EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL 1 TRUSTEE COUNCIL 2 3 Meeting Monday, May 22, 2000 4 10:00 o'clock a.m. 5 Fourth Floor Conference Room 645 G Street 6 Anchorage, Alaska 7 8 TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: 9 MR. STEVE PENNOYER U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NOAA/NMFS - (Chairman): Director, Alaska Region 10 MR. CRAIG TILLERY 11 STATE OF ALASKA -DEPARTMENT OF LAW: Trustee Representative for the Attorney General 12 MR. ROB BOSWORTH for 13 STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT Mr. Frank Rue, OF FISH AND GAME: Commissioner 14 MS. MARILYN HEIMAN U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: 15 Special Assistant to the Secretary for Alaska 16 MR. DAVE GIBBONS 17 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE U.S. FOREST SERVICE Trustee Representative 18 MS. MICHELE BROWN STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION: Commissioner 19

22

20

21

23

24

25

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

1	TRU	STEE 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.	PAULA BANKS	EVOS Staff
6	MS.	BRENDA HALL	EVOS Staff
7	DR.	BOB SPIES	Chief Scientist
8	DR.	PHIL MUNDY	Science Coordinator
9	MR.	HUGH SHORT	Community Facilitator
10	MR.	JOE HUNT	Communications Specialist
11	MS.	DEDE BOHN	U.S. Geological Service
12	MR.	ALEX SWIDERSKI	State of AK, Dept. of Law
13	MS.	GINA BELT	Department of Justice
14	MS.	MARIA LISOWSKI	U.S. Forest Service
15	MR.	KEN HOLBROOK	U.S. Forest Service
16	MR.	BUD RICE	National Park Service
17	MR.	STEVE SHUCK	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Svc.
18	MR.	GLENN ELISON	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Svc.
19	MS.	BRENDA HALL	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Svc.
20	MR.	BARRY ROTH	U.S. Department of Interior
21	MR.	BILL HINES	NOAA
22	MS.	CLAUDIA SLATER	ADF&G
23	MS.	MARIANNE SEE	State of AK - DEC

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Call to Order	04
3	Approval of Agenda	06
4	Approval of April 24, 2000 Meeting Notes	06
5	Public Comment	
6	Mr. Alvin Squartsoff	07
7	Ms. Catherine Reft	11
8	Executive Director's Report	16
9	Vote on Extending PAG to September 30, 2002	24
LO	Tatitlek Small Parcels	26
L1	Koniag Large Parcels	47
L2	Farewell to Steve Pennoyer and Rebecca Williams	64
L3	Public Comment	
L4	Mr. Frank R. Peterson, Sr.	92
L5	Koniag Discussion	100
L6	Tatitlek Discussion	105
L7	Investments (Adoption of Payout Rule)	114
L8	Adjournment	132
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

(On record - 10:10 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, for the record this is the 840th meeting of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Council and I've been asked to chair it, I'm Steve Pennoyer from the National Marine Fisheries Service and I'd like to show that all the Trustee Council agencies are represented. Michele Brown will be here later with Marianne See sitting in for her; Craig Tillery is here for Bruce Botelho; I've mentioned I'm here for NOAA/NMFS; Rob Bosworth is sitting in for Frank Rue; Marilyn Heiman will be here momentarily and Barry Roth is sitting in for her; and, of course, Dave Gibbons is the Trustee representative for the Forest Service. So I'd like to call this to order.

And the first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda and you've got the agenda in front of you, it consists of seven items. Are there any comments, additions or subtractions, deletions? Modifications? Yes, Molly.

MS. McCAMMON: Two changes, Mr. Chairman.

One thing I did add on the draft on Friday was adding a

possible executive session on Koniag.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: When will that be, at noon?

MS. McCAMMON: That would be under Koniag, number 5.

1	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oh, okay at that point.
2	MS. McCAMMON: At that point.
3	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We would break then at
4	that time?
5	MS. McCAMMON: Right. The other thing is
6	there's I think you should have a proposal on your desk
7	in front of you extending the Public Advisory Group from
8	January 1st, 2002 to October 1, 2002.
9	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Is that an additional
10	thing you're
11	MS. McCAMMON: That's an additional item,
12	yes.
13	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: This is the resolution
14	of the EVOS Trustee Council
15	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, and
16	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER:extending the
17	Public Advisory Group? Okay.
18	MS. McCAMMON:I'll speak to that when
19	I get to it.
20	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay.
21	MS. McCAMMON: That's a new item.
22	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: All right, we'll add
23	that then during your report, perhaps?
24	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, we could do it at that
25	time.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Dave, did you 1 have your hand up? 2 MR. GIBBONS: No. 3 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Then the agenda 4 is approved as modified. 5 The second item on the agenda is the approval of 6 the April 24th, 2000 meeting notes, which are in your 7 It was the meeting chaired by Dave Gibbons, I binder. 8 believe, and there were several approved motions listed there. Are there any comments on the meeting notes for 10 11 that April 24th meeting? (No audible responses) 12 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do I hear a motion to 13 14 approve them? 15 MS. SEE: Move to approve. MR. TILLERY: Second. 16 17 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Moved and seconded that we approve the April 24th meeting notes. All those in 18 favor, please say aye. 19 IN UNISON: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oppose? 21 (No opposing responses) 22 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you. Okay, then, 23

Molly, next I believe is the public comment period and I

don't have any idea who's on the line, I don't have a list.

24

25

Are there people out in communities on line that would wish to comment?

MS. McCAMMON: Who we got in Kodiak, Frank Peterson, Frank Pagano, and I'm not sure, those might be the only ones.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Well, let's go around the net then and ask people if they wish to testify. And I think I'll take Kodiak first since we've identified some people from Kodiak. Kodiak, would you care to -- do you have anybody there that would care to comment?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Maybe Kodiak is the group that rang off.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Kodiak or we're here in Larsen Bay also.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, go ahead with Larsen Bay then while we wait for Kodiak. Anybody in Larsen Bay wish to testify?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Good morning, my name
Alvin Squartsoff, I'm a resident of Larsen Bay, I was born
and raised on Kodiak. I've been a shareholder with Afognak
for 38 years and I've been affiliated with Koniag now since
the turn of the century, I guess. That's the last century.
My concerns on the river are 59,000 acres that we seem to
be trying to work something out with, you know, putting

some kind of a program together where it still involved shareholder activity on the river. I guess as a commercial operator running a lodge down here I was just -- I was real unsure of how things were looking for Native shareholders that are operating on that river, not to mention shareholders that go up there for subsistence because it seems like we're just -- there's a lot of questions in people's minds on exactly how this is going to turn over because I know we met with Koniag down here a few weeks back and it seemed the meeting went real well. Dennis seemed real positive about it, along with the other directors, the other board directors that were along with him.

But again, like I say, we just don't want to be left out in the cold, especially running clients on that river. I know there's a number of different commercial operators on there that aren't really tied in with the Koniag Corporation, especially being on their own land, I just -- I feel that this is going -- if there's some kind of an agreement that's going to come together, at least keep that link in where shareholders still have access to that river as far as commercial and subsistence goes because -- I mean we don't -- as far as our income is concerned and monies is involved, that's my livelihood and my wife's livelihood and I guess that's how we put our food

on the table. I gave up commercial fishing a few years back and I went to sport fishing and now we have so much money invested into this -- for that river to go in another direction would probably crumble our little enterprise along with a couple other lodge owners around here.

1.2

We need to take a good look at the big picture and hopefully be able to manage this thing in the future together instead of that driving force that seems pushing things away from us.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you very much, do you have further comments?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: No, I'm fine on that, but I'd like to stay on the line, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You bet, sure.

Molly, would you care to comment on the status of things?

MS. McCAMMON: We'll be going through that when we actually describe Koniag.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, that's fine. That's good.

MS. McCAMMON: But I think there are provisions for that.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you. Are there other comments from the Trustee Council members or questions?

	(NO addible lesponses)
2	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you very much.
3	Anybody else from Larsen Bay?
4	(No audible responses)
5	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, let's try Kodiak
6	then, anybody from Kodiak that wishes to testify?
7	(No audible responses)
8	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: All right. Are there
9	any other people on the net that wish to testify out in the
10	various oil spill communities?
11	MS. BRODIE: This is Pam Brodie in Homer,
12	I'm just on to listen, thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, Pam, thank you.
14	MS. BRODIE: And I can hear Kodiak I can
15	hear Larsen Bay really well, but I can't hear the Trustee
16	Council as well, so if there's anything that can be done
17	technically to turn up the volume, I would appreciate that.
18	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We'll just try and
19	speak louder, I think.
20	MS. BRODIE: Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You're welcome.
22	Anybody else on the line that wishes to testify?
23	MS. REFT: Yes, the Native village of
24	Karluk is on line also.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Do you have

anybody there that wishes to testify?

1.8

MS. REFT: Yeah, my name is Catherine Reft and I really don't understand what this conservation is about and it's really got the residents of Karluk confused. You know, we may not use that river as much as Larsen Bay does, but we got a lot to lose also. (Pause)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I'm sorry, you're fading out. Did we lose them? Are we still on?

MS. McCAMMON: Hello, are we still on?

Catherine, can you hear us?

MS. REFT: Just barely. But Koniag has been going to Larsen Bay and talking with them about this whole situation and all the other villages, they have left Karluk and the residents of Karluk out of it. And so we arrive (telephone distortion) on what's going on with this particular land and with Exxon and what you guys are proposing to do to protect the Natives that live around this land. We're the ones that are going to lose a lot if our rights aren't protected.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you. I assume you'll stay on line during the discussion and hear some more about, as Molly said, more about what is being done here as we get into that discussion. I think I'd like to assure you that that's certainly what we're trying to do, we're trying to make sure everybody understands what is

happening and has a say in what the ultimate outcome is, so hopefully you can stay on the line and listen to the discussion and you'll hear more about the progress on it.

Are there any other questions....

MS. REFT: Would you please....

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I'm sorry.

MS. REFT: Would you please care to explain why it was that Karluk was not even notified about this meeting and we had to hear it through a reporter?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Molly, do you know?

MS. McCAMMON: We put out a regular notice through all of the media and we have a regular list. I assumed that Koniag would notify each of the tribes and the villages that they were working with directly on it. I don't think we specifically notified Karluk village, although through our community involve....

MS. REFT: Wait a minute. Are you guys dealing with our land?

MS. McCAMMON:through our community involvement project all of the facilitators also were notified and they should be notifying the other villages also. So apparently there was a breakdown there and I apologize for that, Catherine.

MS. REFT: Thank you. I'd appreciate it if we're notified in the future of any more meetings that are

going to be happening. 1 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We'll make sure that 2 happens. 3 MS. McCAMMON: Absolutely. 4 MS. REFT: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Are there any other 6 questions of Catherine, Trustee Council members? Anybody 7 8 want to comment? (No audible responses) 9 Okay. Thank you very CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: 10 Anybody else out on the net that wishes to testify much. 11 this morning? 12 13 (No audible responses) CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I guess not. Are there 14 15 people here in Anchorage that wish to testify this morning? (No audible responses) 16 17 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, last chance, anybody else wish to testify in Anchorage or out on the 18 net? 19 (No audible responses) 20 Okay, well, then we'll CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: 21 end the public hearing at this time and go into the next 2.2 item on the agenda, Molly, which I believe is the Executive 23 Director's report. 24

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I'm

25

1 trying to see..... MS. RUSK: Excuse me, this is Catherine 2 again. 3 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes. 4 Is there a way that Karluk can 5 MS. RUSK: get a copy of your guys' agenda? 6 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, do you have a fax 7 number there, Catherine? 8 MS. RUSK: Yes, and it's available to use 9 right now, it's 241-2208. And after the meeting we would 10 also like minutes to this meeting. 11 Absolutely. MS. McCAMMON: 12 MS. RUSK: Who's all there? Is Koniag on 13 line, too? 14 15 MS. McCAMMON: I do not see anybody representing Koniag here at the meeting right now. 16 17 MS. RUSK: Yeah, this is Karluk again, (indiscernible) that Koniag/Exxon, EVOS Trustee Council 18 hearing, meeting, whatever you want to call it. 19 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: No, the meeting has 20 21 several different parts to it, that is one of the topics is 22 the discussion of the Koniag negotiations and what's happening on land acquisition and we're going to go into 23

MS. RUSK:

that.

24

25

I guess an agenda will clear

that up for us then, thank you.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Alvin Squartsoff from

Larsen Bay again. I guess I'm not clear here on something,

you guys are negotiating our lands and our corporate

executives aren't even there?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, the discussions are occurring with them, we're being informed as to how those discussions are going here, this is not the actual negotiation here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: So who's informing you folks? Is that us, the shareholders?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, this is Molly McCammon. Glenn, is Bill Timme supposed to be here?

MR. ELISON: Bill Timme and Tim Mahoney told me that they would be here about 10:30.

MS. McCAMMON: Bill Timme and Tim Mahoney who are representing Koniag are supposed to be here at 10:30, I believe they're on their way. We've been dealing directly with them as the formal negotiators for Koniag.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Any further questions from the Trustee Council?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. We'll proceed with the agenda and maybe when we get to the Koniag part if questions haven't been answered you could probably let us

know, but I'll close the public hearing at this time and go on to the Executive Director's report.

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

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There are a couple of things I wanted to make sure you were aware of, one is the financial report as of April 30th, 2000 and that should go into your packet. The other is the quarterly project status report as of March 31st, 2000.

The main thing I wanted to bring to your attention today was the GEM schedule and the draft agenda for the National Research Council review of the GEM Program, and those are also in front of you at your desk here, and there's also copies out at the table for the public. committee make-up for the NRC Review Committee should be announced sometime this week. Its chairman is from the University of Maryland, by the name of Mike Roman. first meeting is scheduled for here in Anchorage, June 15th through the 17th. The 17th is actually a closed session. And I have a draft agenda that we've been developing with the NRC staff here and I'd like to make sure that you see it and if you have any comments or questions, suggestions, if any of the Trustees, themselves, would like to address the NRC Committee or if you have others that you would like to address the committee, please let me know and we'll make sure that that's accommodated within the schedule.

The main purpose of the first meeting is more an

introductory session for the committee members to meet each other, to go over the purpose of the review itself, why have this study. To provide some direction, also, from other members of the public, the Public Advisory Group, some of the village members or the community facilitators, other representatives of various perspectives. And then to give some background of the scientific research that the Council has sponsored over the last 11 years and also to go over the outline of the draft program.

So that is scheduled for June 15th and 16th, primarily and, again, as soon as possible if you have any comments on this or would like to address them directly.

Then the first item is the GEM schedule and what we have here is the schedule as we currently see it for the GEM review, which also includes all of the National Research Council meetings. It starts with the first draft of what we're calling the GEM Science Program, going to NRC on April 21st, they'll be having their first meeting June 15th through 16th. The NRC Committee will be conducting its review at this time, their next meeting on that document will be in September, they have a third meeting in November and we'll be getting a draft report on that in February, an interim report.

