscernible) have published
6 research September '99 contains 287 projects funded through the
7 Trustee Council through '99. The Chief Scientist recommended,
8 the Executive Director's recommendation both agree that two
9 previous video projects, harbor seal and herring nearshore
10 resources, were enough about our local and traditional
11 concerns. Although there have been, for instance, 34 projects
12 funded for river and sea otters, with more being funded for
13 FY2000, plus the Trustee Council is soliciting for future sea
14 otter proposals. I would recommend that the Trustee Council
15 recommends Chenega Bay and Ouzinkie documentary film on the oil
16 spill impacts on subsistence use of intertribal resources.

17 And that's all I have.

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. And do
19 you have anything yourself to add to that or is that it.

20 MR. ANDERSON: No. No, I don't.

21 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Trustee Council
22 members, are there any comments or questions?

23 (No audible responses)

24 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, thank you very much,
25 Mr. Anderson. And, in addition, let's see, we have -- it

1 doesn't look like -- is there anyone else on line who would
2 like to make a comment at this time?

3 MR. RUE: There's no one here in Juneau.

4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. All right. And then
5 coming to Anchorage, is there anyone in Anchorage that would
6 like to make a comment?

7 (No audible responses)

8 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, the only one I have
9 listed is Pete Kompkoff, you say he should be here?

10 MR. SHORT: (Nods head in the affirmative)

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, we'll see how it works
12 if he gets here in time, perhaps we can take his comment at a
13 later time.

14 Okay, with that we will close the public comment
15 period, subject to reopening it for Pete Kompkoff if he does
16 get here pretty quickly.

17 Then that brings us to deferred FY2000 Work Plan
18 projects. Ms. McCammon.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also
20 wanted to make sure that the Trustees in Juneau, you should
21 have copies of two letters that were received, one from the
22 Kodiak Area Native Association regarding the documentary
23 proposal and the other one from the Tatitlek Village IRA
24 Council regarding the Tatitlek Coho Salmon Project. So I just
25 want to make sure that those two are there, they were faxed

1 down there, but they are regarding the Work Plan. We have.....

2 MR. PENNOYER: Molly.

3 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

4 MR. PENNOYER: I have the Tatitlek one, I don't
5 know that I've seen the Kodiak one.

6 MR. RUE: Yeah, that's my understanding also.

7 MS. McCAMMON: It was faxed down there, we'll
8 double check and may fax it again right now. The Kodiak Area
9 Native Association one was signed by Fred Christensen in
10 support of the documentary.

11 MR. PENNOYER: Which project is that?

12 MS. McCAMMON: That is Project 481.

13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That's the one that
14 Mr. Panamairoff's statement referenced.

15 MS. McCAMMON: Correct.

16 Okay, going through the projects. I'll go through
17 these individually, we have Dr. Spies on line for more detailed
18 questions and Dr. Mundy is also here as we get into things.
19 There are a few small changes that have been made since this
20 draft went out and those will be noted as we go through it
21 also. I should mention that.....

22 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Well, actually before we go
23 any farther, maybe I better check -- oh, never mind, there's
24 Marilyn.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Remind you that the total

1 approved in August for the Work Plan was 7,321,000, the target
2 that the Council had given for this year's Work Plan was
3 between eight to nine million, with indications of a preference
4 to be closer to the eight million than to the nine million.
5 With that in mind we went through all of the deferred projects
6 and took a fairly hard look at things in terms of what
7 absolutely needed to be done this year and what were the
8 highest priorities.

9 The 127, the Tatitlek Coastal Salmon Release, this
10 project had been a do not fund originally because the Council
11 committed to funding one cycle of this project which was
12 completed last year. However, the project proposer had
13 difficulty getting funds for this year, for this replacement
14 project, and this is now before you again for one additional
15 year of funding. And there is a letter from the village chief,
16 Gary Kompkoff, indicating that they have obtained funding for
17 future years. So this proposal is now a fund contingent for
18 \$11,400. It's a fund contingent because there are a number of
19 late reports that have not been submitted, these are close to
20 being done and we hope to have the submitted in the very near
21 future.

22 MR. PENNOYER: Do you want questions as we go
23 along on these projects? How do you intend to approach things?

24 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, we can do this any way
25 you want to, but since we've got so few projects, I would

1 suggest that just as we go through a project we go ahead and
2 ask questions, so are there any questions on this Coho Salmon
3 Release?

4 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, my question was
5 did the amount recommended satisfy the request in the letter?
6 And I think Commissioner Rue has an additional question, but I
7 want to know was there a relationship between this 11.4 and
8 what the letter is talking about because I couldn't find any
9 funding tracking there.

10 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it did.

11 MR. RUE: Okay. Mr. Chairman, this is Frank.
12 I have a basic question, maybe Molly could give us a sense of
13 how much flexibility we're going to have next year, because a
14 number of these projects may be good projects that we're
15 talking about possibly starting up in the next cycle. Can you
16 give us a general sense of how much money will be available,
17 that is not committed to a long-term project for next year?
18 How much of a discretion are we going to have the next fiscal
19 year, 30 percent of our budget, 50? Rough numbers, can you
20 give us -- assuming we're going to be somewhere in the seven
21 million, six to eight million range, I assume, I can't remember
22 what we told ourselves.

23 MS. McCAMMON: Right. Mr. Chairman,
24 Commissioner Rue, if all of these -- the projects that were
25 approved in August, if they were all to continue next year at

1 the anticipated level that is nearly three million dollars
2 worth of work. If the recommendations for these deferred
3 projects go forward and continue next year, that would be an
4 additional, approximately, 400,000, so roughly three and a half
5 million dollars for continuing projects. If the target, and
6 our thinking here at the staff level, and this will also be a
7 decision at the January 31st meeting as to what to use as a
8 funding target, and we're going to be prepared to recommend six
9 to seven million for an Annual Work Plan next year at that
10 time. That would give about two and a half million for new
11 projects.

12 MR. RUE: Okay, thank you very much.

13 MS. McCAMMON: Two and a half to three and
14 half.

15 MR. RUE: That helps me get some fix on where
16 we want to be. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any other
18 questions on the Coho Salmon Release Project?

19 MR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is Dave.

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Gibbons.

21 MR. GIBBONS: How successful has this been?
22 We've funded this through a cycle of coho, has it been
23 successful for Tatitlek?

24 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, yes, this project
25 has been very successful, it produces in the neighborhood of a

1 couple of thousand of adult returns to Bolder Bay, which is
2 right adjacent to the village. It is a very popular project.
3 They had this project going before the Council added funding to
4 it, they were doing it beforehand, they basically got the fry,
5 I believe, for free from the hatchery. The Council, then,
6 supported it for five years and it's the intent of the village
7 to continue on with this project. When the subsistence uses
8 survey was done about a year ago it was clear that these fish
9 are being used for subsistence purposes, yes.

10 MR. RUE: Yeah, I think another indication is
11 the fact they're willing to put new funds into it for, as I
12 understand, an administrative SNAFU, that got us into us going
13 to fund it for another year. So the fact that they're willing
14 to invest other funds, to me, indicates it has been successful.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there other questions or
16 comments?

17 (No audible responses)

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, let's move on to
19 Pristane Monitoring.

20 MS. McCAMMON: All right, 195, Pristane. This
21 project would continue previously funded work on pristane
22 concentrations in mussels. It's a tool that is used to monitor
23 the copepod concentrations available to pink salmon juveniles.
24 What this project is doing is developing a relatively
25 inexpensive measure of marine productivity which then would

1 allow you to predict future fisheries production and harvest
2 levels in Prince William Sound. This has been -- this is a
3 very unique project and it's been pretty successful at
4 demonstrating this. The need to increase the accuracy is
5 reflected in the fact that this proposal increases the sampling
6 frequency during April and May and also increases the number of
7 monitoring stations near the hatcheries. The recommendation is
8 to fund, contingent on approval of a revised DVB.

9 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there question?

10 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes, Mr. Pennoyer.

12 MR. PENNOYER: And I already know the answer to
13 this, probably, since this is an old project, but how many
14 years is this going to be funded by EVOS and when is the
15 decision point in which the tool is passed off and why is two
16 more years, for example, definitive?

17 MS. McCAMMON: I would turn that question --
18 it's the fifth year of a seven year project and I would turn
19 that question over to Dr. Spies.

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Dr. Spies.

21 DR. SPIES: Yeah, right. I'm on line this
22 morning down here in California and it's a beautiful day.

23 MR. RUE: Nice here.

24 MR. PENNOYER: Oh, quiet.

25 DR. SPIES: Between storms. As Molly said this

1 is the fifth year of a seven year project and what's proposed
2 in the next couple of years is to work on these relationships
3 between the accumulation of this marker compound, pristane and
4 mussels and the productivity of the fishery, particularly the
5 hatchery release, the fry and their rate of return. Jeff Short
6 has found a relationship now between the chemical
7 concentrations in the mussels and the strength of the return.
8 (Phone cut out) claims some 30 percent of the variability, not
9 perfect, but it's somewhat predictive and he believes that by
10 redesigning and working on this a couple more years that we'll
11 will probably see some greater level of predictability here
12 that could, in turn, be used possibly for the wild stocks as
13 well. So we're hoping that the project will pay off and it's
14 something we may want to consider further on as far as part of
15 the GEM Program. So it may continue beyond where it is if it
16 looks like it's needed.

17 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there other
19 questions or comments?

20 MR. GIBBONS: Just a question, Mr. Chairman,
21 this is Dave. This is kind of unusual and normally you see
22 what's deferred in December and a recommendation to go down,
23 this went up. Was there some other activities added to the
24 project or.....

