## EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL 3 Public Meeting Tuesday, July 9, 2002 10:45 o'clock a.m. 4 441 West 5th Avenue, Suite 500 5 Anchorage, Alaska 6 TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: 7 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: MS. DRUE PEARCE (CHAIRWOMAN) Senior Advisor to the 8 Secretary for Alaskan Affairs, 9 U.S. Department of Interior 10 STATE OF ALASKA -MR. CRAIG TILLERY Assistant Attorney General 11 DEPARTMENT OF LAW: State of Alaska 12 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, MS. MARIA LISOWSKI for MR. DAVE GIBBONS 13 U.S. FOREST SERVICE Forest Supervisor Forest Service AK Region 14 15 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MR. JAMES W. BALSIGER National Marine Fisheries Svc: Administrator, AK Region 1.6 STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT MR. FRANK RUE 17 OF FISH AND GAME: Commissioner 18 19 STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT MS. MICHELE BROWN OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION: Commissioner 20 21 22 23 24

Proceedings electronically recorded, then transcribed by: Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, 3522 West 27th, Anchorage, AK 99517 - 243-0668

25

1	TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT:	
2	MS. MOLLY McCAMMON	Executive Director
3	MS. SANDRA SCHUBERT	Program Coordinator
4	DR. PHIL MUNDY	Science Coordinator
5	DR. BOB SPIES	Chief Scientist
6	MS. PAULA BANKS	Administrative Assistant
7	MS. DEBBIE HENNIGH	Special Staff Assistant
8	MR. ROBERT WALKER	Data Manager
9	MR. ALEX SWIDERSKI	Department of Law
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Call to Order	04
3	Approval of Agenda	05
4	Approval of Meeting Notes (June 14, 2002)	06
5	Executive Director's Report	06
6	PUBLIC COMMENT	
7	Ms. Theresa Obermeyer	10
8	Approval of the GEM Program Document	21
9	Approval of the Revised Operating & Report Procedures	31
10	Approval of the New Trustee Council Data Policy	39
11	Habitat Protection	
12	Small Parcel KAP 1087/Chokwak	49
L3	Sitkalidak Land Exchange Equalizing Payment	69
14	Presentation to Bob Spies	75
15	Adjournment	85
16		
L7		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## PROCEEDINGS

(On record - 10:45 a.m.)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Will the Exxon Valdez

Trustee Council meeting please come to order? It is July

9th....

MS. McCAMMON: We're coming to order now.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: It's July 9th, 2002, it
is 10:45 a.m. and the full Trustee Council is present.

Maria Lisowski is here for David [sic] Gibbons of the
Forest Service, she is on the phone and out of the room,
but she is here. I am Drue Pearce, I will be chairing this
meeting.

We need to approve the agenda and,

Ms. McCammon, if you can tell us about a couple of changes
that I believe that I believe are there.

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you. There are only a couple of changes. One is there's only one small parcel on the agenda and that's KAP 1087, the Chokwak parcel. The Swartzes' parcel is no longer on the agenda. And then Brad Meiklejohn will be here instead of Glenn Elison for The Conservation Fund. Randy Hagenstein will not be here, but there is a report from him that you should have before you. And then there's an additional item that's being added for action today, and that's the Sitkalidak land exchange equalizing payment of \$41,000.

1	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Do we have a motion to	
2	approve the agenda?	
3	MR. TILLERY: I move we approve the agenda.	
4	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Is there a second?	
5	MS. BROWN: Second.	
6	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We have a motion and a	
7	second to approve the agenda, all those in favor please say	
8	aye.	
9	IN UNISON: Aye.	
10	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed?	
11	(No audible response)	
12	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: The agenda is approved.	
13	That brings us to the Executive Director's report. Madam	
14	Executive Director.	
15	MS. McCAMMON: Do you want to do the	
16	meeting notes for June 14th meeting?	
17	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Oh, I'm sorry. Next is	
18	approval of the meeting notes for the previous meeting,	
19	which was June 14th. Any discussion on those?	
20	(No audible response)	
21	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Do you have a motion?	
22	MR. TILLERY: I move the meeting notes be	
23	approved.	
24	MS. BROWN: Second.	
25	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: There is a motion and a	

second to approve the June 14th notes. All those in favor. IN UNISON: Aye.

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

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed? (No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: The notes are approved. And that brings us to the Executive Director's report.