But concurrently with that, Trustee Council staff will be developing a Draft Monitoring Plan. And it became

really clear as we were developing the program, the document over the last year, that what we had there was the framework for a process, procedures, policies, an outline for a program, but it really wasn't a specific monitoring plan. So we will be developing over the next six months a plan. We've talked to the NRC staff about this, they're aware it's happening, the committee will be aware of it, so they will also be giving some iterative guidance as we're developing this plan along the way, too.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Will they actually see drafts of this as you go along?

MS. McCAMMON: They will be seeing drafts as we go along, yes. But they won't actually get a formal document to review until February or so of next year. And at that time they will have two meetings specifically on that plan, then they will have a conclusion meeting in August of 2001 where they look at the monitoring plan plus the entire program and they make their final recommendations and conclusions, with a final report November 2001. So it's a very ambitious schedule, we'll do everything we can to meet that schedule, but it's going to take a lot of work between now and then.

But if you have any comments or questions or concerns about that schedule also, please let me know. But I wanted to make sure that you saw how our planning efforts

are kind of dovetailing with the NRC review.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you. It's certainly complex and ambitious. Are there comments from Trustee Council members?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I'd like to note that Marilyn Heiman did join us at the start of public hearing, has been here the whole time.

Okay. Well, then, I guess we're charged with looking this over and getting back to you. What's your time frame on people getting back to you if they want to have additional comments? You said as soon as possible but.....

MS. McCAMMON: As soon as possible, by the 1st of June.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: 1st of June?
MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Do you have -who actually is addressing the NRC on behalf of the
agencies and the groups? You have a number of names listed
here, how do they on -- reactions to Draft GEM Science
Program? How can this committee -- that's the PAG, I
suppose, but also you have other aspects there as well.

MS. McCAMMON: Those were names that I put down as suggestions to the committee and I'd welcome any

other changes or suggestions or even additions for perspectives, too.

2.0

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay.

MS. HEIMAN: Do we have a list of the committee members?

MS. McCAMMON: We don't have a formal list yet, it has not been announced, we should get it, hopefully, this week.

MS. HEIMAN: It's surprising with the meeting coming right up, we still don't even know who's on the committee.

MS. McCAMMON: They know all but one member. They didn't want to publicly announce it until they got the last member. They need 20-day public notice on the membership, so they put it on their website and have 20 days, so they have to have by this week, I think, otherwise they don't meet their 20-day public notice.

MS. HEIMAN: I would even like to see the list without the full list, I haven't even seen that list at all.

MS. McCAMMON: I can send it to you.

MS. HEIMAN: Thank you. Also I will have comments on people briefing the council, so I'll get those to you.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Would you send the list around -- Molly, would you make sure there's something next to the person's name as to what they represent, a university or where they're from or some type of....

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: That would be helpful, thank you. Other comments or questions on this part of the Executive Director's report?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you very much.

MS. McCAMMON: The only other item I wanted

Molly, what's next?

months ago the Council did set June 15th as a deadline for action on all small parcels that are currently in the mix. After that date funds that are not spent that have been earmarked for small parcels in the past would potentially be considered opened and subjected to reappropriation or other use. And we'll be sending a reminder around to all of the agencies on that in the next day or so with what's on the list with kind of the earmarked amounts. And probably talking with various agencies about what they'd like to see come about after that June 15th review. So we're looking for a date to have a meeting after that time and we haven't been able to come up with a date yet, but we

will have something scheduled after that time.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you. I'd like to note that Michele Brown has joined us, DEC.

Further parts of your report then?

MS. McCAMMON: The only other item was that one on the Public Advisory Group, and if you'll pull that draft resolution up in front of you. We're going through a process right now with the Public Advisory Group of looking at the current structure and make-up of the group, looking at other models for groups across the country and trying to figure out whether, number 1, there should be a Public Advisory Group in the future under GEM. Number 2, what should the make up and representation of the group be. Should it be structured differently, should it be different designated seats, things of that nature.

The current PAG is very actively involved in that and won't have a recommendation or alternatives developed, really, until probably next winter or spring. In the meantime, the current PAG is up for renewal on October 1, 2000, but under the original charter the PAG is only chartered through January 1st 2002 and it had been our intent to have this next PAG stay in existence for two years, we go through this process and then perhaps the whole charter for the Public Advisory Group would be restructured and have to be rewritten, so there'll be some

major changes at that time.

1.4

So this resolution would allow for an extension from January 2002 to October 1, 2002, it gives that PAG the full two years to act. And it's just a simple amendment to the charter, but it requires unanimous approval.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Would it be appropriate to read this into the record, then, and if you would do so and then we can decide.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, and I can do that.

WHEREAS, it is expected that the need for the Public Advisory Group will continue until approximately January 1st, 2002, extension of the group beyond such a date is subject to the unanimous written consent of the designated Trustees and;

WHEREAS, the Trustee Council has plans underway to extend the Oil Spill Restoration Program through a long-term research monitoring and general restoration program to October 1, 2002 and;

WHEREAS, the Public Advisory Group continues to fill an important role in the Trustee Council's public involvement process and is deemed necessary during the transition period;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council hereby extends the term of service of the Public Advisory Group to September 30th, 2002.

1	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do I have a motion?
2	MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I move the
3	resolution as written and as stated by Ms. McCammon.
4	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do I have a second for
5	that?
6	MS. BROWN: Second.
7	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: It's been moved and
8	seconded that we adopt the resolution as written and read
9	by Ms. McCammon. Is there any objection to the motion?
10	(No audible responses)
11	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Consider it unanimous
12	then. Thank you very much. And you urge us to sign this
13	at this meeting then, I presume?
14	MS. McCAMMON: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do you have a blank
16	copy or
17	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, we have one that will
18	be circulated to everyone.
19	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you. One other
20	item I noticed in the notebook was the quarterly project
21	status summary.
22	MS. McCAMMON: Yes.
23	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Is there anything that
24	you'd care to point out to us? It's a very large part of

our....

MS. McCAMMON: No, other than....

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: It was a good review, it was very helpful, I thought, seeing the projects....

MS. McCAMMON: I think it is very helpful. Sandra Schubert puts this together, she keeps close track on all of the projects and whether they're on track or if any of the various objectives have been delayed and, if so, why. It also keeps track of all of our reports. There are a number of the really old reports that, again, continue to concern us, but we've been working with the agency involved, and that's primarily Fish and Game, to get those completed so that we can take those off the attachment, but most of those we have made arrangements with, and hopefully we'll have them by this fall.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Any comments from Trustee Council members on this item?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I thought it might be helpful to put a dollar amount on each project, just how much we're spending on each project.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: So as you get to it, it's -- I think -- it's talked to the content, but it's a little more impression of how major the project is for us.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Get that, Sandra?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Anything else on that agenda item?

MS. McCAMMON: No.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I think we'll go to the next item then, which is the Tatitlek small parcels item in your booklet, in your notebook. You want to take us through that?

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, I'll just give you the background and then Ken Holbrook is here. But, if you'll recall, the Council -- the large parcel resolution in December of 1997 for the Tatitlek large parcel acquisition committed Tatitlek Corporation to work with the Council to pursue acquisition of homesite lots in the Two Moon Bay and Snug Corner Cove subdivisions. There are 164 homesites lots, 120 in Two Moon Bay and 40 in Snug Corner Cove. Some are owned by individuals and some by Tatitlek Corporation, roughly half and half. The resolution authorized expenditure of an amount of funds not to exceed the amount previously authorized for Tatitlek large parcel that was no longer needed for that acquisition. It ended up being a total of \$205,600.

So an appraisal on all 164 homesites lots has been completed, landowners have been notified of the appraised values and, to date, the following 13 owners have indicated a willingness to sell their lots to the Forest Service.

And there are individual -- there's a general map of those and then there's an individual map and restoration benefit report for each of those parcels. The total for the 13 parcels is 19.5 acres totaling a request of \$180,000.

One of the sections of the resolution also provided that if the government acquires any block of six or more contiguous lots from Tatitlek or individual landowners then the corporation would convey, at no cost, the surface fee estate to the acreage immediately behind the block of homesites.

And if you look at the summary map, which is right behind the memo, the homesites are actually right along the shoreline and then there's a block of land behind them that is conservation easement, it was not fee titled, that was acquired by the Forest Service. Behind that conservation easement is the -- that was acquired by the Forest Service. So the idea is that once there was a block of six parcel and the land behind it that's now conservation easement would become fee.

And, as I said, Ken Holbrook from the Forest Service is here to provide any additional detail and any extra information.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I'm sorry, Molly, so the action here is to approve the funding for these 13 owners?

here then?

0.1

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, that is the request.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: And as far as the acreage behind the parcels goes, did that actually happen

MS. McCAMMON: No, it would not happen, there are not six contiguous parcels in any of these.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: That's what I thought.

MS. McCAMMON: They are basically spread out throughout Snug Corner Cove and Two Moon Bay. So under this scenario there would be no fee lands that would be transferred.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Ken, were you going to make a presentation and then we'd ask questions or are you just here to ask [sic] questions?

MR. HOLBROOK: Answer questions and then also I did bring a better map, it displays the ownership pattern versus what's been nominated. And the green ones belong to Tatitlek Corporation and we haven't started negotiations with them. Without the corporation we can't acquire six in a row.

MS. HEIMAN: The red are homesites?

MR. HOLBROOK: The red ones are the ones that are on the block this time, the green ones belong to the corporation.

MS. HEIMAN: Okay.

MR. HOLBROOK: And this nomination is much less, (indiscernible - rustling maps) 30 homeowners have come forward, but the appraisal wasn't done until January of this year and in a short period we only got a couple of people to come forward. More are coming forward. So you see, the majority of these lots are owned by the corporation. And the Forest Service already owns two (indiscernible - rustling maps)

MS. HEIMAN: So 13 homesites for 180,000; is that correct?

MR. HOLBROOK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: The question then is there was only 205,000 to start with, we haven't started negotiations with the corporation and that leaves 25,000 difference between what we started with if these are acquired, so where does that leave us, are we looking for additional funds? Are we looking for a decision relative to these parcels, as to whether these aren't six contiguous ones or should we talk to the corporation first before we buy these? I'm not getting a picture of where we are in this strategy.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: That's exactly what bothered me about this is that it's not just six contiguous to be

able to then get the back part, but it's, like, more than one contiguous. One and a half acres isolated doesn't seem to me provides that much of a benefit. And it sounds like we really haven't talked to everybody that we need to talk to try to lump things together, which I think was sort of the intent of the Council, that stuff be lumped together. If we spend these we're only going to have, like you say, \$25,000, which looks like it's about two lots, and we'll just end up with these isolated lots. So I guess I would -- unless there's another explanation, I would be kind of reluctant to commit this money until we had exhausted all of our other possibilities for looking at the lots.

MR. BOSWORTH: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Rob.

MR. BOSWORTH: Is it possible to get a briefing on the strategic significance of these parcels? I mean I agree with most of what's been said, but on the other hand would it allow for the possibility that there might be an isolated parcel that was unique and important for some particular activity, boat launch, or something. So is it possible, without going....

MR. HOLBROOK: Individually I don't believe that any of these are unique parcels. These were identified by the Trustee Council as meriting special attention in the resolution, in the purchase agreement.

Tatitlek has agreed to, in writing, that they will work
with us to acquire these lots in blocks of six. Once we
acquire shareholder lots they would work with us.

Obviously, the.....

MR. BOSWORTH: How does that work? They

MR. BOSWORTH: How does that work? They would work with us to sell us the adjacent parcels once we have.....

MR. HOLBROOK: Yes.

come from?

MR. BOSWORTH: But where would the money

MR. HOLBROOK: Well, there was never -- the 205,000 was never enough to purchase everything, that was understood from the beginning.

MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Dave.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, and if you look at the amount of money that was set aside and you look at the amount of lots that are available, 205,600 was never enough to acquire all of them. So I think the process here is just to look at, you know, acquiring some of the best --well, some of the parcels that are coming up now and then look at further acquisitions in the future using the small parcel set-aside funds or other funds that are available.

(Off record comments - music on teleconference)

MS. HEIMAN: So maybe you could just go

through, with us, the overall strategy of the other parcels. Are you just waiting for those to become available for sale? Right now those are the only ones that there was interest in selling?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think once we show that the Trustee Council is fully intent on purchasing these lots, I think more shareholders are going to come forward with lots to sell. And I think that's our strategy is to demonstrate that we are willing to acquire these and we are willing to pay fair market value for these and then acquire the other ones as they become available, but like Ken mentioned, initially we had 30 plus come forward, the delay of the appraisal until January and getting back to the people only allowed for the 13 to come forward now, but I fully expect more will come forward very shortly.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: But as Mr. Tillery said, isn't then the question here, you got a strategy but there's no funding for it, so we're still in a position of having to decide if there's adequate funding to go ahead beyond this and we've only got whatever it is here, 13 of 164, obviously we're way short. So I'm not sure what the strategy means or where we ultimately we're going to end up with and whether we need to actually now consider whether we're dealing with 13 and we're happy with that or we have

a strategy that's going to cost another million dollars.

This is a million dollar strategy for \$25,000, it's kind of hard to see if we've agreed on where we really want to get to on this. Could you elaborate on that, Dave?

MR. GIBBONS: Well, like I say, I think we need to demonstrate to the shareholders of Tatitlek that we are interested in acquiring lots. These are lots on the water, you know, some of them adjacent to Tatitlek homesites, I mean Tatitlek sites that are to be managed differently than these privately owned sites, so there is some value of acquiring the privately owned sites now. The strategy is, like I say, there was never enough money, 205,000 was never enough to acquire all of these, but we're trying to demonstrate that we are willing to acquire lots.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: But wouldn't you need to demonstrate that to the people who might see you doing something and then seeing there's nothing left in the purse? I mean we're not demonstrating to anybody how far we're willing to go with this if we have \$25,000 left.

Michele.

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I think the question is partly what you just said and also if the strategy ultimately is not successful and other people do not come forward, do we have enough value through this checkerboard pattern for the money that we will have spent?

MR. GIBBONS: Well, I think the lots, if you look at them, they're all on the water. They're all very, very valuable, you know, from that point of view, into access to the land. We purposely, when we designed the Tatitlek acquisition left conservation easement behind because the management of that land behind was going to be difficult, you know, to do and that's why we arranged for the block of six and then fee simple behind, then we could manage an area. To bring fee simple up to the boundary then it was making it difficult management for our part.

MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Ken.