25 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, based on the

1 review of the work and analysis of the work done this fall
2 there was a decision made that they did need to increase the
3 sampling frequency and monitoring stations and that's what is
4 reflected in the increase costs.

5 MR. RUE: That's a good project.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there other
7 questions or comments?

8 (No audible responses)

9 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. As I indicated
10 earlier, Pete Kompkoff had asked to testify, but he was delayed
11 getting here. Pete is now here and so I am just going to let
12 him -- ask him to go ahead and speak if he wants to at this
13 time. I think you probably have to sit in front of that mike
14 over there.

15 Okay. If you can just maybe spell your last name and
16 then go ahead with any comment.

17 MR. KOMPKOFF: K-O-M-P-K-O-F-F, Pete. I'm
18 representing Chenega IRA Council. I'm the Vice President and
19 Chairman. This project, O'Brien Creek, I would like to know
20 why the project was denied for funding. This stream is pretty
21 important to residents of Chenega, it's right next door to us
22 and lately we've been having good years, lot of fish returned,
23 but, you know, there's good years and bad years and the lean
24 years are what we're worried about. The restoration for the
25 stream is what we'd like to have, just put a bunch of pools.

1 The stream is so -- there's not enough water running through
2 and we need a bunch of pools all the way up from the intertidal
3 area so the fish have a place to spawn and that stream is --
4 the restoration for that stream is very important to us there.

5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay.

6 MR. KOMPKOFF: And the other comment I'd like
7 to make is on -- could you answer why the Ouzinkie Tribal
8 Council and Chenega IRA Council with regards to the plan
9 intertidal community and subsistence injury to those -- we
10 wanted to do a documentary on the intertidal resource,
11 including mussels, clams, kitens, octopus, why was that denied?

12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Just to clarify.
13 Neither of these projects have been denied yet, they are
14 recommended, at this point, as a not fund. We haven't gotten
15 to them in our discussion, yet, and hopefully during that
16 discussion that will give you some sense of why those
17 recommendations were made and what the Council's thoughts are.
18 So if you want to just -- we'll be getting to that pretty
19 quick. We appreciate your comments on this.

20 Are there any questions or comments for Mr. Kompkoff
21 from Juneau?

22 MR. RUE: This is Frank Rue in Juneau.

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, Frank.

24 MR. RUE: Maybe if Mr. Kompkoff can describe
25 the importance of O'Brien Creek to people compared to other

1 pink salmon areas around the community? Because I understand
2 it isn't a very large stream, so it wouldn't have that many
3 fish in it. And I'm just wondering what other alternative
4 resource is available and why this one is particularly
5 significant.

6 MR. KOMPKOFF: Well, the stream is virtually
7 drying up, there's not very much water running through it and
8 if we could do restoration now and preserve the lifetime of
9 that stream, otherwise it's going to -- eventually the whole
10 stream will die of fish.

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Rue, did that answer
12 your question or did you.....

13 MR. RUE: Well, are there other pink salmon
14 resources available to the community or is this particularly
15 important because it's so close to the village or what is it
16 about this creek that's.....

17 MR. KOMPKOFF: Well, we take the kids out there
18 from school, the kids that are growing up, the younger
19 generation, teaching them how to take the eggs from the pinks
20 and the chums. And occasionally there's reds up there as well.
21 But we take the eggs once they're ready to hatch or once
22 they're ready to spawn, we take them and put them in our bags
23 and take them home even cook them up for subsistence.

24 Does that answer your question?

25 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Rue?

1 MR. RUE: Yes. I thank you very much.

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

4 (No audible responses)

5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: How about from Anchorage?

6 (No audible responses)

7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you very much.
8 And, again, we will be getting to that project shortly.

9 MR. KOMPKOFF: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Thank you.

11 Ms. McCammon, I believe we were on Chenega Bay: Stream
12 667.

13 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, this is Project 221, this
14 is Anderson Creek. We'd received two proposals for enhancement
15 projects adjacent to the village of Chenega and these have been
16 proposals that we've seen before over the last couple of years.
17 This particular project came forward as an enhancement proposal
18 and in analyzing that the main problem with the proposal is
19 that the stream runs through the village dump. This is on
20 private property, it's property owned by Chenega Village
21 Corporation and they -- except that they have the
22 responsibility for the lands there and for the dump. They have
23 -- they revised the proposal to request a feasibility study
24 that would evaluate ways to clean up the dump and to provide
25 long-term management of solid waste from the village. This was

1 reviewed and the proposal is a good proposal. My
2 recommendation is to not fund at this time basing it on a lower
3 priority for funding this current year, just trying to keep
4 closer to that eight million dollar target. But it wasn't
5 necessarily on the merits of the proposal itself but more on
6 funding priorities.

7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
8 or comments?

9 (No audible responses)

10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. McCammon, I have one.
11 When I looked at this project it looked to me like it should be
12 one that is fundable through Village Safe Water Act monies and
13 I would wonder if DEC knows if there's a reason why this
14 couldn't be done through that grant program? I mean.....

15 MS. SEE: I can find out. I don't know the
16 answer to that, but I can find out.

17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. I guess what I would
18 ask is I concur that it sounds like a very good project, but I
19 would ask that someone explore other funding options that are
20 available and, again, one of them, I would think, would be
21 Village Safe Water.

22 MR. RUE: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Rue.

24 MR. RUE: I would be a little more specific
25 than that. I agree with you, but I would suggest the that

1 before the Council take this up again, there ought to be a
2 clear documentation of what other things are possible and why
3 they are not being pursued.

4 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.....

5 MR. RUE: So as not.....

6 MR. PENNOYER: I'm sorry, were you done?

7 MR. RUE: I just think we shouldn't leave it
8 vague. Proponents of this project ought to have a clear
9 instruction, a clear idea of where we would go, that we need to
10 know why these other programs don't work for them.

11 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer.

13 MR. PENNOYER: I would, if I can, I was going
14 to second that advice and note that the recommendation in the
15 book is somewhat different than the one we just heard, which
16 says this is a good project, but it wasn't priority at the 80
17 million dollar level. The actual recommendation says propose
18 until after the dump has been cleaned up. Those are not
19 exactly the same thing in my view, and I think Commissioner
20 Rue's addendum fits right in with that line of thinking. So,
21 Ms. McCammon, as I understand it, actually is recommending it
22 not be done until the dump is cleaned up, not just that we
23 don't do it because we're under a funding cap.

24 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, we actually have
25 no recommendation on the enhancement proposal itself. We

1 weren't even able to assess the value of the enhancement
2 proposal and whether it might work given the problems caused by
3 the dump. So this refers just to the revised proposal of the
4 dump clean up only.

5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, my understanding was
6 this proposal is just an evaluation, it's not even clean up the
7 dump.....

8 MS. McCAMMON: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN TILLERY:it just an evaluation
10 of the dump.

11 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct. And I'm sure
12 the Forest Service would appreciate any assistance DEC could
13 provide on this because I think they've been trying to get help
14 trying to fix this and have been a little frustrated trying to
15 get assistance on this.

16 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Well, under the
17 Village Safe Water it's a process that requires the village
18 itself or some organization within it to make an application,
19 but we can work with them.

20 MS. McCAMMON: The land is owned by the village
21 corporation, so I don't know if that complicates it or not.

22 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I don't believe it would
23 based on my -- other things. But there may be other reasons
24 why that doesn't work, but it certainly something -- again,
25 that and any other avenues hopefully would be explored before

1 it would come back.

2 MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

4 MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, I actually was at this site
5 and was helping with the feasibility study and we kind of
6 stopped the fishery feasibility study due to the pollution of
7 the stream. There were a lot of unusual things flowing down
8 that stream when I was there. And I think if it's cleaned up,
9 I think the project, at least looking at my part, I think it
10 would be a good project for silver salmon, there's good rearing
11 habitat and a little bit of falls modification would work, but
12 we stopped that whole analysis due to the water quality issue.

13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there other
14 comments on this project or questions?

15 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you for the explanation, I
16 think I understand the difference now.

17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, Ms. McCammon, Solf
18 Lake.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, Solf Lake. This
20 project, I thought, was all ready to go and unfortunately we've
21 had some miscommunication on information on this and it looks
22 like we're going to have to do an additional month or so of
23 deferral on this. Solf Lake is -- this would provide funding
24 for the fish pass for the Solf Lake Enhancement Project, which
25 is to produce an enhanced line of sockeye salmon on the western

1 side of Prince William Sound. What has led to the confusion is
2 what stock is being used in that lake and we got various -- and
3 we have put the funding contingent on the Forest Service
4 providing a copy of the fish transfer permit for the stocking
5 component of the project.

6 They have provided a copy of that permit, but it turns
7 out that actually two permits for two different stocks have
8 been submitted. It is unclear in the process whether -- we
9 were counting on the fish transfer permit process to basically
10 protect the genetic.....

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Integrity.

12 MS. McCAMMON:integrity of the lake
13 system and of this area. It appears that, in talking to Fish
14 and Game this morning, there's some confusion over which stock
15 is being used and there are a number of questions that were
16 raised at the very last minute that we are not able to answer
17 to the satisfaction of the Chief Scientist and Dr. Mundy and
18 we're recommending that it now be deferred for another month.
19 And if we can get these resolved we would bring it back to you
20 in January.

21 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
22 or comments from Council members?

23 MS. HEIMAN: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Heiman.

25 MS. HEIMAN: Is there some timing for this year

1 that this has to be done by?

2 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, they would need these
3 funds, I'm sure, by spring at the latest, by March or April at
4 the latest. So they do need a decision on it by then.