MR. HOLBROOK: Some additional information. Part of the acquisition from Tatitlek purchased first right of refusal on the Tatitlek lots. And the appraisal shows that with appraised values on the Tatitlek owned lots at being 50 percent of the values of the privately owned lots, which actually reduces the cost here. I think -- the strategy we've looked at is many years and involves money other than just Trustee Council money also, we realized that the Trustees are not going to purchase all of these lots.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I think we did a rough estimate if all the lots were purchased at appraised value, if they were all available and all

1	purchased at appraised value, I think it was 1.5-1.6
2	million total.
3	MR. HOLBROOK: And we do hold basically
4	Tatitlek cannot sell their lots to anybody except the
5	Federal government or the State.
6	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: So you think there is a
7	value in proceeding with this as sort of demonstrating as
8	getting started on the process?
9	MR. GIBBONS: Yes, I do.
10	MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.
11	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Mr. Tillery.
12	MR. TILLERY: I guess my view is it
13	doesn't seem to me like
14	MR. SQUARTSOFF: Excuse me one second, sir.
15	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Hello, yes.
16	MR. SQUARTSOFF:Squartsoff here, if
17	you have the first right of refusal on lands and you don't
18	have the money to purchase them, how does that put you in
19	that category?
20	MS. McCAMMON: They haven't been offered
21	for sale at this point, so it's actually not an issue at
22	this point.
23	MR. SQUARTSOFF: I see. Thank you.
24	MS. McCAMMON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: It does seem to me that we do need to -- we should be waiting until we have some lots that make a coherent package that even -- just so we're not just sort of betting on an unknown and that if something happens, you know, we're spending our money hoping something will happen in the future, hoping that other people want to sell, hoping that we can find the money I guess I would rather -- unless there is, and somewhere. I think what Mr. Bosworth says is correct, if there's a single lot and somebody can say, hey, this is the only access point to that beach, it's a great spot, it would be a good place for somebody to tie up a boat and put a mooring buoy out there or whatever, that would be a different thing, but if it's just -- and when I looked at these descriptions in here it seemed to be like, yes, very good habitat, but no different than what's around it and in isolation I don't think they would have that big of a benefit, so my inclination would be to wait until we have heard from other people, until they can put together a package that sort of survives on its own.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Is there money in the small parcel designation even to consider this total purchase? Do we have enough resources to extend this or -- where did the Forest Service think that money was coming from?

MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, there is a \$25,000,000 small habitat parcel acquisition program that's been set aside that kicks in in 2002, I understand, and that would be one source of the funding that we would be looking at.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: And then these would have to be a priority for that though?

MR. GIBBONS: Those would go into the process for acquisition under that program.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: What's the pleasure of the Council? Is there anyway to not take action now and get some of these things resolved? I don't hear any resolution to one site being so unique that it ought to be taken now, and I don't see any resolution yet to deciding whether the other balance of the sites are important enough to command the total amount they'd take out of the 25,000,000. I don't know if that judgment has been made yet.

MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Apparently it hasn't been made because we only put \$250,000 towards this activity.

Ken.

1.0

1.3

MR. HOLBROOK: There is a great deal of anticipation by the shareholders that this will proceed and

they will be very disappointed if we don't get on with it, and they let me know that frequently. And, like I pointed out, none of these lots are individually unique, it's just a coastal habitat in this area, but if we don't proceed we're going to lose people and these lots are starting to sell and one recently sold that we did have appraised.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: So we're not going to see anything....

MS. HEIMAN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER:further than we have in front of us at this time, at this point. I know that the coastline in these areas was considered important by us, even though we only put \$250,000 into this activity, knowing it was actually -- could be a lot more, so I can't recall our thought and our statements at the time that we did it. We certainly knew that you weren't going get 170 lots, or whatever, for \$250,000, and we never crossed the bridge of whether we should put more money into it or not.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the amount was actually based on the amount of money that was left after -- from sort of a previous earmarked.....

MS. McCAMMON: The closing for Tatitlek ended up happening later than anticipated and so there wasn't as much interest earned on the amount and so this was kind of the amount there that was left behind.

MS. HEIMAN: Left behind from what?

MS. McCAMMON: There was a certain amount earmarked, based on certain assumptions, and because the closing.....

MS. HEIMAN: Earmarked for Tatitlek overall?

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, for Tatitlek overall, and because -- and that was what the cost of the actual acquisition was supposed to be. Because the actual closing was delayed it ended up not costing quite as much and so that remainder in the resolution was earmarked for inholdings and it ended up being the \$205,600.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Marilyn.

MS. HEIMAN: I guess -- I was not around, I don't think, at least I don't remember when we, you know, started the discussions of this project. It sounds like the Forest Service has gone forward and they must have had some reason from the Council that they should go forward with these purchases. So I guess the other thing I'm hearing that we can only purchase these when they're up for sale, I don't want us to be going to people and force -- you know, if they want to keep their homesite, you know, I don't really feel comfortable with that either, so I can understand the situation that the Forest Service might be in, in that they're only able to purchase those that have

come up to date, but their goal is, and we have similar goals in some other areas, as in like Kodiak, their goal is to try to get that coastline or as much of it as they can to protect the resources. And I assume that they had been ranked as very high or else the Forest Service would not have gone down this road, but I have not heard that and I was not here when that took place. I'd love to get a little bit more background before we decide not to approve this.

1.1

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Go ahead.

MR. TILLERY: I think that's right, but there's a fundamental difference though between this and the kinds of Kodiak parcels, which are generally 5-10 acres, which typically are parcels that someone has selected because of a particular aspect of that, because it does have a beach access, because it's on a stream or something like that, and they're individually important, plus they're large enough to have some significance in themselves. This is just, you know, piano keys of one and a half acres and to take any single piano key out of there would seem -- doesn't seem to have any benefit and then we would be spending the money that perhaps when we could -- did hear back from Tatitlek and maybe we could string four of them together or six of them together or whatever it is

we string together and that really could have an impact.

And I hate to spend the money now and just have a couple of piano keys.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Dave.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, maybe we should explain the difference in the types of parcels there. Tatitlek. like we said, you know, first right of refusal goes to the Federal government or the State government, so those are pretty well protected. The privately owned parcels can be sold to anyone and, like Ken mentioned, they are selling those parcels presently, so if we don't move pretty quickly some of those are going to be sold and we're going to be locked out of that process. And so there's two different types of parcels we're talking about here, and I think it's really important that we move forward with some of the privately owned parcels, and like you said, the 205 doesn't cover -- won't buy everything, but we need to show there's good intent here on our part to protect habitat and also follow through with a resolution that was passed on the Tatitlek acquisition that has the language that -- and the amount of funds not to exceed the amount previously authorized and it identifies to move forward with acquisition of these parcels.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Marilyn.

MS. HEIMAN: Well, I would like to make a 1 2 motion that we approve these parcels and that it would be contingent on an overall plan brought forth at the next 3 meeting by the Forest Service that would show the other 4 monies that they would have available and an overall plan 5 in which they see to ensure protection of this habitat. 6 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Is there a second, 7 8 first of all, before we discuss it? I'll second it. 9 MS. BROWN: 10 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Moved and seconded. Are there questions about the motion, clarification? 11 MR. BOSWORTH: Yeah, I guess -- could you 12 restate it, please, Marilyn? 13 MS. HEIMAN: It would be approval of the 14 15 parcels that they've identified with, contingent on them coming back at the next meeting with an overall plan on how 16 they would purchase the other piano keys and with what 17 18 money. 19 MR. BOSWORTH: Does that mean that by passing the motion that these parcels would be purchased or 20 21 not? 22 MS. HEIMAN: At the time when we come back. I mean if there's a sense of the body..... 23 24 MR. BOSWORTH: At some future time or

MS. HEIMAN:the sense of this body

25

that we would approve those contingent on this plan that we would like to see at the next meeting.

MR. BOSWORTH: Oh, okay. So we're not authorizing a purchase until there's a plan; is that right?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yeah, that's kind of the basic question on the motion. So if I'm a property owner selling my property, I've got two or three offers and I going to sell it to the Trustee Council for this purpose, do I have a feeling that by June or July or August I'm going to know whether the sale really goes through or not? And I don't know whether -- if you want to buy these pieces of property it seems to me that you're going to go ahead and buy them not -- I don't know how the contingent works, is the contingent on us liking what they bring forward or just the fact they bring a plan back?

MS. HEIMAN: I'm up for friendly amendments.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I guess I think
I know where Marilyn is going, but I thought her motion was
a little different. It seemed to me like she was asking we
actually approve these so they could go out and consummate
the sale. I would be more inclined to defer consideration
of these parcels until the next meeting with the direction
or the request of the Forest Service that they do try to

come up with an overall plan that talks about why these parcels are important, individually, or how they anticipate being able to group some of the together, and a plan for the funding of acquisition of a larger group. I can understand you point that these are parcels that are available now and you grab them if they're available, but I just don't, right now, see how you're going to end up -- I don't see where the money is coming from. If, for example, the Forest Service has funding available to exercise its right of first refusal, then that would certainly make a big difference in my own approach to this. And, actually, if you could answer one more question, which is what percentage of the privately owned

parcels are these 13; how many total privately owned parcels?

> CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Seventy-seven.

MR. HOLBROOK: Sixty-four, 66 are private.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: It says 77 in the

brochure here.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: Seventy-seven.

MR. HOLBROOK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Individually 77,

Tatitlek Corporation owns 87.

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, 13 out of 77.

MR. TILLERY: Okay.

MR. BOSWORTH: And, Mr. Chairman, am I 1 right, did you say that of that 67, or whatever, 30 2 individuals had indicated they would be interested in 3 selling? 4 MR. HOLBROOK: That's correct. 5 MR. BOSWORTH: So there are 19 or 20 that 6 are sort of unaccounted for at this point. 7 8 MR. HOLBROOK: That's true, yes. MR. BOSWORTH: And what are the prospects 9 of getting information about those potential sales sometime 10 soon? 11 MR. HOLBROOK: Well, Tatitlek has chosen to 12 work through a realtor to represent their shareholders and 13 so the realtor is in contact with the shareholders, and out 14 of the 70 or so privately owned..... 15 16 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Excuse me one second. CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: 17 I'm sorry. 18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Sorry to interrupt. were just wondering here in Larsen Bay, and I'm sure Karluk 19 20 is wondering the same thing, when the discussions on the easement up there on that Karluk land is going to be 21 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I think that's the next 22

item on the agenda, so it'll be a few minutes and we'll

MR. SQUARTSOFF: All righty, thank you

finish this, probably 10 minutes.

23

24

25

I have....

then.

2.2

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You're welcome.

So in a strategy sense, if we don't -- if you come back with a plan at the next meeting, the plan, presumably, would ask for more money for the 30 parcels that is currently is available and we'd actually be voting on the monetary thing as well as the parcels that are up. So how is that going to be influenced by us taking action or not taking action at this meeting on these 13 parcels?

MR. HOLBROOK: If I can't go forward, if we can't go forward to these shareholders, I assume from the input I've had that they're going to start falling out and going for other options. Our plan is, as the Trustees basically told us in the purchase agreement, that we would purchase over time, I mean obviously there's not enough money and we plan on putting some money forward for sales from different sources.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Ms. Heiman.

MS. HEIMAN: May I ask for a brief at-ease?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Sure. We'll stand at ease for five minutes.

(Off record - 11:02 a.m.)

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

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: All right, we're back and let's move on to the next agenda item. Ms. McCammon.

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, just for a little background, if you'll recall in 1994 the Trustee Council working with Fish and Wildlife Service did authorize acquisition of about 50-some odd thousand acres of Koniag owned lands. There were an additional 56,000 acres or so of lands on the Karluk and Sturgeon Rivers that the Trustee Council could not, at that time, agree on a price with Koniag. What they did agree to was protecting those land through a long-term -- through a seven-year conservation easement and during that time we would continue negotiations and see if a price could be decided on for those lands.

1.1

2.3

So during this period the staff here and Fish and Wildlife Service and the State have been negotiating with Koniag. Over that time it has also become clear that, at this point in time, Koniag is not interested in a permanent sale of those lands, sale of the fee interest in those lands. And so for the last year or so what we have been talking about is extending the current conservation easement. Our discussions have included adding Camp Island, as well as some additional lands surrounding some of the in-holdings that the Council has been acquiring over the last several years. So it's a few additional thousand acres than in the original conservation easement.

But the proposal that we've been talking about, at

this time, is not a land purchase, it's an extension of the current conservation easement, it's looking at some provisions in the conservation easement, and we'll get into this later, in terms of access and commercial use of the area, limitations on potential development, things of that nature. The scenario that we've been talking about is extending the current easement, at the same time the Council would put into a separate fund an amount of \$29,550,000 into a separate account. That account would be used to fund a fee for that conservation easement and that fee would go directly to Koniag.

After 10 years Koniag, at its sole option, could choose to either sell the lands for whatever amount is in that account or they could choose to extend the conservation easement for another 10 years. And it's completely up to them.

We have been discussing -- so this would automatically -- their vote, 10 years from now, would automatically trigger a sale if they chose to do that, or their decision at that time. So, basically, it extends the conservation easement for 10-20 years and gives the option for a sale to be decided at some future date. If a sale was not concluded after the maximum 20 years then those funds would revert back to the Trustee Council to be used for the habitat protection program.

And we'll go into details later. I know there was some aspects of this that the Trustees wanted to discuss in executive session, but the folks that we've been talking with over the last several years on this wanted to address the Trustee Council before that happened, and that is Bill Timme and Tim Mahoney, they have represented Koniag throughout the negotiations and they're here today to speak.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: That's fine. Would you gentlemen care to come forward? Just pull another chair up there.

MR. TIMME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bill Timme, I've represented Koniag and with me is Tim Mahoney who also represents Koniag in the course of the negotiations.

First, I'd like to express the apologies of Dennis Metrokin, President of Koniag, for not being here. Dennis had a prior commitment that when the Trustee meeting was moved from Thursday to today he wasn't able to shift his schedule so as to be available.

There are a couple of points that we'd like to make on behalf of Koniag. First, Molly, I'd like to underscore that there's implicit in what you said is a third option, which is that Koniag not only could extend the easement for 10 years, could, if the board elected to do so, sell the

land, thirdly it could terminate the agreement at that point entirely, and no easement would continue and unincumbered title would revert back to Koniag.

1.7

Director is aware, that there's been a lot of misinformation that's been disseminated about the course of the negotiations. Over the past couple of months there was a misfortune of having a statement in the local newspaper in Kodiak that the Council and Koniag were negotiating a sale of these lands. Of course, that is not what was happening and the board specifically, several years ago, took the position that Koniag, at this time, was not willing to sell the lands. However, that statement, plus some misstatements that were made in some of the villages by individuals caused a great deal of concern, as well it should, among some of the shareholders that the land was --Koniag was talking about a sale of the lands when, in fact, it wasn't.

I want to express our appreciation to the Executive Director because she was very kind enough to talk to the mayor of Larsen Bay, the president of the tribal council and a member of the tribal council in Larsen Bay. She's written letters to the Kodiak newspaper as well as to the tribal council setting the record straight, there is no sale being contemplated in this agreement. Koniag has not

agreed to one and has, in fact, indicated, at this point, that it is not looking at a sale. Dennis Metrokin, representatives of Koniag, representatives of Larsen Bay have, in fact, gone to a number of the villages, I believe they were able to make all of the villages in the Kodiak region, with the exception of perhaps Karluk and they weren't able to get in there because of a scheduling difficulty, you know, that's my understanding. But they have met with the people in Larsen Bay, they have discussed with them, at some length, the subject matter of the negotiations and how they progressed. Koniag appreciates the effort the negotiating team has put in on this and we'd like to say that we feel that where we are now, recognizing that there are a number of minor issues that have to be worked out, and Koniag's board has yet to take action on this, of course, that we feel that, in principle, this addresses a number of the concerns that Koniag has had.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As we are all aware the Copper River is a very special resource and Koniag just does not have the resources to manage it in a manner necessary to ensure its protection. And this was one of the goals of this agreement, to provide for joint management of the river in a manner that would protect it and ensure its viability in the future.

The discussions have also, obviously, focused on

the protection of the subsistence rights of the people in the area, as well as an ability to provide some economic opportunities for Karluk and Larsen Bay. Koniag will be retaining the right to grant concessions for commercial guiding on the river, it would continue its cabin rental program, continue the bear viewing operation that it has successfully operated at Camp Island. And there would be even opportunities for other tourist facilities, all within the framework of protecting the environment.

We are also very happy that we were able to, in principle, discuss the possibility of an internship program that would give the young people of these communities an opportunity to explore and perhaps have an opportunity to engage in jobs related to resource management of the river and of these lands. Most of these issues were raised by a special panel that Koniag had put together of its people, shareholders, representatives of the villages, representatives of the business community that were relying on the river to address the needs of the river. And these were decisions that were made by this group that in meeting with a negotiating team we were able to incorporate in our discussions.

So while I cannot speak for Koniag in terms of saying that this is something that Koniag accepts, it certainly is a good start and we're looking forward to

taking it to Koniag's board so that they might consider it.

It's our understanding that, at this time, it will be subject to further action by the Council at a later date when the documents are completed. And at that time Koniag's board would also consider it and make a determination of whether it did, in fact, meet Koniag's objectives and goals.

Tim, do you have anything?

2.4

MR. MAHONEY: I wanted to add that Bill and I met with leaders from Larsen Bay here in Anchorage last month, got their detailed concerns about the need to provide for opportunities in the guiding and outfitting business, particularly on the use of the river and the use of the cabins near the river. And we have provided those opportunities and the protection of those economic opportunities for shareholders from the villages in our discussions at this point.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you very much. Questions from the Trustee Council?

(No audible responses)

MR. AKIN: I'd like to just throw in a quick question and this is, I guess, for the Trustee Council. My name is Brad Akin, I'm in Larsen Bay here. I spoke with Bill and Tim on the issue. But this amount, this 29,555,000, is this an amount that has been decided on

that one?

with the perspective of Ken Biland and the Portage

(indiscernible) being held out for possible management from

Larsen Bay, Karluk, Afognak Joint Ventures?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Molly, you want to try

MS. McCAMMON: Do you want to do it?

MR. TIMME: I'll be happy.....

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

MR. TIMME: Brad, this is Bill Timme. The 29,000,000 is an amount that goes into, basically, a trust account which would be used to fund the annual payments, as well as provide an amount of money, at the end of 10 years that would be available for Koniag to consider selling the land. That amount, based on our negotiations at this point, is still the amount that would go into the trust with Koniag having these concessions or retaining these concession rights during the period of the easement.

MR. AKIN: Okay, great. And what is the Trustees feeling on these being left out for concession to the villages for management?

MS. McCAMMON: They're still being briefed on it at this point. Hopefully they'll have a better response shortly.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Craig.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, at the end of

10 years Koniag has the option to say we want to sell and the Trustee doesn't. The sale would be negotiated now, essentially, the terms of the sale. In other words, we would -- whatever we did now there would be a package of deeds with whatever restrictions they might have in them or provisions, package of conservation easements for the other government, that sort of thing, so it wouldn't be a "we'll get together in 10 years and talk about it." It would be Koniag can say yes or no.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes or no, right.

MS. McCAMMON: Right.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Further questions?

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. AKIN: Right. I guess my question has not been answered yet, and I guess it sounds like, I believe that was Molly who answered it, that this is still under discussion and there's still questions to be drug back and forth on this management proposal; is that correct?

MS. McCAMMON: I think that the answer is that not all of the Trustees have been fully briefed on it yet, so I'm confident that there has been an understanding reached, but I can't speak for the other Trustees since not all of them have been briefed on it. So that should happen shortly.

22 |

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yeah, that's part of what we're going to get into next, I presume.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Any other questions?

MS. BROWN: Just a brief clarification

question, having not been....

MS. REFT: (Indiscernible) here in Karluk, who came up with the 29,000,000? Who came up with price amount?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I can answer that. It's really not a price amount, it's not intended to reflect a value of any particular amount of lands or the deal, it was just the amount of money that the Trustee Council would be willing and has available and would be willing to set aside. So it's not intended to reflect a value.

MS. REFT: (Indiscernible) my opinion, for 29,000,000 you guys can have a little square up there by the mountains, not by our river.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Marilyn.

MS. HEIMAN: Molly, just for purposes of people who may not know this, can you explain how this setaside money will collect interest and how that will all work so that there will be payments to Koniag shareholders over the next 10 years?

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. The money would be set aside in a separate account, accounted for separately, but it would be invested pretty similarly to the other Trustee Council investments, although probably a little more aggressively. But starting -- let's just say there's 29,550,000 when it's first set up on October 15th, 2002. After that first year that amount of money invested in a combination of stocks and bonds and things like that is estimated to earn about \$2.7. Out of those earnings would come a fee that the governments would pay to Koniag for the conservation easement, and that fee would grow for the first 12 years, it would be increased every year. But what's not used for that fee then goes back into the fund and is still invested and earns additional earnings. And after 10 years it's estimated that 29,550,000 would end up being a total of over \$61,000,000 in the fund. After 20 years it's estimated that amount of money would be almost \$134,000,000. And it could be more because these are fairly conservative projections, so it could be substantially more than that amount. That's the estimate

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at this time.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: These are fees being paid for the conservation easement?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

MS. REFT: (Indiscernible) deal can

actually take place at anytime, you know, let's say, seven years down the line Koniag turns around and says, okay, we'll sell it.

MS. McCAMMON: No, it can't happen until a

1.6

minimum of 10 years. After that time it could happen if the conservation easement was extended for another 10 years then it could happen, the sale could happen at anytime during that second 10-year period, but for the first 10 years they could be no sale.

MS. HEIMAN: Can I just clarify, too? Is there interest that is accrued as well as payments over that period of time?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

MS. HEIMAN: What are the payments?

MS. McCAMMON: The payments are....

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: The escrow column.

MS. McCAMMON: Start at the escrow column, the escrow payment.

MS. HEIMAN: So each year it would grow from 372.....

MS. McCAMMON: Thousand, one hundred dollars to year 12 when it would be \$744,200.

MS. REFT: (Indiscernible) Exxon Valdez
Council to know from Karluk, Koniag has not made an attempt
to come down here, they met with all the other villages,

but have not attempted to come to Karluk to meet with our people.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you.

Do you care to respond to that?

MR. TIMME: I was aware of the fact that
Koniag was trying to meet with Karluk, I know that they
were not able to get in there, I think there was a conflict
between Karluk's travel schedule and their schedule.

MS. REFT: (Indiscernible) to get ahold of the tribal council or people in Karluk to let them know you're going to be coming here, not just show up unexpectedly and not expect anybody to be here or what? I just don't understand that, because I work here in the tribal office and we never received a fax, a phone call, any type of notice that Koniag was interested in coming down here to meet with the people. I found out through other sources that you guys were going to Larsen Bay, last minute.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, thank you. We'll certainly make sure -- I think Molly has already faxed you the agenda information, we'll make sure the other items are in your hands as well. Certainly anything that's here available to us should be available to you, so we'll make sure you get it. The other thing....

MS. REFT: Well, I'm not too worried about

2 know. CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Well, people are 3 sitting here representing that, so..... 4 MS. REFT: (Indiscernible) but from 5 Anchorage, I mean, come on, you know, it's upsetting, we 6 didn't get nothing. And we didn't receive your agenda as 7 of this minute right -- when I asked for it at the 8 beginning of the meeting. 9 10 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: It hasn't been faxed? MS. McCAMMON: Has it been faxed? 11 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We're checking on that, 12 it should have been, I don't know why it hasn't gone 13 through and try again. 14 MS. McCAMMON: Did you receive it, yet, 15 Catherine? 16 MS. REFT: No, we haven't. 17 18 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yeah, she said she had 19 not. MS. McCAMMON: It's been.... 20 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, we'll resend it, 21 we have somebody going out to check on that now. The other 22 point of this is the escrow payment part is an annual 23 24 payment all through the period of time, starting at 372,000

for the conservation easement during that period of time,

the Exxon Trustees, it's Koniag, and I'm just letting you

1

2.5

so each year a payment is made of 372,438, escalates up to 1 744,000, that's being made annually. 2. MS. McCAMMON: Yes. 3 MS. HEIMAN: Mr. Chairman. 4 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes. 5 MS. HEIMAN: Am I correct to assume that 6 7 Koniag will be going to Karluk and speaking with the people 8 there? MR. TIMME: We certainly will pass that to 9 Dennis and.... 10 MS. HEIMAN: And give them advance notice 11 and all the things..... 12 MR. TIMME: Yes. 13 MS. HEIMAN: I think people are hearing 14 your concerns loud and clear here in the meeting. 15 16 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you very 17 much. No other questions? (No audible responses) 18 19 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you, gentleman for your statements. And, Molly, would you take us on to 20 21 the next part of this agenda? MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, there has been 22 a request for an executive session on this, there are a 23 couple of issues through our discussions that some of the 24

individual Trustees wanted some additional clarification on

25

before we actually had additional discussion on the record.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. I'd take a motion to do that. I guess we need a motion to go to executive session. Somebody move to go to executive session and state the purpose.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I move that we go into executive session for the purposes of discussing the Koniag acquisition and the Tatitlek small parcels.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. It's been moved, do I have a second?

MS. BROWN: Second.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Moved and second we go into executive session to discuss the Koniag acquisition and Tatitlek small parcels. And, Catherine, for your benefit, we'll do that, but we will be back on the line -- we will not be reaching decision, we're just discussing some of the negotiating problems and questions.

You want to take us off the line then?

MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, I think.....

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: How long do you think

this will take, a half hour?

MS. McCAMMON: If we're in executive session until noon, we have some things planned from noon to approximately 1:00-1:30, so we probably wouldn't come back onto the record again until 1:30.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: 1:30, okay. 1 MS. McCAMMON: 1:00 or 1:30, yeah. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: 1:30 then, we're going 3 to have the executive session until lunch, then we'll break 4 for lunch and then come back at 1:30. 5 MS. McCAMMON: So you should call this 6 number, the number that you called in to get on this 7 conference call, you should call that number again. 8 MR. PETERSON: Are there going to be any 9 more testimonies accepted? 10 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We can discuss that. 11 We closed the public hearing, but certainly I could reopen 12 it for a set period of time at 1:30 if you like? 13 MS. HEIMAN: I think that's a good idea. 14 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I think it's a good 15 thing to do, so let's do that. We'll count on reopening 16 17 the public testimony at 1:30. Is that what you had in mind or did you want to hear some more of the discussion first? 18 19 MR. PETERSON: No, I'll be ready at 1:30. CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, 1:30 we'll do it. 20 21 Thank you. 22 MS. McCAMMON: Thank you very much to everyone on line. 23 (Off record - 11:35 a.m.) 24 · (On record - 1:01 p.m.) 25

MS. McCAMMON: We're going to get started

now

and actually.....

(Conference operator getting Frank Rue on line)

MS. McCAMMON: Okay, for this portion of

the Trustee Council meeting, actually the Chair is going to defer to another chair.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Can I do that for the rest of the day?

MR. TILLERY: I'm temporary.

MS. McCAMMON: But the reason we're here today, I think, is actually to mark the end of an era. When two people are going to be leaving the Trustee Council process who have been with it almost from the beginning, Steve certainly has been with it from the beginning. He's the only Trustee who was a natural resource Trustee right at the time of the spill and then through damage assessment days and, after the settlement, has been a Trustee for National Marine Fisheries Service/NOAA ever since that time, so he has been here since day one.

The other person whose last meeting this is, is
Rebecca Williams, and Rebecca has served as my executive
secretary, administrative manager of the office and has
been here since 1990, so she probably has almost the next
longevity practically among everyone else here. And I find

it hard to believe that I'm letting her do this, but she's actually abandoning me for the warmer climates of Texas.

But the reason we're having this is to honor, I think, both Rebecca and Steve and their contributions to the Trustee Council process. When you look back at the time of the spill and a lot of you were involved in various capacities through your agencies or through other activities, if you can remember just the emotion that folks had at that time trying to deal with an incredible, almost like a battle, an emergency situation, a battle of dealing with the effects of the spill. And having folks like Steve having to respond without any real guidance from other kinds of spills throughout the world.

And certainly we have Charlie Cole here who was one of the instrumental folks in getting the settlement achieved in 1991 and creating the Trustee Council and through all the early days of trying to figure out how it should be organized, what it should do, what does restoration mean. When you look back at those days and you look at where the Council is today in terms of how many species have recovered, how much habitat has been protected, the fact that the Council has underway a long-term endowment for research and monitoring for the Northern Gulf, it really is an incredible evolution.

And Steve Pennoyer and Rebecca have been

instrumental in that whole process. So I'd like to call upon the other Trustees, and I know there are folks in the audience to say a few words and help us honor these folks.

Frank.

MR. RUE: I thought you had a list of people.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You're at the top of the list.

MR. RUE: All right. I feel like I've been in diapers during most of Steve's tenure at Fish and Game. Steve has been in fisheries issues longer than anyone that I know of in Alaska, probably knows more about both State and Federal fisheries, so he's going to be a huge loss to both the fisheries management program in Alaska, but especially the Trustee Council. And, Steve, I know from the time that I've worked with you I've really appreciated your pragmatism, you know, let's get something done, let's get something good done, your vision and your willingness to see all perspectives. You know, I think that this kind of a process could not have worked if people didn't have that combination of both vision and pragmatism and weren't tied down by their particular agency's agenda or mission, and you weren't. I really appreciate that.

I really appreciated your wisdom as a fisheries manager, sort of the new kid on the block, I felt that I

could rely on your experience and make sure we weren't doing something foolish. And I guess the other thing I believe you really brought to the process that I appreciated was your sensitivity to the public, you really listened to people. Again, as an agency head, sometimes it's pretty easy to get tied up in our own missions and I believe you really listened to the public and helped the Council listen to the public.

So, from my perspective, you've been a great member of the team, I've relied on you a lot in making my decisions. I'll miss that, so thank you very much and I'm jealous.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. BOSWORTH: Molly, I'd like to followup, if I may, with a presentation from Fish and Game.