5 MS. HEIMAN: Do we have an April meeting?

6 MS. McCAMMON: We don't have one scheduled yet.

7 MS. HEIMAN: When do we go over the next set of
8 projects?

9 MS. McCAMMON: August.

10 MS. HEIMAN: Oh, okay.

11 MS. McCAMMON: What has happened, apparently,
12 is that two different stocks have been used in the lake system,
13 there was a decision made to use one fry from one stock and
14 then it was changed and we aren't sure if it's -- if the
15 proposal is to change it next year or if it was changed this
16 year, there's some confusion over that and what the genetic
17 implications of that are and whether everyone was fully
18 informed of the stock change and these are questions that just
19 arose this morning.

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there other
21 questions or comments on this one?

22 MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, this is Dave.
23 I like the recommendation to defer it to January. We need to
24 -- I understand there's been some eggs collected and they're
25 being incubated, I'm not sure of the stocks or what's going on

1 but we've had, what, two years of stocking in the lake or three
2 years and we need to iron out the stock situation, but I don't
3 think we can defer it until spring, we need to act on it either
4 in January or February.

5 MS. McCAMMON: That would be our intent to work
6 this out. And I apologize to the Forest Service because
7 they've been very forthcoming in providing information and it
8 was just -- we were getting information and people were saying
9 different things and we didn't realize until this morning that
10 we didn't really have a clear picture of what was going on
11 there.

12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anything
13 else on this project?

14 (No audible responses)

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Let's move to Western
16 Prince William Sound, Human Use Model.

17 MS. McCAMMON: This project would have funded a
18 manuscript for the development of the Western Prince William
19 Sound Human Use Model, unfortunately due to the transfer of
20 some key staff from one agency to another the final report has
21 not been completed and reviewed yet and so we're asking the
22 proposers to submit this next year again.

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
24 or comments on this project?

25 MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, just a little

1 emphasis there. Karen Murphy transferred to Fish and Wildlife
2 Service and then the State member is retiring, so it's been --
3 kind of fallen back to one person, who is very busy, to get it,
4 so I agree with the recommendation.

5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, thank you. The next
6 project is Remote Video and Time-Lapse Recording.

7 MS. McCAMMON: 366, this project has been a
8 very successful project at testing the use of remote video
9 technology for monitoring salmon escapements. The proposal is
10 to do a second year of this in a different kind of stream and
11 Port Dick Creek and to include the use of microwave
12 transmission so they can provide close to real time data on
13 escapements. This is a very exciting potential tool to improve
14 not only fisheries management, but it also has applications for
15 monitoring marine mammals and seabirds.

16 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
17 or comments on the Remote Video Project?

18 (No audible responses)

19 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. The next
20 one is Regional Analysis of Juvenile Herring.

21 MS. McCAMMON: This project, if you'll recall,
22 there -- a number of the herring projects in August were
23 deferred pending a workshop this fall to discuss where we were
24 on herring research and where we should go in the future. That
25 workshop was held in November, it was very successful in

1 bringing together managers, seabird biologists, herring
2 biologists and discussing further what kinds of research needed
3 to be done in the future. One of the main, I think, end
4 products or end decisions points of this group was that that
5 kind of discussion needed to continue, there needed to be more
6 of it. And so this proposal is reconfiguring a proposal
7 originally submitted by Brenda Norcross to use and further
8 develop a life history base model for the Prince William Sound
9 herring population and to continue to get the various folks
10 together in a working group to develop -- to understand a
11 little bit better where we should go with herring research.

12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
13 or comments on this project?

14 (No audible responses)

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, the next one is the
16 Assessment of Risk to Residual Oil using P450.

17 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, this project used
18 two fishes, masked greenling and crescent gunnel and these fish
19 were taken adjacent to oiled mussel beds in 1998, '99 and 2000,
20 with the goal of trying to figure out if they were getting
21 hydrocarbons into their system from the mussel beds. The
22 recent data analyzed this fall indicates that the fishes
23 analyzed in the first year had very low levels of exposure to
24 contaminants and that the levels were so low that they did not
25 justify another year of sampling. So they recommendation is to

1 fund the closeout of this project, contingent on submittal of a
2 revised DPD. The budget has been submitted, but we're getting
3 a new project description. And the recommendation is that
4 32,100.

5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or
6 comments on this one?

7 (No audible responses)

8 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I guess I would have the
9 question, what is the benefit of even doing a close -- and what
10 is the closeout going to be and what's the benefit of it?

11 MS. McCAMMON: The closeout includes --
12 preliminary analysis was done in the fall based on the season's
13 field work and so the closeout includes the final analysis of
14 all of the samples and a written report so, basically, it's
15 pulling together all of the data and actually putting into a
16 report form. But there's still quite a bit of analysis that
17 needs to be done as part of that.

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Does anybody expect the
19 analysis to show anything different?

20 MS. McCAMMON: Dr. Spies?

21 DR. SPIES: No, I don't think so, it's just a
22 follow-up and putting into publication form, which is kind of a
23 standard type of thing we do with a scientific project of this
24 nature.

25 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Any other questions

1 or comments on this one?

2 (No audible responses)

3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, the next one is 3-D
4 Ocean State.....

5 MS. McCAMMON: The 3-D Ocean State Simulations,
6 this project was an outcome, also, of the herring workshop in
7 November. And actually I will let Dr. Spies and Dr. Mundy
8 speak to this one. But I can say that it is basically an
9 outgrowth, also, of the SEA Project and something that the
10 commercial fishermen in Prince William Sound have really been
11 pushing for to try to develop a model that they could use to
12 predict productivity in the future.

13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Dr. Mundy, Dr. Spies.

14 DR. SPIES: Yes, we invested 20 million dollars
15 or 20 some million dollars in the SEA Project and there was as
16 part of this a circulation model that was developed and Jau
17 Wang is the proposer on this particular project, was part of
18 that initial effort. And during the last part of SEA and
19 analysis subsequent they were able to run this model and look
20 at the distribution of larval herring within the Sound. In one
21 year, 1996, if you'll recall, we funded also in 1995, '97 and
22 '98 for the major SEA field efforts. So this proposal would
23 take the other three years and look at the distribution of
24 herring spawn and where that might be released and where those
25 larvae might be transported to, and compare that with the field

1 data that we have, the aerial surveys mainly from the work of
2 Evelyn Brown to kind of compare where those -- the densities
3 and the distribution of the zero plus age class herring in the
4 various bays around Prince William Sound.

5 And I might say in '96 there was a reasonable agreement
6 between what was predicted by the model and what was seen, so
7 we need to follow-up, I think, on our investment in SEA and use
8 the harvest available information, if you will, and run this
9 model for another three years. I think we also need to keep
10 the physical oceanography and the improvements and usefulness
11 of that physical oceanography in the forefront as we think
12 about how the information -- the kind of information that we
13 want to gather during GEM and its applicability to coastal
14 systems like Prince William Sound. So I'm very much in favor
15 of this project and it got a pretty strong endorsement during
16 the herring workshop that we held in November.

17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Dr. Mundy, did you have
18 anything to add?

19 DR. MUNDY: Just briefly. I would add that
20 this sort of modeling exercise would take advantage of data
21 that we've already collected, so this is not collecting
22 anything new but this is getting more out of what we've already
23 paid for. And this kind of model is really fundamental to
24 understanding physical processes in the Sound and would be
25 available to a lot of different kinds of researchers. For

1 example, the Pristane Project from Auke Bay Lab which forecasts
2 pink salmon abundance in the year following the observations,
3 they have been successful in explaining 33 percent of the
4 variability in year class strength in pink salmon. However,
5 he's also found that geographically looking at individual
6 locations he can explain up to 88 percent of the variability,
7 which is a really high precision management tool. However, we
8 need to understand the geographic differences between the
9 locations that make this high precision possible, and that's an
10 example of how a model like this could be used. So it's a
11 pretty basic tool in the toolbox of trying to find better
12 management tools that are less costly.

13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, thank you. Are there
14 questions or comments from Council members?

15 MR. RUE: This is Frank. I'm glad to hear
16 Dr. Mundy speak about the Pristane Project because that was
17 (phone cut out) thinking about that, too, how that might be
18 relate. It's still a little foggy, to me, but I'm glad to hear
19 someone say that it may be applicable. Good.

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there other
21 comments or questions?

22 (No audible responses)

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Thank you. We're on
24 to CIIMMS.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, this is Project

1 391, the Cook Inlet Information Management Monitoring System.
2 This is the second year of a three year project. The actual
3 recommendation for funding for this year is \$361,000, so
4 there's a little bit of a change there. We have received a new
5 budget. This was deferred in order to receive and review a
6 prototype of a distributed website, distributed database system
7 for information on the Cook Inlet watershed. We did receive
8 that prototype, it has been reviewed by several of our
9 reviewers, they came up with a number of recommendations on
10 potential -- just issues that need to be resolved if that gets
11 developed. None of those were fatal problems at all and, in
12 fact, the review of the prototype overall has been positive.
13 There are some concerns in terms of ensuring that a long range
14 maintenance plan is developed concurrent with the final
15 specification and implementation of the actual -- of the final
16 complete website. And so we did ask DNR and DEC to look at
17 some of the tasks and to see whether that could be done in the
18 second year. And to do that they've shifted some of the other
19 tasks onto a third year in FY01. So this was originally
20 conceived as a two-year project, it's now a three-year project,
21 but it does seem to be on track. I think all of you should
22 have received presentations over the last few months on this.
23 And our recommendation is to continue going forward with it.
24 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
25 or comments on this project?