Steve, we reached deep into the vaults at the Department of Fish and Game to come up with a suitable item for you to reflect upon in your time not only with the Trustee Council but your time at the Department. So I want to present you with a trophy and I want to you know that this is not -- this is a hat, for those of you on line, Fish and Game hat, this is not the Elmer Fudd style, this is the low rider, the contemporary model, it is enormously popular and valuable, street value I wouldn't even want to calculate.

(Laughter)

1.5

MR. BOSWORTH: So you may also want to put this in a vault.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you. It came out of the vault, yeah, it was in there for a while, wasn't it?

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you very much. I'll wear it fishing.

MR. BOSWORTH: Wear it in good health.

MR. GIBBONS: If I could say a few words.

I've been in the process, I think, just about as long as

Steve has and I remember the first Trustee Council meeting

I walked into, I walked in and there was Steve there and

Mike Barton and I think Don Collingsworth and maybe Walt

Stigglitz. And I walked into this damage assessment and I

thought what did we get into? The complexity of the

situation was really great and I really observed Steve and

I echo what Frank says, you know, a real calm demeanor,

more worried about the resources than the agency and really

it's been a pleasure working with you, Steve, for almost 10

years or more than 10 years. And in various capacities, as

damage assessment or as an administrative director or as a

Trustee Council member, so thank you, Steve.

And, Rebecca, I want to say a few words about Rebecca. She probably remembers the early days when we

were on this floor, and nothing against you, Charlie or Deborah....

(Laughter)

MR. GIBBONS:or you Craig, but we'd have more attorneys in the meeting than real people and they would just be very contentious. Stan's shaking his head, he remembers those days, too, that I'm surprised we got anything done, it was a very contentious time and I just want to thank you for your help in those times when I was sitting in here and thank you.

So thank you both for many memories.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You're the Chair.

MR. TILLERY: I'm reserving my right to comment, however, I want to particularly echo what was said about Rebecca. With all due respect to Molly, we know that Rebecca is the one.....

(Laughter)

MR. TILLERY:that keeps us functioning. I deal a lot with Rebecca because as the lawyers tend to end up having to execute a lot of the things here, and when you execute things you need to have documents and so forth and so on. And the wonderful thing about Rebecca is not only was she competent in that, when I would say, Rebecca, I need this resolution and I need this meeting notes, or something like that. And she would

immediately say, yes, I'll get them, and within a couple of hours they were there. But then the next time you called up you would say, Rebecca, I need, and she would say, yes, I know you need this resolution, you need these meeting notes and they're on their way. I mean it was dealing with a person of Rebecca's calibre has made our life simple. And also dealing with a person with Rebecca's personality and just friendliness and so forth has just been terrific and generally been quite -- it's been a pleasure dealing with this office and Rebecca has been a large, large part of that.

And if I knew of a legal way to prevent you from going I would do that. So you need to get out of this jurisdiction and down to Texas before we think of something.

(Laughter)

MR. TILLERY: I'll get back to you.

MR. CHARLIE COLE: I'd like to say a word, if I may. All I can say -- well, maybe not all I can say, but I really want to say what a great guy, what a great friend and what a great Trustee you've been, Steve. When we first negotiated this settlement we struggled with how to divide up the various voting agreements among the various agencies and it seemed impossible as we were negotiating it to figure out how we arrive at a majority

vote, because it just seemed like it wouldn't work. And so I said, well, why don't we require a unanimous vote and eventually we were able to make the first draft of the agreement requiring a unanimous vote. And then the Legislature did not approve the settlement and so we went back to renegotiating.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And there was, again, great pressure to not have the unanimity requirement for all decisions of the Council, but Barry Hardman and the Department of Justice said, no, we made an agreement with you that we would amend the settlement as little as possible and we had the requirement in the first agreement and we will keep it. And as I reflect back upon that I think, notwithstanding the many objections that we had to the unanimity requirement, it has worked well, at least certainly when I was there. But I say the reason that I think it's worked well during that time is because people, like Steve Pennoyer, who was so well prepared, so congenial, so understanding that we were able to accomplish so many things that we did in the early days. And, you know, I appreciate, probably as much as anything the patience that Steve had with me and my obstreperousness and recalcitrance and the many things that we struggled with over the years.

I remember well Steve's concern over that AB Pod. (Laughter)

MR. CHARLIE COLE: That went on for about a year or two and I kept exercising my singular objection to it, but Steve, wonderful Trustee that he was, had this unfailing patience with me and said, fine. So eventually I capitulated and I hope they figured out what happened to the AB Pod over the years.

1.4

1.6

But, Steve, I wanted to thank you personally and as a former Trustee for all the great work that you have done, you've made a great contribution to the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council and everyone in the state owes you a great debt.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you, Charlie.

MS. D. WILLIAMS: It's hard to top
Charlie's very brilliant and incisive comment, but I'll add
just a few words. I had the pleasure of working with Steve
as a co-Federal Trustee for about five years and I would
just like to add a few comments reflective of that.

First of all, when I first joined the Trustee

Council and asked people about the members of the Trustee

Council, I'm really quite confident that 100 percent of the people I asked about always made one initial comment and that is, Steve Pennoyer is a wonderful Trustee. And it was borne out in every possible way. I think the first meeting I attended Steve chaired, and I think we all know that

Steve is the an absolute consummate chair, I know of few

people who can chair a meeting more graciously and effectively as Steve, and I think he served as a model for all of the rest of the Trustees of how to chair a meeting beautifully, and I thank you for that. And I learned a lot from watching you as chair, Steve.

1.1

Secondly, Steve, as other people have reflected, but I'd just like to underscore, is so calm and there are lots of times when the rest of us weren't, and we would look to Steve for his moderate, calming influence. And because he was calm and reasoned, Steve would oftentime be the ambassador between the State Trustees and the Federal Trustees on those very few occasions when we had differences. And it really was always reassuring to know that, you know, if Federal Trustees agreed to something and Steve agreed to something that if we need it, and oftentimes we needed Steve to talk to the State Trustees to build those bridges, Steve was our big bridge builder.

Steve was also the one that many of us on the Federal side looked to, to see where he was. So if Molly would try and put something together, one of the first questions I'd usually ask Molly is what does Steve think? Because Steve inevitably gets to the heart of the matter and would represent the public interest well, Steve has a very good sense of the public interest and, particularly, as science and species recovery and things that apply to

the public interest. So I can say as a Federal Trustee I, again and again and again, looked to Steve for his wisdom on a topic, and it was never wrong.

1.3

I do want to, finally, underscore Charlie's comments, Steve, you have been a phenomenal asset to the process, to the public interest and to the restoration and the spill area. And I confidently say that the restoration process would not have gone as well, would not have as profitable, would not have been as cordial without your leadership, you really were a critical, indispensable leader in this process and we all thank you for it.

I would like to say just a few comments about
Rebecca because, as so many other people have said, Rebecca
has just kept things going so beautifully. And, you know,
like many of us, I'd call up and ask for Molly and if Molly
was there I'd say, well, is Rebecca there? And if Rebecca
was there it was okay. And the thing about Rebecca, it's
like what Craig said, everything Rebecca did she did
beautifully and we all have had utter confidence in
everything you've done. And, you know, when you're a
Trustee, when things are tense, when things are very
challenging, to know that always whenever Rebecca was
involved in something that it would be done beautifully, it
would be done, it would be done accurately, it would be
done thoughtfully, just meant that we could think about

other things. And so, Rebecca, I can't thank you enough.

You are really one of those extraordinary people that you
have utter confidence in in whatever you do, so thank you.

2.

2.2

MR. SENNER: A couple of things, without repeating too much. I was in a lot of those meetings that Dave referred to back in damage assessment times and it was evident, to me, that Steve was someone whose first concern was the resource and not agency or government turfs. And in those early days, as you remember, it wasn't just the agencies squabbling, we had the State and Federal government often at loggerheads, and Steve's first allegiance was to the resource and to seeing that the kind of science was done that needed to get done. That's one thing.

Wearing my Audubon hat, we all know that bringing an ecological perspective to fisheries management has a long way to go, but I think people around the country look to Alaska and the North Pacific Council and Steve's office with NMFS being leaders in that arena, and a lot of that, I think, is a tribute to Steve's leadership and knowledge over many, many years in Alaska. So to the extent that we have come a long way with ecological management of fisheries, I think Steve has had a lot to do with that.

On a personal note, one of the things I've always appreciated is that Steve paid a lot of attention to those

of us on the staff as individuals and people, not just as professionals, and Steve never failed, including today, to stop and ask how I'm doing and this and that, and I was always appreciated as a staff person. So you will be sorely missed for all those reasons.

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

And in regard to Rebecca, when I started out in the oil spill program, also in 1990, the Restoration Office was actually in a separate building and Ken Rice and a couple of others remember when we were over there where Deborah's offices are now. And we were sort of roped into the fold, I think to rein us in, maybe, to bring us under the management of everything else. And those of us over there were pretty concerned about that, we thought our independence and everything would be compromised. was quickly evident that when we came over here what we discovered is this was such a smoothly operating machine that this was really the place to be. Things worked here, we has enormous administrative support, as well the collegiality of working with good friends and people who became friends, and a lot of that is due to Rebecca and the way she ran things, so thank you, Rebecca.

MS. SEE: Yeah, for the Department of Environmental Conservation, where we have not enjoyed the same stability of leadership at the top that your department has had, we've greatly appreciated your

continuity, your intensive commitment to the resources and your blend of science and administration of public trust.

It's a rare combination to have such breadth and capability in all those different areas and to see them so consistently applied to the EVOS process over the years has been a great benefit, as was mentioned, to the people, of all of the people of the state. And we're very grateful to your years of service in that capacity.

1.7

And I've known you now for nearly 20 years, having had a history with Fish and Game myself, and I've also admired your commitment to people, to staff, as well as people from all walks of life and expertise and your respect for public involvement, but for people, in general, I think that's been a hallmark of what I used to hear at Fish and Game in your career there and also in this process here. And I know the kind of continuity you've brought to all of this process under EVOS has been enormously important and I, for one, and Michele as well, will greatly miss you here.

And a couple of words about Rebecca. One of the great benefits to us has been the continuity of staff and capability of staff at the office here. I think this office has a tremendous, well-deserved, reputation for efficiency and excellence, and I think all the players here deserve credit for that, but Rebecca will be greatly missed

with all your history of everything that's gone here and ability to, as Craig pointed out, pull out just exactly what you need when you need, or before sometimes. And I think I don't want to be around Molly the first week you're gone because I think there's this phenomena called "Rebecca Withdrawal" that will set in and maybe everybody should take leave that week or something.

(Laughter)

2.0

MS. SEE: You will be missed.

MR. CHARLIE COLE: I'd like to say I'm sort of disappointed the Charles McKee isn't here today.....

(Laughter)

MR. CHARLIE COLE:I was looking forward to seeing him.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, you just missed Theresa, we were going to reopen the public hearing just for you.

MR. TILLERY: I would, Steve, like to say that I haven't been around this process and viewing you since the time it started, I'm not trying to make you old, but longevity is interesting, I mean it's quite a phenomena in this era of government and changing governments. But longevity in itself isn't a lot if it's not the right person, and quite clearly if I could have picked anybody to have longevity in this process it really would have been

you. It has been a pleasure knowing you and it's been -you know don't how hopeful it was to me knowing that the
rest of us can do what we do and always knowing that
there's not just an adult in the room, but there's an adult
that's a scientist and knows what he's talking about.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Older person.

(Laughter)

1.7

2.2

MR. TILLERY: Somebody with common sense and who always brings us back, somebody with the vision to be looking a couple of steps ahead when we're talking about the reserve and those kinds of things. But somebody with knowledge and that we respect and that, you know, when you start speaking and we're talking about that Work Plan, we all stop and listen and it gives us comfort in knowing that we can rely on the decisions that we've made because we respect your knowledge.

The other thing, I think, that I thought most marked some of your tenure here was your interest in this process, it was not a casual interest. It was a real deep interest, at least that's the way it came across to me, if it wasn't you did a great job of disguising it. But it was an interest that said that you really cared about the restoration process and about the resources and the people here, and I just -- it's been great and I'm really pleased to have been able to work with you and in some sense work

for you and just to be associated with you in this process and you made the process better and I think you made all of us a little bit better.

And Charlie is right about those killer whales. He did, he kept that thing going when nobody else, well, not say nobody else, but the lawyers were skeptical because no injury had been demonstrated. Well, we have a bunch of killer whales that were missing, but there was no known oil on them, we didn't seem to know how it would have gotten -- and I was fortunately able to locate a killer whale that actually has a patch of gray weathered oil on it.

(Laughter)

MR. TILLERY: And you'll notice this guy is very lethargic.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oh, that's great.

MR. TILLERY: So I think that we have actually located it for you, vindicated you after all these years.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I'll send it to GSA myself, because they still don't believe it.

MS. McCAMMON: GAO.

(Indiscernible - multiple voices)

MR. TILLERY: The Department of Law does not have any fancy hats for you, all we can do for you is.....

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Any speed ticket

2 exemption?

MR. TILLERY: Well, one of the problems is now that you're going there really is no one to speak for the killer whale out there and as part of the Department of Law's retirement gift to you is our pledge that in the future we will speak for the killer whale.

(Laughter - Mr. Tillery pulls out a killer whale hand puppet)

MR. TILLERY: So you can leave knowing it's in good hands.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. I could have used this a while back to talk with Charlie with. It's got teeth, Charlie.

(Laughter)

MS. HEIMAN: Well, I'm just going to pop in here. Everyone has said everything that could be said and more. And I'm a newcomer to this process, but I sure have appreciated and enjoyed working with you and getting to know you and I really want to thank you from the Department of Interior for what you've done to protect the oceans [sic] of the state and I really think that that has been an incredible contribution and you will be very much missed. So thank you.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Elison.

MR. ELISON: Steve, I'm not going to try to add anything to the many laurels that you have richly received and deserve, I'm going to focus on Rebecca.

Rebecca, I'm somebody that has been blessed with an exceptionally good executive assistant and I, long ago, recognized your skill, and so I probably more than anyone knows how big a problem Molly has. You will sorely missed, you've done a great job.

MS. R. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: I am very grateful that when Jim Ayers asked you to go work for him in Juneau you said no.

(Laughter)

2.0

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oh, at the time he left?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oh, yeah, that goes for all of us.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, we're all grateful.

Actually, I'd like to introduce Rebecca's family who are here with her today with her, too. Her husband Roger, her granddaughter Haley, her son Preston, and their daughter Shawna Wingrove. And Shawna's visiting from Texas, right?

MR. R. WILLIAMS: California.

MS. McCAMMON: California, okay. So it's

great to have them here. They're here for Preston's graduation this week.

MR. P. WILLIAMS: Wednesday, 2:00 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You're selling tickets,

(Laughter)

right?

MS. McCAMMON: Do you want to say anything, Rebecca?

MS. R. WILLIAMS: I have just really enjoyed my time at the Restoration Office, the biggest part that I will miss, of course, are the people. It was a great staff, it's a great group to work with and the agency folks and I will miss you all.

MS. McCAMMON: I'll say my farewells later. This really, as I said early, is an end of an era and I think it must be something in the water. On my evaluation, I think the last six years, everybody says, oh, you have such wonderful staff and you keep them and blah, blah, blah. And I keep wondering how am I going to explain the fact next December that I'm losing all of my staff, that they're all moving away. This is Rebecca's last Council meeting, but Hugh Short, and I don't know if Hugh is here, Hugh is leaving for Bethel next month. Joe Hunt is leaving for Hawaii/Minnesota, he hasn't decided yet, one of those two place. Traci Cramer is leaving for Minnesota in July

and Rebecca leaving, so there is a huge staff turnover right now and it just all is -- they tell me it's all kind of happenstance, but it's all happening at the same time.

But there is a tremendous change going on right and we've got great staff on board here, we have some great new staff, Brenda Hall, this is her first day and she'll be at the front desk and answering phones. But it's going to be a challenge to keep up with this reputation for excellence that we've been able to achieve so far. All of you have really set the mark very high, so it's going to up to all of us to keep making sure that we keep reaching that mark.

But, Rebecca, on behalf of the Trustee Council, we do have a certificate of appreciation for you in recognition of your outstanding service on behalf of the people and resources of the Northern Gulf of Alaska, your dedication to the restoration of the injured ecosystem following the Exxon Valdez oil spill has made a difference. Thank you. And we have a little gift for you, too. And it still needs to be signed by Frank.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hello.

MS. McCAMMON: We're finishing up right here and we'll be starting the regular part of the meeting shortly.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

MS. R. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Do you want to say a few words here, Steve?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, I guess I ought to say something, even if I'm embarrassed is all I can really say. You all should know Molly came to a very, very nice retirement dinner they gave me in Juneau last Friday and she presented me with a huge poster signed by all of you. She spent quite a bit of time wondering why there were only five signatures on it.

(Laughter)

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, it was like, who's missing.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Finally after several hours she figured that out and explained it to us, but I -- like Dave said and Molly and others said, I was here when the -- not this Council, but in a different group, also calls itself a Trustee Council before that when the tanker ran aground in Prince William Sound. As a matter of fact, I'd been on this job for two and a half months, I think, at the time it hit, my first knowledge of it was a meeting in Seattle when a reporter called me up 7:00 o'clock at night or sometime, I don't remember when it was, and said, what do you know about that tanker that ran aground in Alaska? And I said, oh, I don't know too much about it. Little did I know and believe and understand all where that was going

to go. And that was, obviously, a very traumatic experience for a lot of us, my staff in NMFS at the time, and all of us and the people in the spill area, but really a lot of good things came out if it in the long run, even if they started from a very bad event that impacted a lot of people's lives very negatively. And probably the best part of it was this process.

1.5

I appreciate everything you said, but frankly I've enjoyed this and it's been a chance to mix with six different agencies, all with generally the same type of background and needs but with somewhat different missions that had to come together and agree and talk to each other and design a program worth an awful lot of money to restore the spill area and conduct the appropriate research. It's been a pleasure to be involved with people like Stan and Bob and other people on the scientific staff that in putting together programs, both shorter and longer term, that will go on, I hope, from the Restoration Reserve, now in the GEM Program for a considerable period of time.

And I'm glad Dave said it first when he first came on, he was staff then, and frankly most of us would not be able to do this if it wasn't a very wonderful staff, Rebecca and Stan, a lot of people on the staff that worked on things that supported the mission of this Council and really made it a lot easier. I mean, we didn't dream all

these things up by ourselves, somebody dreamed up the project proposals and brought them in and talked to us about them. Somebody designed the Restoration Plan and we worked with them and gave them some help, but basically you came up with the details, so a lot of you made us look good, and I appreciate it.

1.6

MS. REFT: Excuse me, this is Catherine from Karluk, I'm just letting you guys know we're on line and you're cutting out pretty bad whoever is speaking.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, you're hearing a talk that you probably don't have to hear, a retirement talk, but that's -- we're going to be back to business in about another five minutes or two minutes or something, so if you'll bear with us for the moment.

Anyway, it has been a long go, but this has been an exciting process. This is probably one of the few place in the whole North Pacific arena I know, and maybe worldwide, where a whole lot of different groups got together and had to come up with some common viewpoints and design common programs, where research was done not just as a separate entity but in a design fashion with workshops, PIs asked to talk to each other, a staff that brought all that together and last, but not least, I really -- Jim Ayers, when he first came on as Executive Director, well, Dave actually was doing the ground role when we started, and then we went

on with Jim Ayers and later Molly had brought an order to this process that we needed and an organization which most of us read the materials, come and work at the meetings, but you guys do it 24 hours a day and a long time, and you've been very supportive, so I appreciated it all. I appreciate having worked with all of you and this Trustee Council and those of you, both, who have been here a short time and a longer time, this has been a good group to work with.

So I'm looking forward to what I'm going to do.

And I told Molly actually a year ago in March that I might not be going to the 10th Anniversary because I was thinking of retiring and some marine mammals got in the way somewhere along the line.

MS. McCAMMON: Sea lions.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Some other small issues. And get Stan to talk to the judge about our ecosystem management, maybe he'll get us off the hook here.

MR. SENNER: I tried to be careful the way I stated it.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You were careful enough we won't take a declaration and have you subpoenaed in the court. So thank you all, I have appreciated it, thank you, particularly for this, far more than I deserve and I thank you very much. Okay.

1	MS. McCAMMON: Thank you.
2	(Applause)
3	MS. McCAMMON: Well, we also have a
4	certificate of appreciation for you, Steve, and to make
5	sure there's enough lines on here and signatures and all,
6	we had Dr. Baker sign on behalf of NOAA.
7	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: The guy I represent,
8	right.
9	MS. McCAMMON: And there are a few that
10	still need to be filled in, Frank and Michele still need to
11	sign it.
12	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, fine.
13	MS. McCAMMON: But thank you for all your
14	work from the Trustee Council.
15	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you very much. I
16	guess I'll get back to you and have them sign it.
17	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, so we can the
18	signatures.
19	And a card for you also. And I think everybody needs to
20	I think, Rebecca, you need to open up yours, too.
21	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I can open it up in a
22	packed room, it's okay?
23	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, yes. And if you have a
24	child in the Anchorage School District, you, too, can have

this wrapping paper.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: This looks like cubic of effect statement on sea lion feeding.

(Laughter)

MS. McCAMMON: It was great being at Steve's retirement party on Friday night because all of his old cronies from the early days at Fish and Game, a number of them were there with slides from the early days.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: All good deeds will never go unpunished, I guarantee that.

(Laughter)

MS. McCAMMON: These were in 1960, sampling on the streams of Alaska.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Sampling on the fringe or a fringe sampler maybe.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oh, my goodness. "For the Operation of the U.S. Steamer, Nunavak, on the Yukon River Station, Alaska, 1899-1901." This is probably dated about 1902. It's very nice. I collect old books, it's one my hobbies and a lot of people don't know that, but apparently somebody does. Thank you, Molly, very much. 1902, this is a wonderful book. I started on the Yukon River in Alaska, actually, that's where I first worked when I got here, I really appreciate that, thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you. I don't know if 1 Frank is on. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You got to open yours, 3 too, Rebecca. You probably got a tether because they want 4 you to come back. I got a going away present to read. 5 6 (Laughter) MS. R. WILLIAMS: Oh, that's lovely. 7 8 That's great, thank you. MS. McCAMMON: You're welcome. So I join 9 10 in everybody in applauding both Rebecca and Steve and wishing them well in their new adventures and come back and 11 12 visit us any time. CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Can we applaud each 13 14 other? 15 MS. McCAMMON: Yes, you can applaud each other. 16 (Applause) 17 18 MR. TILLERY: So back to you. CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oh, really. The one 19 thing I was going to point out, somebody here said I was 20 such a wonderful chairman, the reason they knew that is 21 back in the early days of this Trustee Council we recessed 22

for about six meeting in a row, and didn't adjourn, I

didn't catch on to until about the fifth meeting.

(Laughter)

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I kept wondering why am I always chairman. They finally explained the procedure to me.

Okay. Well, let's go back to the agenda then. And do we want to go back to Koniag or Tatitlek small parcels? Your pleasure.

MR. TILLERY: We got people on line for Koniag.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We got people for Koniag, it's a good idea, let's go back and do the Koniag discussion.

MR. PETERSON: Hello.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes, hello, we're just coming back on line now and just starting with the Koniag discussion and I think we're going to go back to, as I recall, a public hearing, we're going to reopen the public hearing because we had people who wanted to testify to us on this matter.

MR. PETERSON: Yes, sir, I'd like to present my testimony, if I can?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Great, go ahead. Give your name, please, and where you live.

MR. PETERSON: You betcha. The following is my testimony, a little introduction and then I have a statement, okay?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You bet.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PETERSON: My name is Frank R.

Peterson, Sr., I am an Alaskan Native of Koniag, Sukyuk (ph) decent. I was born in Lazy Bay five miles south of Native village of Akhiok where I was raised. school in Akhiok, Kodiak, Homer, Sheldon Jackson and received my associate's degree in business management from the Flathead Valley Community College in Kalispell, Montana and attended the University of Idaho in pursuit of a bachelor's degree. I am a shareholder and manager of Iakulik, Inc., Native Village Corporation. I'm also a shareholder in Akhiok-Kaguyak, Inc., another village corporation. Finally, I am a shareholder and director in Koniag, Inc., our regional Native corporation. I am the past executive director and president of the Kodiak Area Native Association, founder of the Kodiak Area Community Development Corporation, co-founder of the KANA Housing Authority, which is now called the Kodiak Island Housing Authority. Past assistant director of Rural Alaska Community Action Program, past assistant director of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Health Affairs Division, past president of the Larsen Bay Tribal Council, past manager of the Old Harbor Tribal Council, past consulting manager of the city of Old Harbor and Old Harbor Native Corporation. I'm also a past member of the Kodiak Island Borough

Assembly and a fellow with the National Urban Fellows

Program, which took me to Yale University for a summer of
intensive studies on urban economics and I was sent to work
in Congressman Nick Begich's office for a year.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The following is my testimony. I wish to state that I am opposed to the negotiated 10-year conservation easement presently being considered by you on the Exxon Trustee Council and Koniag, Inc. I sincerely believe you as a Trustee Council should take every step necessary to inform not only the public in general, but especially the Alaska Native shareholders who are going to be affected and impacted by this conservation easement agreement you're pursuing with Koniag. One important step is to inform our Native shareholders about the 1987 Koniag shareholder vote which authorized the trade of these very lands with the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In my recollection there were no shareholder authorizations to sell any of these lands to the Exxon Trustee Council.

Another important step for you Trustees is to explain to the Alaska Native shareholder the current conservation easement in which you entered into with Koniag on December 2nd, 1994, which expired [sic] December 2nd, 2001. I understand the purpose of this easement is to negotiate the terms of the sale of the remaining 56 or 59,000 acres of the former Karluk/Larsen Bay lands between

Koniag and the Trustee Council; is this not correct?

Please correct me if I am wrong.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I realize that your recent discussions with Koniag, Inc. management has been about a new conservation easement, the terms of which have not been fully disclosed to the board of the directors until just recently, nor have the terms been disclosed to the Koniag shareholders. It would seem prudent on your part that our Native leadership would first consult with the board of directors and the shareholders on such a monumental move, such as a sale or a conservation easement of this nature. I am opposed to any more land sales as called for in the current conservation easement. I am opposed to any conservation easement currently being discussed between you on the Trustee Council and Koniag, Inc. because, as I understand it, an easement, as currently written, is paramount to the sale of the Karluk/Larsen Bay, period [sic].

Additionally, no other option, such as a lease agreement has been put forth even to the Koniag board of directors for consideration. What I would favor and promote is a long-term lease between Koniag and the Exxon Trustee Council, the very same terms as being considered with the conservation easement could be included with a long-term lease agreement, all the protection that is being discussed could be included in the terms of a long-term

lease agreement.

б

2.2

A couple of questions along with my testimony are three, as follows: why was the 20-year maximum easement being considered for the amount of money proposed, the 29,000,000, when the appraisals for those very lands were 145,000,000, 116,000,000 or so, and 104,000,000? Secondly, are the shareholders of Koniag going to have a vote as was promised by President Metrokin before any of these lands are sold or the conservation easement executed? And one last comment is I'm concerned about the lack of the media coverage and shareholder consultation prior to the first sale of that first 56,000 acres.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony, I'll be glad to summit the written testimony as well.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I think we'd appreciate that if you want to send it in. Molly, do you have an address?

MS. McCAMMON: 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, 99501.

MR. PETERSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Questions or comments on the questions that were asked? Anybody?

MS. HEIMAN: Are you going to answer those questions?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, I was asking --

yes, if you have a response in particular on them, I think we should go ahead and try. Certainly on -- part of it is covered by the table of the sale agreement that it's not same amount at the end of the 10 years, but sale versus.....

1.1

MS. McCAMMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could. First of all, the 29,550,000 is not intended to be payment for the 20-year easement. The easements are actually paid for through a fee that comes out of the interest earned on that fund, so there really is no connection between how much is in that fund and the 20-year easement or anything between either a 10-year easement or a 20-year easement. It would be strictly up to the Koniag board to look at what's in that fund after 10 years and we have some estimates on it, but it could be greater, it could be less, we hope it's at least that amount, and hopefully more, but it's up to Koniag, at that time, to decide if it's an appropriate amount and if they are or are not interested in sale at that time.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yeah, the easement payments actually escalate from that 400,000 to about 650,000 over that period of time.

MS. McCAMMON: That's correct and by year 12 they go to 740,000 and then from....

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Per year.

MS. McCAMMON: Per year, and then at that time through year 20. There's also a provision if the Trustee Council and Koniag wanted to extend the easement after 20 years, there's always that option, but it would be up to the Council and Koniag at that time.

The question about are shareholders going to vote.

Koniag is a corporation that's incorporated under State and Federal laws and the United States and State of Alaska governments have to abide by the laws governing corporations of that nature. And so whether or not there's a shareholder vote is not something the Council can require on a corporation like that. It depends on what the requirements of the laws are. And, in some case, if there is a sale of a significant percentage of the assets then the corporation is required to have a vote, but it's up to the legal advice given to the individual corporation. And so that question is really directed to Koniag in terms of whether they believe a shareholder vote is required or not.