1 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to second
2 what the Executive Director said, there's been a considerable
3 effort over the past month to explain the project to a number
4 of people and the project has actually sent out a lot of
5 background information, including budgetary information. I
6 think that -- and initially the concern about the ability to
7 put all the data somewhere and use it, as opposed to the
8 approach now of going toward a metadata database approach. And
9 still concerned about long-term maintenance, but on the other
10 hand this type of thing may be more what the Trustee Council is
11 going to leverage under the GEM Plan to coordinate the input
12 from a lot of different agencies we can't -- don't have enough
13 money to cover the work of, you know, a lots of other things
14 we're doing. So I'm very please with what people came forth
15 with and look forward to the second iteration of this.

16 MR. RUE: I would simply second what
17 Mr. Pennoyer said. I agree. And I think it is going to be
18 important to find a home for this, a long-term home, because
19 it's going to take long-term maintenance and support, but I
20 think people will want to adopt it if it's got the kind of
21 utility it appears to have.

22 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, thank you. Are there
23 other comments or questions?

24 (No audible responses)

25 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Salmon Sharks.

1 MS. McCAMMON: 396, this revised proposal
2 researches the role of the predominant shark species, salmon
3 sharks in particular, and the dynamic trophic structures in the
4 Prince William Sound region. It has been reviewed by the Chief
5 Scientist and it's considered to be a well conceived proposal,
6 however, it would initiate a new line of research that we think
7 is more appropriate in the entire context of our overall
8 ecological assessment of the Northern Gulf. And so our
9 recommendation is not fund and to consider it further down the
10 road in terms of the bigger picture of developing GEM.

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or
12 comments on the Salmon Shark Project?

13 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not anxious to
14 adopt another killer whale, I went through that once before,
15 Dr. Spies. I have some concerns here and they are engendered
16 by the rather dramatic looking increase in the parts that dog
17 fish, salmon sharks and sleeper sharks may be playing in the
18 ecosystem out here that may or may not be a direct -- certainly
19 is not a direct result of the oil spill, but may be a response
20 of these predators, the changes that started occurring back in
21 the mid-'70s and it just delayed in catching up with it. I
22 know a number of management groups, both State and Federal, are
23 looking at the concerns. We have requests from people to
24 charter fish from them, there are request to discuss whether we
25 need a plan of some kind in the State and Federal arenas to

1 manage or prohibit or change commercial fishing if it might
2 develop on this. We have actual request for commercial
3 fisheries on these species.

4 We have a fair amount of information on some rather
5 unusual metabolic rates on at least one of these species. And
6 some information on the part they may be playing in controlling
7 or influencing the productivity of some of the species that
8 we're of direct concern in the oil spill. I know that some
9 work has been going on, mostly sort of seat of the pants,
10 cobble up some money if you can, interest from outside groups.
11 And I'm a little bit concerned that just dropping that now
12 we're going to lose some value added in building on some of
13 these things. This is currently not part of any agency's
14 budget either, so the concept if it being new work is true for
15 everybody, but it doesn't mean it shouldn't be a concern to all
16 of us.

17 I understand that next summer there may be people who
18 do have funding, external to EVOS, and other things the State
19 or Federal government are doing in Alaska, do things like extra
20 tagging or other items that may be willing to test on, some of
21 the funding they thought the tagging development work in terms
22 of sharks. And I'm concerned that we don't lose that momentum.
23 I haven't really had time to explore this enough with any of my
24 State counterparts or in our own budget or with the Council or
25 some groups like this, but just dropping and deciding to do

1 nothing in 2000 is still -- I'm not clear that's the best
2 course to take. I think there's some obligations here in our
3 terms of understanding what's happening out there in the
4 ecosystem, we may not want to just give up on it this
5 intermediate year.

6 So I would -- you're going to bring something else back
7 the next meeting, I'm kind of thinking on a couple of these I'd
8 like to hear a little further exploration of that before we
9 just close the door in 2000. I don't know that there's very
10 much money involved, I'm not sure that it's going to, frankly,
11 impact our ability to stay within some general limit, again,
12 it's about a million dollar range we've talked about. And I'm
13 not totally sure how much the various agencies are going to
14 want to get into this. I know Fish and Game has petitions to
15 the Board to open up commercial fisheries and the Council has
16 petitions to do Shark Plan and we've got a lot of groups that
17 are interested in doing regulations in the Board of Fisheries,
18 recreational fishing on sharks.

19 So I think what I'd like to propose is that we
20 basically get a further iteration of this. We've had a
21 proposal for \$86,000 that's not in here, it would be actually
22 initiating a whole block of new things to us, not a whole
23 block, but new things to us. We had \$40,000 proposal to do
24 sort of a literature search. In between people have come up
25 with some pretty good evidence of the dramatic increase in the

1 stocks, and things like the Halibut Commission longline surveys
2 are pretty clear, fairly document this increase, it's not a
3 matter of conjecture. And I think I'd like to see these same
4 people go out and explore a little bit further what is
5 available this summer and where we might have a continuation of
6 research and then perhaps come back at our next meeting, along
7 with the other proposals, such as Solf Lake, we've talked
8 about, there maybe one or two more, and ask us, because I think
9 there's enough flexibility to do that.

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

12 MR. RUE: Mr. Chairman, this is Frank.

13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Rue.

14 MR. RUE: I guess I have two clarifying
15 questions, one of Molly. When you say consider during GEM, do
16 you mean -- we're not really getting into implementing GEM for
17 another couple of years, right?

18 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman. That's correct,
19 Commissioner Rue, although what we're trying to do in the next
20 couple of years is develop what kinds of basic information and
21 tools do we need in order to make decisions on the final
22 development of GEM. And the kinds of information that
23 Mr. Pennoyer put forth today, these are things that I did have
24 Dr. Spies and Dr. Mundy look at and that information was
25 provided and we appreciate the concern and the issue that seems

1 to be developing with this. I think our concern is this -- to
2 us this looks like the hot issue, the hot species of the day
3 and when we look at GEM and what that's going to be, we're
4 looking at it in terms of trying to look at things ecologically
5 and from the entire prospective and not respond to things
6 piecemeal. And this seemed to be more of a piecemeal approach
7 to a potential issue and not looking at things from all
8 aspects. So it would just be not throwing money just at an
9 initial problem that's been developed, but certainly not the
10 result of a well thought out piece of research that's
11 coordinated with other aspects of our ecosystem research. And
12 that was the reason after listening to the information provided
13 by NOAA that our recommendation was still not to fund.

14 Certainly there are other things that have come before
15 us in the last couple of years that are very similar, the
16 potential of losing good people, if they didn't get funding
17 they were going to go off and do new project and we had to say
18 no at that time, too, just because the timing wasn't right
19 because we are looking at trying to do a program that really
20 fits together.

21 MR. RUE: Okay. Then my other question was
22 really for Mr. Pennoyer and that was clarify what you wanted to
23 do in the next month, roughly, between now and January, because
24 I see this -- clearly it's not a fishery issue, but there's
25 also really sounds like significant ecosystem issue where you

1 got a top predator showing huge, I mean just incredible
2 increases in biomass, you know, it's off the chart kind of
3 increases, which is pretty interesting from the ecosystem
4 perspective. And so I guess I would be interested in the next
5 month if NOAA is willing to put together a summary of how it
6 thinks this could fit into our existing research in
7 anticipation of it becoming a piece of GEM, short-term, but not
8 looking as much from a fisheries perspective as what does this
9 indicat -- or this species showing us about what's going on, is
10 it a useful -- and how can we use that information in what
11 we've been looking at, so that's a fairly vague charge, I know,
12 but I think could just put it off for a couple of years.

13 I'd give NOAA another shot at telling us why they think
14 it's imperative that we go ahead with something sooner and how
15 it fits into the other issues and species we've been looking
16 at. You know, we've been looking at marine mammals and
17 declines of harbor seals and there are dramatic declines in
18 that species that may or may not have been increased by the oil
19 spill. What's going on this other predator, top predator?
20 It's going way the heck up. So I don't know if it can be
21 integrated into our ongoing research, a comprehensive look or
22 not, but I would be willing to let NOAA take another run at it,
23 rather than just put them off for two years.

24 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, if I may respond.
25 I'm not a member -- some of my compatriots in the past have

1 advocated that sleeper sharks were eating all the seal lions,
2 that's where they went. I'm not in any way trying to pick out
3 just a hot issue in terms of either one particular recreational
4 and commercial fishery or people getting excited about it. The
5 hot issue to me is more the increase in the species that's so
6 dramatic over the last few years and the part they may play in
7 the whole ecosystem, so I would suspect that it's more to do
8 with what they're eating in terms of prey than what they're
9 eating in terms of other top predators. But I think Frank
10 encapsulated that fairly well, I don't very well able, at the
11 moment, to argue what happens if we wait two years and I would
12 just as soon not close the door on this, at least to continue
13 some level of work between now and the time we actually
14 implement GEM. And I think there may be some options here to
15 do some things relatively cheaply and agencies may be
16 interested, including Fish and Game, in doing more in this line
17 themselves. But I would like to not close out the possibility
18 of doing field work in 2000. So I'm simply asking that you
19 give us another shot at coming back and discussing this. And I
20 think if we don't do that we may lose a significant
21 opportunity. I'm very swayed by the number of these animals
22 that apparently there are out there that are a part of the
23 biomass there apparently are, as well as their role in the
24 ecosystem. So I would like a chance to come back at the next
25 meeting and perhaps -- I'm not saying everybody here didn't do

1 a good job, but do a better job of taking into account some of
2 the current realities and talking to the Council about it.

3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there other comments or
4 questions about this project?