There was concerned by Mr. Peterson expressed about the lack of media coverage and public information before the first sale. I really can't speak to that, although I did know that there had been discussion for a long time between Koniag and the other Kodiak corporations, Old Harbor and Akhiok-Kaguyak about some kind of a transaction for a number of years, so it was nothing new at the time,

in 1994, when that did happen. And the Trustee Council has certainly made no secret that they have been interested in a long-term protection of the Koniag acreage on the Karluk and Sturgeon. In fact, in every Annual Report the Council has published since that time in our habitat updates that we do on a regular basis, it's been clear that ongoing negotiations for long-term protection of those lands has always been a priority of the Council. We've made frequent mention of this to the media and to the public that this is a top priority of the Council.

It's only been recently, in the last, probably, year to two years that Koniag has made it clear they are not interested in an actual sale at this time. And that's when our discussions actually changed and we are doing what, in some ways, almost looks more like a lease than --very similar kind of provision to a lease.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Paying by the year, yeah.

MS. McCAMMON: Paying by the year, making a payment, basically renting certain rights and provisions from Koniag that hopefully will have mutual benefit to both Koniag and to the Trustee Council in terms of habitat protection. So, in that case, I think it is very similar to a long-term lease.

But this gives Koniag the option to leave it, to

end it after year 10, extend it or if conditions are there that they choose to do so then to go ahead with the sale.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Any Trustee Council members care to add to that description? Or do any Trustee Council members have questions?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, we would appreciate it if you would send the material in to the address given you and we're going to try and make sure everybody does have a chance to look things over before this comes to a final conclusion anyway.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. PETERSON: Okay, I appreciate it very much. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Is there anybody else on the line that wishes to testify on this matter?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, I guess that is.

Anybody here now change their mind and want to testify in

Anchorage office?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. I think we'll close the public hearing and go back to business then, and the business is discussion of the Koniag land acquisition or conservation easement on the schedule.

1	MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman, in front of
2	you you have a document and there's copies out there. If
3	there's anybody on the line we did send this to village
4	of Karluk, we had your fax number. If there is anybody
5	else on line who would like us to fax a copy of the motion
6	to come before the Council. Mr. Peterson, do you have a
7	fax number you'd like it to go to?
8	MR. PETERSON: Yes, please. It's 486-0406.
9	MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Is there anybody else
10	who would like this document faxed to them.
11	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is Gwen
12	(indiscernible) my fax number is 245-6306.
13	MS. McCAMMON: Anyone else on the
14	MS. REFT: Can you send another copy here
15	in Karluk, our fax number is 241-2208.
16	MS. McCAMMON: It's on it's way to Karluk.
17	MS. REFT: Okay, thank you.
18	MS. McCAMMON: You're welcome.
19	MR. SQUARTSOFF: Larsen Bay, 847-2212 and
20	we'd like a copy of the minutes also.
21	MS. McCAMMON: Okay, it'll be a couple of
22	days before we get the minutes, but we can get them to you.
23	Anyone else?
24	(No audible responses)
25	MS. McCAMMON: Okay, Paula, I've got the

numbers here, too.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. You've heard this discussion and we all know, at this time, where the process is at, would you care to enter a motion on where we go from here?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I have one more question, if you don't mind, please.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Sure, go ahead.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: With all due respect to the panel, this is Larsen Bay, my name is Alvin Squartsoff, my question is how does the Trustee Council feel towards the shareholders as far as having commercial access and subsistence access to the river, as far as concessions are concerned?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, I think that's part of the discussion that's ongoing and certainly we appreciate your feelings an your view points and those are going to be taken into account in the negotiations. I think the Trustee Council has been pretty insistent in the other land acquisitions on the need to preserve subsistence and the economies of the local corporations, so I think this is certainly part of our feeling. If you have additional things that you want us to consider you can certainly -- free to send them in. I think you won't be.....

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Is that a consideration?

I was asking a question, just a yes or no answer would be just fine for me.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I guess, yes. If we're worried about it? Yes. If I remember the question correctly. And I think when we get done here you'll see that we have been listening to what you're saying and that we are not taking a final vote on an actual agreement here, this is simply a way station and an information to us. So if somebody would care to make a motion on what we need to do next.

Ms. Heiman.

MS. HEIMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion. And as you just stated, this is just -this is not to approve the deal, this motion is to say -what it would do is to give direction to the negotiators
that we feel comfortable with the direction that things are
going and that we would urge the negotiators to continue
their negotiations. So I'll move and I'll read it so that
everyone the line knows. I move that the Council
direct the negotiators to proceed with Koniag negotiations
as generally described in the proposal framework, the Camp
Island operations and facility framework and the attached
spreadsheet that reflects the estimated value of the
account over time. Once the details of the purchase

agreement and proposed conveyance documents have been resolved the negotiators and the Executive Director are to submit them to the Trustee Council for review together with a proposed resolution for approval for funding.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do we have a second?

MS. SEE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: It's been moved and seconded, the motion as read by Ms. Heiman. Do we have any further comments or questions? And again this is a motion to proceed with the negotiations with the understanding final packages will be coming back to us for approval at a future date.

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, all those in favor of the motion as state, please say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Motion carries. Do you care to discuss this any further? Do you think the feelings of the Council are clear to you in the negotiations?

MR. ELISON: I think I have a good sense of the intent of the Council and look forward to negotiating and achieving those objectives.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. We appreciate that. We appreciate everybody on line that contributed to this discussion and please feel free to communicate with us because we do want to hear what you have to say on it.

MS. McCAMMON: And the motion and attachments is being faxed to the those who gave me their fax number.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. I think that ends our business on Koniag at the moment. Would you care to go on to the Tatitlek land purchases, small parcel purchases, acquisition? And who wants to lead that discussion?

MS. HEIMAN: Did we still have my motion on the table?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We had a motion on the table which I wasn't sure whether you were through or not, on something on contingency, which I think you probably have to restate because it's two hours now.

MS. McCAMMON: There was no second.

MS. HEIMAN: No, Michele seconded.

MS. McCAMMON: Did Michele second it?

MS. HEIMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes.

MS. McCAMMON: Oh.

MS. HEIMAN: However, I'm glad to restate

it or we could just -- I'll withdraw if we want to still discuss it, if that's preferable?

1.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Maybe it would be easier if you changed your mind to withdraw it and make a separate motion.

MS. HEIMAN: Okay. I'll withdraw it, but I'm not sure I have the....

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Does the second agree?

MS. SEE: The second agrees.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you.

MS. HEIMAN: I quess my comment would be, I think we had some very good discussions earlier and I believe that -- this is Marilyn Heiman for those you on the I believe that the Forest Service has gone out and followed up on what we had, in the past when I was not here, but understand that we had approved them to look at purchasing those homesites along the coast in the areas on the map and I do think that we should honor that. believe that it is a good idea to come back with a plan of how we're going to deal with the whole area and what monies will be used to purchase those, so that we can ensure that we'll get as much of that area as we can possibly can get. But I think it wouldn't be a good idea now to turn back after negotiations, good faith negotiations, have moved forward and people are feeling fairly set on these.

statement.

think this will set a precedent so others who live in that area see that there is an interest by the Forest Service in purchasing these lands and that it's something that could be available for others who are interested.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Was that a motion?

MS. HEIMAN: No, that was just my

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Oh, okay.

MS. HEIMAN: I would like to move that we adopt -- or that we approve the purchases of the Tatitlek homesites for 180,000 for the 13 sites.

MS. McCAMMON: There'll be a resolution to follow.

MS. HEIMAN: And that at the next meeting that the Forest Service would come forward with a plan to discuss how the overall area will be addressed.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do I have a second?

MS. SEE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Moved and seconded to proceed with the purchase of the parcels as indicated in a presentation to us. I guess it's the 13, and that a plan be brought back to us on what it would require to acquire further parcels in this area at the next meeting.

Is that about correct?
(No audible responses)

1	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. All those 1'm
2	sorry, Mr. Tillery, you had a question.
3	MR. TILLERY: I have a question. Are we
4	being asked, then, to approve the draft resolution that's
5	in the packet?
6	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I just asked the
7	Executive Director the same question.
8	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, but
9	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: She said we'd do that
10	later, so I don't
11	MS. McCAMMON: Well, I meant we'll do it
12	yes.
13	(Laughter)
14	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, we got consistent
15	answers anyway.
16	MS. McCAMMON: I think if you do the motion
17	you approve the purchase of the parcels and there is a
18	resolution to follow with that.
19	MR. HOLBROOK: Here's a corrected one?
20	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: There's a corrected
21	resolution.
22	MS. McCAMMON: I have a corrected one here.
23	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: So I think most of what
24	the resolution is, is to detail on having the hazardous
25	material surveys, other things. We do have to get to that.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

What the Trustee Council wants to do, at this time, relative to the purchase of these 13 parcels and then where we want to go from there. So I think the motion gets us there and then maybe we need to deal with the resolution specifically at that point. I was kind of trying to find out if we all agreed with this.....

MS. HEIMAN: Concept.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, proceeding with the concept and then we'll do this detail afterwards.

MR. TILLERY: Today, though?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Today, right now.

MR. TILLERY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Two seconds from now.

Well, 10 seconds. All those in favor of the motion signify
by saying aye, please.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Motion carries. And then would take us through the resolution, Ms. McCammon?

MS. McCAMMON: The resolution is one of the fairly standard resolutions, indicating they are homesites in Two Moon Bay and Snug Corner Cove, appraisals have been

done, they have -- these parcels have attributes which will, if acquire, will restore, replace, enhance and rehabilitate injured resources and the services provided by those resources. Existing laws and regulations are intended under normal circumstances to protect resources from activities on the lands. However, restoration replacement and enhancement of resources injured by the EVOS presents a unique situation. Scientists and other resource specialists agree that in their best professional judgment protection of habitat in the spill area to levels above and beyond that provided by existing laws and regulations will have a beneficial effect on recovery of injured resources and lost or diminished services provided by these resources.

2.

1.2

And I won't read, word-for-word, the entire resolution, but it does go on to say that, therefore we resolve to provide fund for the United States to purchase all of the seller's rights and interests in these small parcels and to provide funds necessary for closing costs recommended by the Executive Director of the Council, pursuant to the following the conditions, and it states the amount of funds totally \$180,000 for the three [sic] parcels, disbursement of the funds, authorization of the funding disbursement of the funds, title search. That no timber harvesting, road development or any other

alterations of the land initiated by the owner prior to purchase. Completion of the hazardous materials survey, compliance with NEPA. That a conservation easement on the parcel satisfactory in form and substance to United States and the State of Alaska, Department of Law, shall be conveyed to the State. And that following execution of the purchase agreement that the Alaska Department of Law and the United States Department of Justice shall petition the court for the funds.

2.0

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: So you've had the resolution read to you. Do I have a motion to move to adopt and sign it or do we just sign?

MS. McCAMMON: Does this have to have the contingency added to it or -- it's not really a contingency it's just.....

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is there really isn't a contingency at this point....

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

MR. TILLERY:but I think that there needs to be -- not necessarily this resolution, but added a condition -- was that part of the original first motion to come back?

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Motion that it would come back, yes.

1	MS. McCAMMON: Yes.
2	MR. TILLERY: Come with a report?
3	MS. McCAMMON: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes.
5	MR. TILLERY: So that's separate.
6	MS. SEE: It's taken care of.
7	MR. TILLERY: That's taken care of.
8	MS. McCAMMON: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: This is just, I think,
10	to implement the first part of the
11	MS. McCAMMON: The purchase part.
12	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: The second part would
13	be so do we need to adopt this resolution formally or
14	just sign it at the end of the this is what we would be
15	signing at the end of meeting?
16	MS. McCAMMON: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: It seems to me this
18	does unless somebody argues with it, this does express
19	what we were tying to do in the motion.
20	MR. TILLERY: We need to adopt it, vote on
21	it now and then sign it.
22	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You want to vote on the
23	resolution, okay.
24	Okay. All those in favor of this resolution, as

presented by the Executive Director, signify by saying aye.

1	IN UNISON: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Opposed?
3	(No opposing responses)
4	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: The resolution carries
5	and we'll presumably sign it before we leave the meeting.
6	That is the last item I have. Oh, no, I have an
7	investment item, sorry.
8	MR. GIBBONS: A point of clarification. I
9	think we need to identify when the next meeting is so we
10	can let the Trustee Council members know when we'll come
11	back with a plan.
12	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, we have one more
13	item on the agenda.
14	MS. McCAMMON: I don't know when the next
15	meeting is. I don't know when I can get the Trustees
16	together.
17	MR. GIBBONS: You don't, okay.
18	MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, can I say
19	something?
20	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You certainly may.
21	Mr. Tillery.
22	MR. TILLERY: I forgot to do this when we
23	first came back on but I need to report for purposes of
24	complying with Alaska Statutes

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes, thank you.

that time.

_

MR. TILLERY:that during the executive session we did meet and did discuss the Koniag acquisition and the Tatitlek small parcel acquisition as described in the motion.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: And took no action at

MR. TILLERY: And took no action.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Tillery, you reminded me I should have done that after we came back, too.

MS. SEE: And I'm here for Michele again.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Sorry?

MS. SEE: And I'm here for Michele again, that needs to get back on the record.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Right. Oh, do we need to state that on the record? Okay. Marianne See is here for Michele Brown who was called away. We don't need to go into that.

Okay, I think we're on to the last item on the agenda then, which is the investments, and do you want to report on that, Molly or did you have somebody else?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have two items regarding investments. And if you look in your packet, the second page, the time line for all of the various actions that the Council has to take regarding

investment of the joint trust fund are indicated here. And you can see that the Council is moving right along here. We're on May 22nd with the proposal to adopt a long-term payout methodology and rule, and we'll be reviewing the independent report of the Alaska State Department of Revenue, Division of Treasury, relating to investment custody and safekeeping functions. At this time the Council is also scheduled to discuss custodial options, investment consultants and investment managers.

1.4

The report that we have in your packet -- and before you you also have a final copy on letterhead, you had a draft version in your packet, but the final copy is also there. This was requested by the Trustee Council to have an independent assessment of the State Department of Revenue's ability to provide various functions for the Trustee Council for investment purposes. We should -- earlier we had on the line Bob Storer and Peter Bushre from our Investment Work Group. Are either one of you or both still on the line?

MR. STORER: Bob Storer, I'm here.

MS. HEIMAN: What a patient man.

MS. McCAMMON: Hi, Bob.

MS. HEIMAN: Thank you, Bob.

MS. McCAMMON: We had great food at lunch, Bob. And I don't know, is Bill Wurts on?

MS. CRAMER: No, not at this time.

1.3

MS. McCAMMON: He's not at this time, but he is available if we need him.

MS. CRAMER: I can phone him if you need him.

MR. JENKS: This is John Jenks and I'm on as well.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. And John Jenks is from the Division of Treasury. And Bob will be happy to chime here as I go through this, but basically we asked the consultant to review the organizational structure, the equity and fixed income management practices, the asset modeling procedures, the custody and safekeeping functions, as well as the accounting functions of the State of Alaska and report back to you with the consultant's assessment of whether -- of the Department of Revenue's ability to provide these services to the Trustee Council.