5 MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, Mr. Gibbons.

7 MR. GIBBONS: I am, too, impressed with the
8 number of animals out there. This summer I flew out to an area
9 and I -- reminded me of a school of pink salmon, but they were
10 salmon sharks, I mean there were just -- the whole bay was
11 filled with them, so I would support this proposal to come back
12 in January with some additional information and perhaps looking
13 at the ecological links.

14 And so my comments.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, thank you. Perhaps, I
16 should just -- Anchorage, is there a consensus here we should
17 defer this until January?

18 MS. HEIMAN: I'd support that.

19 MS. SEE: I support it.

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: I see some head nodding, so
21 we'll, on the list, put that tentatively down as a defer until
22 January.

23 Okay, if there's nothing else then, Ms. McCammon,
24 Chenega Bay, O'Brien Creek Restoration.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is

1 Project 416, O'Brien Creek. This project was a new proposal to
2 remove a berm from a O'Brien Creek and returning the channel to
3 conditions that existed before the 1964 earthquake and
4 otherwise provide more suitable habitat for chum and pink
5 salmon. Given the availability of salmon from other sources,
6 this is right next to a pink salmon hatchery at the village,
7 there appears to be little need for increased production of
8 pink salmon. And in the review of chum salmon it wasn't
9 indicated that there would be a significant likelihood of
10 producing a real significant run there.

11 Dr. Mundy, here, has had a lot of experience with
12 reconstructed stream beds, with the Port Dick Creek proposal
13 and others, and says that the long-term prospects for this
14 project in terms of increased production are very uncertain.
15 And he's here to answer any specific questions if anyone has
16 them.

17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
18 or comments from the Council members?

19 MR. RUE: I have a quick question, this is
20 Frank in Juneau. As I understand it, this is to take out a
21 beach berm one time; is it going to just reform every year? I
22 mean once the uplifting happens, it seems like they're into a
23 long-term maintenance, unless it blasting rock, the beach is
24 going to move, it's going to come back, winter's gone, it's
25 going to pile it up again. Is this just a system that's going

1 to be \$27,000 every year? Seems like it might be, but I don't
2 know. Dave Gibbons maybe knows more about this situation.

3 MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes, Mr. Gibbons.

5 MR. GIBBONS: Yes, I haven't visited the site,
6 so I don't know, but I just know that some of our streams after
7 the '64 earthquake out on Montague when this similar thing
8 happened and the berms shut off the chum salmon out there and
9 we tried to do a similar thing with real mixed success.
10 There's a lot of maintenance involved with it. But I haven't
11 been to the site, so I -- but I'm not too optimistic that it
12 would work but, like I said, I haven't seen the site.

13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Mundy, did you want to
14 respond to that? Dr. Mundy.

15 DR. MUNDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
16 concern here is exactly as has been expressed, is how lasting
17 would the changes be if indeed they could be made. The issue
18 is one of whether we're trying to thwart a natural process of
19 stream aging here rather than overcome the one-time effects of,
20 say, an earthquake. And our experience at Port Dick Creek, the
21 reason that we went into that and invested so heavily in that
22 is that the scientific question was how well can we actually
23 engineer nature? How well can we get into a stream and recreate
24 it? And if we, in fact, can reconfigure it so that it produces
25 salmon, will this last?

1 And the experience at Port Dick Creek is similar to
2 that Mr. Gibbons cited on Montague is mixed. We found, indeed,
3 that even though despite our best engineering designs that what
4 we did at Port Dick Creek didn't work all that well in the case
5 of one channel to begin with and had to be redone, almost
6 immediately. So there seems to be a very high probability that
7 you could go in initially, cut down the berm and improve the
8 prospects for producing salmon, but the issue of how much the
9 Trustee Council would be committing to, how much, that is,
10 finances they would be committing to this project in the long-
11 term is another question entirely. So it's not an issue of
12 whether we could initially go in and excavate and solve some of
13 the problems, but the issue is long-term stability and whether
14 or not trying to thwart a natural process here of stream aging.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Dr. Mundy, one
16 question. Mr. Kompkoff seemed to be describing this in terms
17 of creating pools to deal with the low water flow, which is
18 different than this description which talks about, as I
19 understand it, a berm, it's not when it hits the ocean. What
20 -- can you explain that?

21 DR. MUNDY: I'm not familiar with the site
22 either, I've not visit the site.....

23 DR. SPIES: If I might interject here, Phil.
24 Bob Spies. Both processes are proposed in the proposal to both
25 remove the berm and also to do some reconfiguring of the stream

1 bed and I think both are probably subject, although it's
2 difficult to say without visiting the site and a detailed
3 analysis by people that are expert, but both of these processes
4 -- I mean both of these areas are probably subject to a similar
5 process of infilling again, in general, so I think that caution
6 is certainly warranted here in terms of long-term prospects
7 in the potential investment in something that might return
8 eventually where it is right now.

9 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there other questions or
10 comments?

11 (No audible responses)

12 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: One thing is it seems like
13 most response to these questions seem to end with "but I
14 haven't visited the site, so I don't know." Has anyone visited
15 the site to make -- to form the basis of this recommendation?

16 MS. McCAMMON: The Forest Service has visited
17 the site, Ken Holbrook has visited the site and we asked for --
18 in order to do the analysis, a cost benefit analysis of whether
19 it was worth it. They provided some additional information
20 about what they thought the stream might produce based on what
21 they think streams might produce elsewhere, and I think it was
22 the view of the reviewers that it wasn't very strong evidence
23 that it would be a strong producing stream, even if you could
24 make it work.

25 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: So the recommendation is

1 based on people actually having been out there, physically
2 looked at it and so forth?

3 MS. McCAMMON: The reviewers themselves have
4 not been there physically to look at it, no. The proposer, Ken
5 Holbrook, has.

6 MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, is Ken Holbrook
7 there?

8 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, he is.

9 MR. GIBBONS: Ken, can you speak to that? You
10 seem to be the one that's visited the site.

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And maybe down by that
12 microphone right there. That one.

13 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes, Mr. Holbrook.

15 MR. HOLBROOK: O'Brien Creek is a small
16 drainage with a small minimal flow, especially in the summer.
17 It does exhibit both a beach berm, which is a result of an
18 uplift which, from previous experience, I believe can be
19 removed and kept out by narrowing the channel which will
20 increase the velocities there. And then installation of some
21 in stream structures and channel work upstream would improve,
22 for a time, habitat in the stream. The minimum -- keep in mind
23 that the stream is very low flow, especially in the summer,
24 which limits the amount of fish the stream will produce. Or
25 has the potential to produce. We're not going to put more

1 water in the system.

2 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay.

3 MR. HOLBROOK: As proposed, there would be
4 benefit, how much is hard to document or to predict.

5 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: You're saying that the berm
6 you could keep out, but reengineering the pools and stuff you
7 don't know whether that would stick?

8 MR. HOLBROOK: Well, the drainage is minimal
9 flow and how much water will stay in the summer we can't
10 predict rainfall and that kind of thing. We do believe that we
11 could maintain it by channelizing the lower end which has been
12 on numerous streams, it would increase velocities and help keep
13 the berm out. But there's multiple problems and the main one
14 is minimal flows in the stream, very small drainage.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there any other
16 questions or comments?

17 MS. SEE: I have one. This is Marianne See in
18 Anchorage. In the Executive Director's recommendation it says
19 that given the availability of salmon from other sources there
20 appears to be little need for increased production. And I
21 don't have a good feel for any area.....

22 MR. RUE: Could you speak closer to the
23 microphone, please.

24 MS. SEE: The little on?

25 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

1 MS. SEE: Okay. The Executive Director's
2 recommendation notes that given the availability from salmon
3 from other sources there appears to be little need for
4 increased production and I don't have much familiarity with
5 this particular aspect of it. Ken, what does that mean to you,
6 are there other sources that are really readily available to
7 people there in terms of subsistence use?

8 MR. HOLBROOK: Oh, I can't speak to all of the
9 sources of subsistence use in the area, but this is located on
10 a relatively small island, it has minimal stream flows, small
11 stream channels.

12 MS. SEE: Uh-huh.

13 MR. HOLBROOK: There is a hatchery in the bay
14 which produces large numbers of fish.

15 MR. RUE: Can you speak closer to the
16 microphone, please?

17 MS. McCAMMON: Just louder.

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yeah, just talk louder.

19 MR. HOLBROOK: Okay. So there's a hatchery in
20 the bay, Port San Juan, which has been in place for many years.

21 MS. HEIMAN: How far is that hatchery from this
22 stream? Is it close to the school? Do you have any sense of
23 the distances?

24 MS. McCAMMON: Half mile?

25 MR. HOLBROOK: I'd say half mile.

1 MS. McCAMMON: Half mile. There's a walking
2 path there.

3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Kompkoff say about a
4 half mile.

5 MS. HEIMAN: So the hatchery is a half mile or
6 the stream is a half mile?

7 MS. McCAMMON: The hatchery.

8 MS. HEIMAN: And how far away is the stream
9 from the school?

10 MS. McCAMMON: It's right there.

11 MR. HOLBROOK: It's almost -- yeah, we're right
12 there.

13 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, if I could?

14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Go ahead.

15 MS. McCAMMON: Both of these proposal, O'Brien
16 Creek and Anderson Creek have been around for about four years
17 and they just keep circulating and the problem -- I think the
18 potential problem with them, first of all, there were two
19 proposals and so I remember a couple of years ago saying, go
20 out there, talk to people, see what they want, figure it out,
21 if we're going to do any of them, we're only going to do one,
22 but figure out which one is the one that makes the most sense.
23 So Ken went out there and talked to people, there's still kind
24 of a difference of opinion over which one is preferable.
25 Neither one has the potential -- is a guarantee of producing a

1 lot. Both of them are speculative. O'Brien Creek had the
2 additional problem of running through the dump.