So what you have here in this report is, first of all, a description of how things are organized within the Division of Treasury. Looking at things that the fixed income investments are managed internally, domestic equities are invested through State Street Global advisors, which is a division of State Street Bank. And the international equities are managed by Lazard Asset Management of New York.

On page three in the fixed income investment with internal management of fixed income securities, it's the consultant's opinion that this seems to have a reasonable extensive history within the Division of Treasury. Chung, who is recently departed along with John Jenks, who is his replacement, managed these assets and produced very competitive results in the early '90s. The assessment now is that, although they were very successful during a good part of the '90s, in the past two years the relative results have fallen off quite extensively, although they are still consistent with the overall index. The primary reason for this is that the U.S. Treasury market assumed domination in the investment world, especially in the summer and fall of 1998 when the default on the Russian bonds and concern with the long-term capital situation caused a considerable flight to quality and hence to U.S. Treasuries. Because of their approach the U.S. Treasury and agency part of the portfolio is typically underweighted in the Division of Treasury's portfolio and that caused an under performance during this period in several subsequent quarters.

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

There was some concerned expressed by the fact that Michael Chung has left the Department of Revenue earlier this year, he's been replaced by a Mr. Lee Livermore who is just coming to work for the Division of Treasury now.

However, given the fact that John Jenks was very closely involved in the fixed income section and will be at the helm of the Division of Treasury it's, I think, safe to assume that they will continue on the same path that they have in the past. The consultant also said that once you take into account the kind of fees that are charged by the Division of Treasury, then the performance results compared to others is very similar.

And if you look on -- I don't think these are page numbered so it makes it a little hard to tell you which page to go to.

MR. GIBBONS: Upper left-hand corner, Molly.

MS. McCAMMON: Oh, okay. There it is, there where my staple was. But you can see on page 4, some of the results for the periods ending on 12/31/99, over one year, three year, five year, eight year and 10 year. So overall for fixed income I think that the assessment is that they've done not quite as well in the last couple of years, but overall it's a solid approach and certainly competitive.

Under domestic equity investments, these are invested in two index funds, it's managed by State Street Global advisors which are designed to replicate the Russell 3000 Index. In the past what they have done is purchase a

certain percentage of equities within the S&P 500 and then with a certain percentage, a smaller amount, of smaller companies in order to replicate the performance of the Russell 3000 Index. They now have a new ability to have an actual Russell 3000 fund, and the assessment is that this will be to the Council's benefit.

1.0

2.2

The fees, again, are extremely competitive, estimated at approximately one basis point. They're calculated at the incremental dollar on top of the funds that are already invested by the State.

And on the bottom of page 5 you can see the performance of treasuries, domestic equities compared to the Russell 3000 and then this median ICC equity fund, this is a fund that's used by consultants in order to do some comparison and analysis of how various funds do. So you can see that Division of Treasury has been very competitive in terms of domestic equities.

For international equities, this is run by Lazard Asset Management, it's actively managed, it is not a passively managed account and, again, you can see here on page 6, kind of in the middle, how these funds have compared in terms of their rate of return for one year, three year and five year. And again all very competitive over both the short-term and longer term.

These returns are on a pre-fee basis and again

Division of Treasury for active management here is offering a fee of 15 basis points.

Under asset allocation, the assessment, and probably Bob Storer can talk about this a little more. I think it was the general conclusion of the consultant that the asset allocation mix adopted by the Council is a fairly -- relatively conservative one. They also believe that it's based on relatively conservative input characteristics. In other words, when Callan Associates puts together the model and tries to estimate and calculate over time what the rate return is, that they had used fairly conservative numbers in there. But the bottom line is that if they are conservative assumptions then one can only assumed that the Council should be doing better than anticipated. So it's actually to our favor in that sense.

On page 8 and 9, this section goes over the fees and you can see on page 8 we have what the Division of Treasury is putting forth as the fees for managing the Trustee Council accounts and the approximate overall fee of about six basis points or for approximately \$100,000,000 in assets about \$61,000. If you were to actively manage all of those accounts and not use some kind of pooling and passive management, on page 9 you would expect to pay 43 basis points or about 425,000. So 61,000 for what the Division of Treasury would do and 425,000 or so.

If you wanted to compare apples to apples with the mixture that Division of Treasury has of active and passive management, the next section, which describes the fees, kind of typical fees for that kind of management, would be about 23 basis point, 230,000. So to really compare what -- if you were to go on to the open market and try to get what the Division of Treasury would be offering, you would have to pay probably at least 23 basis points to get comparable kinds of investment on that amount of funds.

The consultant did meet with the Comptroller with the State of Alaska and the Assistant Comptroller regarding accounting and custodial services and felt that all of those were very sufficient, that reporting could be tailored to the Council's needs, that they adhere to standards, various standards, even when not legally required to. That they had very good reporting abilities and that all and all the Department of Revenue, Division of Treasury would appear to be a relatively safe and extremely cost effective method of investing the Council's assets.

While the bond performances suffered somewhat in recent years, the long-term record is reasonably competitive. In addition the State Street Global advisor's Russell 3000 fund for domestic equities and the Lazard International equity performance each appeared to be well above average over the long-term and since this is 58

percent of the portfolio it should be the dominant factor in future results of the joint trust fund.

Accordingly, we would feel comfortable in recommending the investment management and custodial functions as proposed by the Alaska Department of Revenue, Division of Treasury.

And if you have any detail questions, Bob Storer is on the line, we can also get ahold of Bill Wurts, if needed. He was scheduled to be here on the 25th when the meeting was scheduled for the 25th, but had a conflict for today.

MR. BUSHRE: Peter Bushre is on line, too.

MS. McCAMMON: And Peter Bushre is on line

MS. HEIMAN: I liked your summary, Molly, it was much shorter than Bill Wurts.

(Laughter)

2.

also.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Questions by Trustee Council members?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: And what is the action required here, Molly?

MS. McCAMMON: On this one there is no action required. What we would like to do is -- I think it's pretty obvious that the two major options for the

Trustee Council for investment are either through the State Division of Treasury or through the private sector. And, obviously, Division of Treasury offers very, very competitive cost effective fees and for a rate of return that seems to be very competitive with others on kind of the open market.

Under our schedule what we would suggest doing is that at the next meeting is that this report be sent out to those members of the private investment sector who have contacted us and who have expressed interest in the process and in possibly bidding or having some participation in this, that they the opportunity to look at this report, provide any written comments that they might have to the Trustee Council, that there be a public hearing on it scheduled for the next meeting and that given what happens after that, I think it's the Investment Work Group's recommendation and my recommendation to go forward and placed the trust funds with the State Treasury.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, what does this mean, Trustee Council adopts long-term payout here?

MS. McCAMMON: That's second, we haven't come to there yet.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: We haven't gotten there, okay, second.

Any comment by Trustee Council members or

discussion of the Executive Director's proposed procedure?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do I hear any contrary views? This isn't a motion exactly, I guess, but do you understand and agree with what Molly's proposing?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: I see a lot of nods around the table and no negative, except Mr. Tillery is wagging his finger at me.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes.

MR. TILLERY: Just that I agree with what is said in here, and as I understand from this is the Treasury does a very competent technical job with this. The Treasury -- in terms of their managerial skills. But also they do a very good job of investing it, roughly in the average with the rest of the country, but where they really excel, for our purposes, is with the fees and the fees make-up, I mean, really will push our net return ahead, and that's certainly consistent with everything that I understand. And I will look forward to seeing if there is anything from the private sector that can compete with this, but it's nice to know that there is, clearly, a very good alternative available.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Very succinctly stated.

So I don't see anybody objecting to the procedure proposed by Ms. McCammon, and so then, fine, we'll proceed to the next part of the agenda.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. The item that is before you for action today, and this follows the draft report in your packet, and there is a draft motion for your consideration. And, if you recall, this was discussed at the last meeting and it concerns a proposed payout schedule for the next seven years. And what we were trying to do with this is to be able to give the program some idea of what amount of funding would be available over the next five to seven years, provide some stability to the program, but still allow, eventually, for inflation proofing of the fund once it is totally capitalized, to allow for some growth to the fund and to try to have kind of a minimum program of approximately \$6,000,000.

So there is a draft motion that the amount to be disbursed for research monitoring and general restoration shall be based on the following schedule: fiscal year 2001, which is the one we're currently preparing for right now, the Annual Work Plan and administrative costs shall not exceed seven and a half million. And that's the scenario we're currently operating under. Fiscal year 2002 the Work Plan and the administrative costs shall not exceed six and a half millon dollars; fiscal year 2003 they shall not

exceed \$6,000,000; fiscal year 2004 they shall not exceed \$6,000.000.

In fiscal year 2005, by that time the account will have had a three year track record of investments, the Annual Work Plan and administrative costs shall not exceed four and a half percent of the average market value over the past three years of the joint trust funds earmarked for long-term research monitoring and general restoration. In fiscal year 2006 it would be four and a half percent of the average over the past four years. And then beginning in fiscal year 2007 and in the subsequent years it would be, not exceed four and a half percent of the average market value over the past five years. So at that point it would it on to a five year rolling average.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: What does that come out to, about?

MS. McCAMMON: Well, if you look a the next page, which is the recommended payout option, this is based on a number of assumptions. It's based on assuming that we follow along with how much money is being allocated for research and monitoring, that certain amounts are lapsed, that the funds start being invested in this new scenario by August and a number of other assumptions. But it -- under this recommendation of four and a half percent payout you can see in 2005 that it actually -- the three-year average

estimated is five and a half million, 2006 5.7, 5,986,000 and then 2007 5,817,000. This is a little under \$6,000,000, however, based on the report from Bill Wurts who believes that the estimates for the State's asset allocation mix -- he believes that the Council will do quite a bit better than what's estimated under that scenario.

2.0

I think that this is still a conservative enough proposal, it allows for inflation proofing the fund, it allows for at least a half percent of growth over the fund and, hopefully -- our hope is that it will allow for, at least, a minimum of \$6,000,000 a year program for that period of time.

Starting in fiscal year 2008 the fund does begin to grow and it will grow, actually, quite substantially after that. And if all of these assumptions are conservative and it actually does as well as things have been going in the last five years, which is probably too optimistic, but even half as well as they've done in the last five years, there should be substantial growth in the fund over this period of time.

But this is tracking with the Council's direction of inflation proofing, allowing for some growth and yet still allowing for a stable program over the short-term and then have it grow over the long-term.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: So what you're doing is fixing the appetite through 2004, regardless of what happens and then....

MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER:from there on it fluctuates with the rate the investment recovers with inflation proofing.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, but once you get to a five year average you can have a fairly significant increases and decreases and still have some stability in the program, it kind of evens that out.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay. And adopting this means -- subject to what's going on, but yeah.

MS. McCAMMON: That we would know exactly what to spend for the next seven years.

MS. HEIMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think Marianne See had a question.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Yes, I'm sorry.

MS. SEE: Yeah, I have a question about the -- in the three that you presented here, option A, B and C, I was just curious as to what would be your basis for recommending option A over option C? Option A being four and a half percent and option C being five percent, what would the advantage of going with 4.5?

MS. McCAMMON: The advantage is that if, in

fact, the estimated rate of return is accurate, going with the four and a half percent allows a half percent for growth in the fund. And just in our discussion at the last meeting there was some indication that the Council would like to see that happen, so it's being a little on the conservative side. There was actually some indication from some of the Trustees that they were pushing for the four percent, so we were being more aggressive with the four and half percent.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Further questions?

MS. McCAMMON: These numbers can always be changed upon unanimous consent of the Trustee Council, but it does kind of set a policy in motion.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, so the motion would be as read by the Executive Director, total amount to be disbursed for research monitoring, general restoration shall be based on the following schedule and so forth. Do I have a motion?

MS. HEIMAN: Not from me.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Are you one of the four percenters, is that the problem?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$$ HEIMAN: I'm one of the five percenters.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: One of the five percenters. Are you a four percenter? You guys want to

1	compromise right now and somebody make a motion?
2	MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I would move
3	that we adopt the draft motion. Ms. McCammon, did you read
4	this word by word?
5	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: She did read it.
6	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, I did.
7	MR. TILLERY: As read by Ms. McCammon
8	earlier and is included in the packet.
9	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Including the four and
10	a half percent?
11	MR. TILLERY: Including the four and a half
12	percent.
13	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Do I have a second?
14	MR. BOSWORTH: Second.
15	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: All in favor signify by
16	saying aye.
17	IN UNISON: Aye.
18	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: All opposed?
19	(No opposing responses)
20	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: You have some
21	direction.
22	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, thank you very much.
23	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: And what else do you
24	have on the agenda?
ם כ	MC MacAMMoN. That/a it Sahadulad for

the next meeting will be a public hearing on the Council's options for the custodian investment and management functions of the trust fund. Also, if it's after June 3 15th, we'll be looking at a status report on all of the small parcels that currently in the hopper and where we are with those and whether there's any monies that need to be 6 reprogrammed. We're having a little bit of difficulty 7 trying to get a date with sufficient number of Trustees 8 available, so it's quite possible that those two things may not happen at the same meeting, we may only be able to get 10 enough people to do the first one, we just haven't figured 12 that out yet.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: As I recollect the motion on Tatitlek had something about a contingency plan brought to then next.....

> Come back, right. MS. McCAMMON:

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Plan brought to the next meeting, would that be possible by June 15th? MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Okay, thank you. Okay. Well, then anybody have any other questions or shall I entertain a motion to adjourn? And don't say not from me.

> I so move we adjourn. MS. HEIMAN:

MS. McCAMMON: To recess.

MS. HEIMAN: To recess.

25

5

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

1	MR. TILLERY: If we recess, do you stay?
2	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: No, we cannot recess.
3	(Laughter)
4	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Well, you could then my
5	substitute gets to take the chair. It's been moved and
6	seconded that we adjourn, all those in favor signify by
7	saying aye.
8	IN UNISON: Aye.
9	CHAIRMAN PENNOYER: Thank you very much.
10	MS. HEIMAN: Thank you, Steve.
11	MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Steve.
12	(Off record)
13	(MEETING ADJOURNED - 2:35 P.M.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

CERTIFICATE

1	CERTIFICATE
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
3	STATE OF ALASKA)
4 5	I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Owner of Computer Matrix do hereby certify:
6	THAT the foregoing pages numbered 5 through 132
7	contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council's Teleconference Meeting
8 commencing at the hour of 10:00 a.m. and to transcribed by me to the best of my knowled	recorded electronically by me on the 22nd day of May 2000, commencing at the hour of 10:00 a.m. and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability.
9	THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the
10	request of:
11	EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL, 645 G Street Anchorage, Alaska 99501;
12	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 5th day of June
13	2000.
14	GIGNED AND GERMINED TO BY
15	SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY:
16	tolled - D
17	Joseph P. Kolasinski
18	Notary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires: 04/17/04
19	MINITER HOLD OF THE PROPERTY O
20	NOTARY
21	PUBLIC *
22	TE OF ALASHIM
23	
24	