3 MR. HOLBROOK: No, Anderson Creek.

4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Anderson Creek.

5 MS. McCAMMON: Anderson Creek, I'm sorry.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Anderson Creek is Stream
7 667.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, and that's that one that
9 goes through the dump. So, you know, they it would come back
10 and neither one is going to be a guarantee success, and
11 certainly in terms of pink production, I mean there's a huge
12 pink salmon hatchery right next door, there are pinks all over
13 the place, but are there other fish with different timings and
14 different species that are important for subsistence. It's
15 very difficult to develop coho runs, they have a lot of
16 problems. The potential for chum is speculative.

17 Where would you like us to go with this?

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Council members are
19 there.....

20 MR. RUE: I'm ready to move on.

21 MS. HEIMAN: Well, just could we.....

22 MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

23 MR. PENNOYER: I think we've had a lot of
24 discussion of this, can we go on to the next project. We're
25 going to come back and discuss how we're going to treat all of

1 these at some point, but I don't what more we're going to find
2 out about this at this time.

3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Heiman had a comment.

4 MS. HEIMAN: Could I just be reminded for
5 purposes of since I haven't been here since the creation of
6 this Council, when you look at a project and you're deciding
7 whether we should fund it or not, I know we're looking at was
8 it an injured species. What are the other basic things you're
9 looking at?

10 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, the basis of this
11 is that it's a replacement project for lost subsistence
12 species.

13 MS. HEIMAN: That's what you're measuring it
14 against?

15 MS. McCAMMON: That's what these replacement
16 projects are.

17 MS. HEIMAN: So then we have to assess does it
18 do it that?

19 MS. SEE: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

20 MS. McCAMMON: And in the last survey that Fish
21 and Game did within a year ago, subsistence resource use has
22 come back to normal or increased predominantly using fish.
23 What has decreased is the use of intertidal resources and
24 marine mammals. But certainly the use of fish has remained the
25 same if not increased.

1 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Any other comments or
2 questions at this time?

3 (No audible responses)

4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Well, the next
5 project is Recovery Following Removal of Introduced Foxes.

6 MS. McCAMMON: Which is Project 453. This
7 would carry out a follow-up seabird, a number of seabird
8 surveys to determine if the fox eradication efforts that the
9 Council funded in '94 and '95 in the outer Shumagin Islands
10 were successful in restoring seabird population. This is
11 something -- intuitively if you remove the foxes the birds
12 should come back, so intuitively they should have recovered,
13 but where the populations are it's uncertain. The
14 recommendation here is to not fund just as a question of
15 priorities and to urge the Interior Department when they go out
16 into the region and doing future surveys that they try to send
17 out a team to the islands to see if they have repopulated those
18 islands. They will be back there, I believe, not this coming
19 summer but the following summer.

20 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
21 or comments about this project?

22 (No audible responses)

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, thank you. The next
24 one is Testing Satellite Tags.

25 MS. McCAMMON: This project is one that's been

1 kind of revised. It's a good proposal, the investigator is
2 very qualified on this. It would investigate the distribution
3 of one key fish species, the Pacific halibut, and primarily
4 test the technology for monitoring individual fish through the
5 use of satellite pop-up and archival satellite tags. The
6 primary goal of using satellite tag technology in the future
7 would be understanding more about the range of various species
8 of fish in the Gulf of Alaska and what might be needed in terms
9 of identify critical marine habitat and what is needed for the
10 conservation of those species.

11 In the use of these satellite tags it's apparent that
12 further work needs to be done of validating them in the
13 laboratory and that this proposal would be done at the SeaLife
14 Center. We actually support this project, but we gave it a do
15 not fund just in looking at trying to keep costs down this year
16 and be closer to the eight million target as opposed to the
17 nine million dollar target. But it is a very good proposal and
18 we support it for that reason.

19 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
20 or comments about this project?

21 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. McCammon,
22 Dr. Spies, I think the idea of being able to do this is -- use
23 these tags, look at distribution is very valuable. On a
24 sampling basis and getting some understanding of importance,
25 the number of tags you might have to put on for other than very

1 top predators to get a statistically valid sample of where they
2 go and what their relationship is to any particular ecosystem
3 is somewhat daunting at \$5,000 a tag. However, the technology
4 is certainly something we are using already, to some degree or
5 another, and with some variation or another. Obviously the
6 marine mammal tags are different than the pop-up tags, the
7 satellite technology can give information back, particularly
8 the monitoring devices like we're talking about where salmon
9 escapement or sea lion counts, I hope, some day are extremely
10 valuable.

11 My question had more to do though with how well we had
12 explored what's going on in this area, what other people are
13 doing? And my understanding is there are some other
14 substantial grants out there to people to actually do satellite
15 testing. I don't know how those work exactly, how they relate
16 to what's happening, how they relate to sort of seat of the
17 pants shark tagging that happened last summer. I know some of
18 it has been for tuna and the people I think have done --
19 interested in some things up here. How it works in Alaska or
20 not or whether it does or not, I'm not sure. I know that
21 halibut might be the species chosen to look at how well
22 something works in a laboratory situation, but obviously -- I
23 say obviously, at least from my standpoint of working on
24 halibut, I don't think we're going to gain very much from
25 tagging a few halibut and seeing where they go because it's

1 sort of all over the place.

2 I'm not -- I'd kind of like to hear how this relates to
3 what's being done elsewhere and whether, in fact, some of the
4 large amounts I've heard have been handed to people to study
5 this are applicable here or not. And then something of how the
6 people who want to do the work and may propose it, which we'll
7 see proposals in the future to use satellite tags, I'm sure,
8 think it fits into our ecosystem monitoring or agency
9 management concerns. So I'm not sure we have all the facts
10 here yet and if Dr. Spies, Molly, if you looked into this a
11 little further I'd appreciate any insights you have on it.

12 MS. McCAMMON: Dr. Spies.

13 DR. SPIES: Yeah. Dr. Pennoyer, since the
14 Trustee Council originally considered this in August and have
15 come to a kind of a negative recommendation here, we have
16 learned of additional work that's being done to test satellite
17 tags. We have not had the time to investigate exactly what
18 they have done and bring this to another level of review, since
19 we saw it as somewhat of a lower priority for your
20 consideration in this second round for year 2000 projects. So
21 I think if we were to be interested in pursuing this that we
22 need to investigate further what's been done elsewhere and have
23 another round of review in that regard.

24 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, is there any
25 chance you could -- we've talked about bring the company back

1 in January anyhow, if we're going to do this, and I'm not sure
2 we are, I'd kind of appreciate that background before we voted
3 on it.

4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Heiman, did you.....

5 MS. HEIMAN: I do have some comments on this.
6 I think, just based on what I understand about it, is state of
7 the art technology that people are starting to use right now
8 and that people do support this and I'm glad to hear that. I
9 guess what I would like to add to what Mr. Pennoyer is saying
10 is are there other tools that we know of that are better at
11 assessing habitat or is this really the state of the art tool
12 for assessing habitat? Because I think the goal here is, as we
13 enter into this phase of GEM, that we will start to use this,
14 whatever tool we pick, to work on habitat issues for different
15 species of fish. And, to me, that's a very high priority of
16 GEM. So I guess I would like to hope that we would find
17 whatever the best technology is and start getting it tested so
18 it works for Alaska, so that when we start getting into the
19 phase of GEM we're ready to go with it and we're not held up by
20 not having the technology tested. And I guess that's my
21 biggest concern.

22 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Do you think that deferring
23 this until January is a viable option time-wise?

24 MS. HEIMAN: I'd like to ask Dede to come up
25 here and just tell us if that would be enough time to give us

1 the answers to this. And another question that has been asked
2 of me, because this is a Department of Interior project, is
3 aren't we doing this in Glacier Bay? And we are doing tagging
4 and I believe it's satellite, but it's a different type of
5 satellite testing. And what I understand about this project it
6 would be actually in tanks, you know, really calibrating this
7 technology to figure out will it work in Alaska and how do we
8 make it work in Alaska.

9 But would the end of January be enough time for you to
10 come back and plus to talk with some scientists to figure out
11 is this the best technology that we've got going for habitat
12 analysis?

13 MS. BOHN: I think we could do that by January.
14 The project chief has already written up exactly what you'd get
15 with -- she wants to do controlled research. She feels this
16 technology is not ready to go out in the wild and there are
17 many issues. When you lose tags in the wild you don't know
18 what you have found. Did you kill the fish with the tag? Did
19 the fish die from some other reason?

20 MS. HEIMAN: Did somebody eat it.

21 MS. BOHN: Right. You can't assimilate the
22 value of it. So she has enumerated 13 different points that
23 she feels this technology has to offer, 13 different questions
24 that she feels she needs to answer with her -- she's only
25 asking for a year of controlled research. Then she would guess

1 that at that point that algorithms which are very tricky to
2 develop, apparently, because this technique works on ambient
3 light or cupuscular light and that's different for Alaska than
4 anywhere they've developed so far. And so she would like to
5 get all that worked out, she would like to get the databases of
6 how to manage the data you get set up and then she would assume
7 that other people would have proposals to start testing this in
8 the wild.

9 MS. HEIMAN: But by the end of January, do you
10 think you could give us some more information.....

11 MS. BOHN: We can try.

12 MS. HEIMAN:and checking with
13 Mr. Pennoyer and find out what his -- you know, let's find out
14 -- talk to their scientists, have her talk -- let's get some
15 dialogue to make sure we're answering the questions that are
16 before us, so we don't end up doing this again in January.

17 MS. BOHN: Could be for other tools. We have
18 certainly met with some of the NOAA scientists and talked about
19 -- they'd like to implement in the wild and we talked about our
20 hesitations.....

21 MS. HEIMAN: Uh-huh.

22 MS. BOHN:and the kind of data they would
23 get. We've had several of those discussions, but.....

24 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer.

1 MR. PENNOYER: I appreciate that and I guess,
2 as with CIIMMS, I don't that we've actually seen the detailed
3 proposal the peer reviewers looked at, so I'm -- personally I'm
4 -- fortunately I'm familiar with all of the discussions that
5 have gone on. I do know that we're actually using these tags,
6 to some degree, in the wilds in Alaska -- in all of Alaska now
7 and getting results, so I'm not sure what the five or six or 10
8 points are that are specifically unanswered and need to be
9 answered. Now, I'd rather be compelling and I'd kind of like
10 to see that, so I guess the question would be can we have the
11 opportunity to look at the detailed proposal as we did with
12 CIIMMS over the last couple of weeks and come back to it.
13 Because I know some people are going to be up, for example, and
14 testing that tag concern in Alaska this summer, or want to, and
15 they've got funding already, so I'm not sure, maybe it's a
16 different tag, maybe it's a different type of work, but I need
17 to kind of understand -- I think I need to understand that
18 before I could understand the viability of doing it.

19 MS. BOHN: The researchers have been in
20 communication -- if you're talking Barbara Block's effort with
21 National Geographic, the PI who is proposing this work worked
22 with Barbara Block for eight years or something and they've
23 been in communication over why they can't take what Barbara's
24 done and implement it in Alaska just now. Barbara was totally
25 in support of having a year of research to figure out the

1 different Alaska needs for this technology.

2 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And doing this in January
3 wouldn't be too late?

4 MS. BOHN: It's pushing us, but rather than
5 lose it certainly we'd wait a month.

6 MS. HEIMAN: We're really devoted to this
7 project, we're donating the staff to do it, it is a high
8 priority for us and I think it's a high priority for GEM as
9 well as we go into the future.

10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And you're comfortable with
11 January, coming back?

12 MS. HEIMAN: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Is that the consensus then,
14 that this project should come back in January?

15 MR. RUE: This is Frank. Sorry, I just got
16 called out of the room by my boss, so I need -- could someone
17 summarize for me what's happened?

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Ms. Heiman.

19 MR. RUE: In five words.

20 MR. PENNOYER: In five words, yeah.

21 MS. HEIMAN: Maybe Marilyn or whoever.

22 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Five words, defer it until
23 January.

24 MS. HEIMAN: We're going to defer until
25 January.

1 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That's five, that's good.

2 MR. RUE: That's okay with Interior?

3 MS. HEIMAN: Yes.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Three words.

5 MS. HEIMAN: Yes, it is. Thanks for asking,
6 Frank.

7 MR. RUE: Yeah, okay, if that's okay.

8 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there anything
9 else on this project?

10 (No audible responses)

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, let's move on to
12 Documentary on Intertidal Resources.

13 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, this documentary
14 was proposed by the villages of Chenega Bay and Ouzinkie. It
15 would be the third documentary to be funded by the Council, if
16 the decision is to fund it, on the impacts of the oil spill on
17 the subsistence use of intertidal resources, including mussels,
18 clams, kitens and octopus, by residents of both Chenega and
19 Ouzinkie. Originally we had two proposals, separate proposals,
20 from Chenega and Ouzinkie and then they submitted a revised
21 proposal that actually would combine both of them.

22 As you heard from the discussion, this is very
23 supported -- much supported by the communities. And I also
24 support the concept of funding this proposal. My
25 recommendation is to not fund it at this time, and there's a

1 number of reasons. One, primarily, priorities, whether this is
2 a project that needs to go this year or not. And I know there
3 is a lot of desire in the communities to have this proposal go
4 forward this year. There are a couple of reasons, one of which
5 is listed here and there's also another reason that I would
6 suggest doing it later. One is that the Ouzinkie one, in
7 particular, is very concerned with PSP. And earlier this year
8 the Council did fund a contribution to developing test kits for
9 detecting PSP in the field. These kits are still in the
10 development phase and so once they're available and are able to
11 be uses, even if it's still testing them, that this would be an
12 appropriate part of the video, so this would, I think, justify
13 delaying this.

14 The other thing, in Chenega, we were starting to think
15 about the invitation for project proposals for next year and I
16 remember that on the list for the next years invitation is
17 doing the final shoreline oiling assessment in Prince William
18 Sound, which is expected to be done, and I'm looking at DEC, in
19 next fiscal year. And I think a lot of the concerns that the
20 folks in Chenega have is how much oil is still out there and
21 what potential impacts are. And I think given that we're going
22 to be doing the final assessment in the next year to two years
23 that it might be more appropriate to consider the video also in
24 conjunction with that one.

25 But I certainly support the concept of the video and

1 it's up to the Council if you decide to do it sooner rather
2 than later.

3 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
4 or comments about this project?

5 MR. RUE: This is Frank Rue in Juneau.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Rue.

7 MR. RUE: Yeah, I agree that this is a good
8 project. I'm wondering if there are -- well, maybe you could
9 describe for me the logistical issues. If we funded this now,
10 how far ahead would we be versus funding it next year? We
11 could basically lose a year; is that right?

12 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

13 MR. RUE: Okay. But if we did it next -- if
14 the Council thought it was a good idea next year, you would
15 then have shoreline survey information and perhaps some footage
16 or no?

17 MS. McCAMMON: You would actually -- if it was
18 funded now, the footage would be shot this summer and the film
19 would be put together in the fall. It would be done under
20 contract. If it was done the following year then the footage
21 would be shot the following summer.

22 MR. RUE: So what you're suggesting,
23 Ms. McCammon, is that by waiting a year you'll get.....

24 MS. McCAMMON: You'll get more work on PSP and
25 you'll get the shoreline assessment actually going on at the

1 time. And then when they start putting together the actual --
2 finalizing the film they'll have the results of the shoreline
3 assessment, that could be included as a piece of the film.

4 MR. RUE: Uh-huh.

5 MS. McCAMMON: Or at least the information.

6 MR. RUE: Uh-huh.

7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there other
8 questions or comments?

9 MR. RUE: I think it's a good idea. I guess if
10 other Council members think we ought to postpone or look at it
11 again under the Work Plan for FY00, what are we calling that
12 now? Zero-zero?

13 MS. McCAMMON: This is FY00, next year is FY01.

14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Aught-1, Frank

15 MS. McCAMMON: Aught-1.

16 (Laughter)

17 MS. McCAMMON: Aught-aught.

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there any other
19 comments or questions on this one?

20 (No audible responses)

21 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, then the next project
22 is the VHSV, Overwinter Survival of Year-Class Strength.

23 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct, Project 562 and
24 as we know disease has been a very important factor in the
25 recovery of herring populations in Prince William Sound. Any

1 new efforts on herring need to be integrated and well
2 coordinated and following the workshop there was a general
3 consensus that there was more of a need for this integration
4 and coordination than additional work on disease at this time.
5 So the recommendation is to not fund.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Are there questions or
7 comments on this?

8 (No audible responses)

9 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay, the next on is Kenai
10 River Streambank Habitat Utilization Study.

11 MS. McCAMMON: And this project has been
12 withdrawn by the proposer.

13 Project 567, Monitoring Environmental Contaminants.
14 This is a proposal from Department of Environmental
15 Conservation to develop some information that we need to
16 develop a contaminants component for the Council's long-term
17 monitoring plan. It consists of two elements to it and these
18 would be contracts. One would compile a literature database of
19 existing data and information on the status and trends of
20 contaminants in the Northern Gulf. And then the second
21 contract would be to conduct a workshop which would get
22 together all of the key players in the Gulf, in this field and
23 develop priorities regarding environmental contaminants in the
24 Gulf. And we see this as two key pieces in developing what
25 might be a long-term monitoring program. So the recommendation

1 is to fund.

2 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there questions
3 or comments on this project?

4 MS. HEIMAN: I'm very pleased to see this
5 project has been funded.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there additional
7 questions or comments?

8 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, can I go back to
9 one? Are we done with that one?

10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Right, that was going to be
11 my suggestion, was that now we just go back and see if anyone
12 has anything else that's come up in the meantime.

13 MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, I have a question, if I
14 could pursue it, with the Executive Director, on Project 366,
15 the Remote Video on Time-Lapse Recording.

16 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Yes.

18 MR. PENNOYER: This is a relatively small
19 investment for something that's very important and is sort of
20 out of context with a lot of other things that are going on.
21 And I'm not -- I haven't read the detailed proposal,
22 unfortunately, so I'm not sure how far these people have cast
23 their net, but I know that there are people right now looking
24 at everything from museum in Homer with a remote camera on Gull
25 Island looking at seabirds on Gull Island in a real sense on an

1 hourly basis. You can walk in and punch it up and look at a
2 murrelet if you want to. And I know the sea lion people for us
3 are considering everything from top secret defense technology
4 to cameras on bluffs looking at the sea lion rookeries so they
5 can record what happens on an ongoing basis and compare that to
6 the infrequent stylized systematic surveys we do and when
7 they're trying to decide how representative those are. So I
8 know there's a lot of things going on. I guess I don't have a
9 gauge.

10 I'm not against this project, that's not what I'm
11 saying, but I don't have a real good feeling for how well EVOS
12 is coordinating its efforts with a lot of these other people
13 that are either doing or on the verge of doing a lot of things,
14 perhaps, for a lot more money than we're looking at here. I
15 wonder if Dr. Spies or Molly could comment on that.

16 MS. McCAMMON: Well, the one thing I could
17 comment on and I think actually -- and Dr. Mundy actually has
18 been the most involved in this project, but we did -- the
19 Council did fund the project on the Barren Islands during the
20 past two years and we'll actually have a presentation on that
21 at the January workshop. What has been interesting -- and that
22 is doing seabird monitoring using remote videos. What has been
23 interesting from that is that the technique has two purposes,
24 one is as an educational tool and the video cameras are located
25 at the Pratt Museum, they work very closely with the school

1 system in Homer. The kids love them, they are able to pan and
2 zoom in and do all of this really cool interesting stuff
3 learning about seabirds and it's been a wonderful educational
4 tool.

5 The researchers involved have not been as impressed
6 with its use. It's interesting, their needs are different than
7 the educational needs. They want a camera set up that is kept
8 in the same place constantly so they can see things happening
9 overtime and count things. And one of the things that we do
10 need to -- and this is related to some of the techniques, also,
11 that are being developed though this salmon remote video
12 project. And so one of the things we need to do is get these
13 folks together talking about whether there's a way to merge the
14 educational needs with the research needs so that we can do
15 both or whether they're so different that they're incompatible.

16 But certainly our goal has been primarily research, but
17 the by-product of education has been a great payoff in terms of
18 bringing things to the public, bringing resources to the
19 public. And I don't know if anyone has had the chance to see
20 this at the Pratt Museum or see the remote camera at the
21 SeaLife Center, but it's incredible to be able to sit there and
22 see these things that are at a distance but see them so close.
23 But I agree, you're right, there's a lot of things going on and
24 Dr. Mundy has been talking to Ted Otis, who is the person at
25 Fish and Game doing the salmon remote video, and that's one of

1 the portions of the recommendation, is to work more closely
2 with marine mammal and seabirds biologists in terms of
3 implementing these techniques.

4 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, before Dr. Mundy
5 starts, I was just concentrating on the educational aspect, I
6 got lobbied rather heavily in Anchorage last week at the
7 Council meeting by a gentleman who has got a fairly sizable
8 proposal out looking at video time-lapse photography techniques
9 to take the place of observers on longline vessels. And, in
10 fact, the Canadians right now are monitoring their offshore
11 sable fish fisheries by just that technology. Unfortunately
12 they're still at a level that simply monitors the location and
13 whether the boat is fishing or not and you can't really
14 breakdown the size and the composition of the catch by species
15 by what they're getting, but it seems like that's his next
16 step, and he thinks it's an easy jump.

17 I also, like I say, have people who are very definitely
18 looking at putting sizeable amounts of money into monitoring
19 sea lion rookeries, not simply from the standpoint, as you
20 said, zooming in for educational purposes, but looking at time-
21 lapse photography and the actual composition, age, sex,
22 composition of the sea lion herd and then the presence and
23 absence during surveys, after surveys, during different times
24 of the year. So what I'm trying to ask is this is not very
25 much money, but it's sort of an Exxon entre' into what I think

1 is one of our better roles, which is coordinating what's going
2 on. And I think there's a lot of things out there, I'm not
3 sure this proposal fits it yet. I'm not saying -- I think we
4 ought to go ahead with this proposal, I think we ought to
5 expand our net a little bit and see what else we can bring in.

6 MR. RUE: Mr. Chairman.

7 MS. McCAMMON: We agree.

8 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Rue.

9 MR. RUE: We've done things inside of Fish and
10 Game since we've had a sonar seminar or workshop where you get
11 all the sonar users on the west coast, whether it's Canadians,
12 to talk about the technology, how they used it, what's been
13 their experience. It seems to me there might be someone out
14 there, if they aren't already doing it, who can organize a
15 seminar or a workshop or a symposium on remote -- not remote
16 sensing, but video -- with the video camera.....

17 MR. PENNOYER: Don't say remote sensing, we've
18 had one of those (indiscernible - simultaneous speech)

19 MR. RUE: I wonder if maybe Interior Department
20 shouldn't sponsor one.

21 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman.....

22 MS. HEIMAN: I have a couple other priorities
23 before that one, but thanks for the recommendation.

24 MS. McCAMMON:we could to go to a non-
25 Trustee agency, I think this really ties in well with the

1 Science and Technology Foundation and one of their former board
2 members would be happy to contact them, I'm sure, to see if
3 there's something collaboratively that we could do.

4 MR. RUE: Or maybe make it a subset of our
5 annual work conference. Highlight it.

6 MR. PENNOYER: Anyway, food for thought, I
7 didn't have a particular proposal right now, but it's
8 something, I think, we're deciding a very small project and I
9 think there's a lot of things out there.

10 MS. McCAMMON: Sure.

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Dr. Mundy.

12 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to
13 respond to Mr. Pennoyer. We're on it, that's the short answer.
14 I've been involved in and published in the using video to count
15 animal populations for some time now and I've challenged the PI
16 in this case to develop a long range plan to tell us where
17 video technology should be within five years as -- you know, as
18 a requirement for further funding. And also challenged the PI
19 to coordinate with other efforts in this area.

20 There are two keys here. One is getting the
21 information off the camera back to where it can be processed.
22 And then the second issue is processing the information. Even,
23 for example, Microsoft, they have a former employee from a past
24 life who is now working with Microsoft on a program to analyze
25 visual data which, for example, to count animals in a digitized

1 frame of video. So these are the kinds of applications that
2 are coming and for processing at sea, observer data, and other
3 things like that, that's on the horizon. It's still not a
4 trivial problem, it's not a problem with even Microsoft has
5 been even to crack so far, but the main thing that our project
6 here is doing is figuring out how to get the data off the
7 camera quickly and efficiently and get it into an area where it
8 can be processed. In this case it'll have to be done by -- you
9 know, visually it'll have done by a human.

10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there any other
11 questions or comments regarding any of the projects?

12 (No audible responses)

13 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion if
14 you're ready for one.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer.

16 MR. PENNOYER: I move we accept the Executive
17 Director's recommendations for these projects with minor
18 exceptions, one being that we're deferring the Solf Lake
19 Project until later when the Forest Service gets back to us on
20 it. Second, that we're deferring some items for consideration
21 with no commitment to funding on the Shark and Satellite Tag
22 Projects until January. And then there are others that are
23 already in the Executive Director's recommendation, projects
24 that are withdrawn, but basically that we accept the
25 recommendation with those exceptions.

1 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Mr. Pennoyer, I believe
2 there was also a suggestion that we defer the Testing Satellite
3 Tags.

4 MS. McCAMMON: He mentioned that.

5 MR. PENNOYER: I just mentioned both.....

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Oh, I'm sorry.

7 MR. PENNOYER:the Satellite for Shark and
8 the Satellite Tags both until further exploration of the
9 background in January.

10 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. And just to make sure
11 that everyone's clear on the Executive Director's
12 recommendation, I understand also from the spreadsheet it
13 includes a \$9,000 reduction in the CIIMMS Project.....

14 MS. McCAMMON: Correct.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY:from 370 to 361.

16 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

17 MR. PENNOYER: That's correct.

18 MS. HEIMAN: So what is the total amount?

19 MS. McCAMMON: The total amount would be.....

20 MR. PENNOYER: \$168,000-something less, because
21 we deferred the Solf Lake Project and 9,000 out of the CIIMMS.

22 MS. McCAMMON: They're not voting eight million
23 today, they're voting on.....

24 MS. CRAMER: It's 709.5.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Oh, okay, 709.5.

1 MS. CRAMER: Yes.

2 MS. McCAMMON: \$709,500 and \$351,600 would be
3 deferred until January.

4 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Is there a second to
5 that motion?

6 MS. HEIMAN: I second it.

7 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motion has been made and
8 seconded. Is there discussion?

9 MR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a point
10 of clarification. I thought I heard that all projects -- those
11 three projects would be deferred until the January 31st
12 meeting; is that correct?

13 MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: That's correct.

15 MR. RUE: I guess I would make just one comment
16 because I wasn't here. Sort of like the remote sensing for
17 video, I like the idea of us working on technology such as
18 satellite tags that may end up being very useful tools in the
19 future, so that's kind of my predilection. I'll be very
20 interested in hearing what we get back in January on that
21 project, since I wasn't here for the discussion.

22 MS. HEIMAN: Excellent, thank you, Frank.

23 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Okay. Are there other
24 questions or comments?

25 (No audible responses)

1 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: And, Mr. Pennoyer, there is
2 a recommendation that the motion have the following conditions:
3 One, that if a principal investigator has an overdue report
4 from a previous year, no funds may be expended on a project
5 involving the PI unless the report is submitted or a schedule
6 for submission is approved by the Executive Director.

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

11 Would you like to make those conditions a part of your
12 motion?

13 MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, that's
14 acceptable, I think that's normally been our procedure anyhow.

15 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Basically that is correct,
16 yes, from previous.....

17 MS. HEIMAN: I second it.

18 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It's been moved and
19 seconded. Okay. Are there any other questions or comments on
20 the motion?

21 (No audible responses)

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

24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed?

1 (No opposing responses)

2 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: The motion passes. Do we
3 have -- I don't believe the agenda indicates any other
4 activities.

5 MS. McCAMMON: No.

6 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: So we'll entertain a motion
7 to adjourn.

8 MR. PENNOYER: So moved.

9 MS. HEIMAN: I move we adjourn.

10 MS. SEE: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: It's been moved and seconded
12 that we adjourn. All in favor say aye.

13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: Opposed?

15 (No opposing responses)

16 CHAIRMAN TILLERY: We are adjourned, thank you
17 very much.

18 (Off record)

19 (MEETING ADJOURNED - 12:50 P.M.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