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Madam Chair. only have two items that I wanted to report to you today. The first is that our solicitation package for nominations for the Public Advisory Committee and the subcommittees for our scientific process -- that package has gone out to our e-mail list and to everybody on our mailing list. Nominations are due back to our office by September 3rd and we encourage you to get people to apply for one or more of these subcommittees. And if anyone needs information or, you know, if you want to suggest names or anything like that, just get ahold of any of us here at the office. we do have this two-month period to get these nominations -- to get them all back to this office.

The second item I wanted to just brief you on a little bit is that there was a legislative resolution that passed the State Legislature, SJR-44, at this past session. And it, I think, in essence, passed unanimously, there might have been one no vote with it. But basically it's calling upon the University of Alaska, the Arctic

Ι

Research Commission, the North Pacific Research Board and the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation to develop a statewide research and development plan. And I have been asked by the University of Alaska, by their vice president for research, Craig Dormand, to help out with that, to help in putting together some of the background materials for the ocean and the environmental research and development pieces of it. So just wanted to let you know that I am participating in that. And if you have any questions on that at any time, just get ahold of me. That's it, that concludes my report today. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. Any questions for -- very efficient.

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.

Molly, you mentioned that MR. TILLERY: there should be a report from Randy, I guess, in here? MS. McCAMMON: Yes. Did you get the report? Do we have it there?

MR. TILLERY: I don't think -- I was looking for it.

MS. McCAMMON: It's not there, Paula? Ιf not, I have mine here and I'll make sure to get copies made, but....

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: All I have is the Chokwak.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. I'll have copies made right now.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Unless it's here. I don't believe I have one.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay, we'll get copies of that and we'll actually talk about it later under small parcels.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mr. Balsiger.

MR. BALSIGER: Madam Chair, if I could.

Molly, could you tell me what your charge was, again,
relative to this? You said it in a few words and I didn't
get it all down. Are you developing the whole outline for
how this resolution carries forward or just some small part
of it?

MS. McCAMMON: No, I've been asked to help with -- it's being carried forward by the University of Alaska, North Pacific Research Board, ASTF and the Arctic Research Commission, and I've been asked to help with the environmental piece regarding ocean monitoring systems, research, things of that nature, so just one little piece of it.

MR. BALSIGER: So we had the resolution last time, but I don't remember the words, but it didn't

mention EVOS in there?

1.0

MS. McCAMMON: It does, it mentions it in one of the whereases that the EVOS Trustee Council is developing research plans, but the Trustee Council is not specifically charged with developing this plan. But I can get you a copy right now of the final plan -- or the final resolution.

MR. BALSIGER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any other questions for the Executive Director?

MS. BROWN: This isn't a question. I just wanted to compliment Molly and her staff for the Ocean and Watershed Symposium, which was superbly executed, so thank you.

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you for participating, it was great.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: That brings us to public comments. Do we have public comment? We'll check for the off site on teleconference first. Do we have anyone on teleconference who would like to make a public comment to the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I'm not sure we have anyone on line listening to us. We have not. What about here in the room, do we have anyone who would like to make

public comment today?

(No audible response)

MS. BROWN: Wow, you run a tight ship.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Pardon me?

MS. BROWN: You run a tight ship.

(Laughter)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. That brings us to approval of the GEM Program document, which I suspect we are not capable of doing without Molly, so why don't we stand at ease while we wait for her to finish her phone call?

(At ease)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We will call the meeting back to order. We had asked for public comment and didn't have any at the time, but I see that Mrs. Obermeyer is here, would you like to make public comment?

MS. OBERMEYER: If like I have it labeled on my forehead. Don't ever think I'm having fun, Senator. It's not enjoyable, but I think a whole bunch of things could come unraveled any day now. See, Drue, you just came to town, right? I don't know whether you even read our local rag anymore. My opponent gets hard news stories almost everyday with color pictures and my name has not been printed since the filing deadline. That is how corrupt our media really is. It really is frightening

worrisome. Of course, see, I really have the -- is I'm better known that he is already, so it's not a big deal.

And I have been told by many lawyers that I'm folk hero. I never know. All I do is take it a day at a time, I always try to get a good night sleep. And then I come out and I say hi and I'm nuts. And I'm proud to be nuts. There is nothing wrong with nuts, but where I live it is so mean spirited and hateful.

And it's really scary to see what these lawyers do. I don't want to be categorical about anybody, I'm sitting with at least two right now, and I don't want to assign motives to anyone, but it's all miscommunication, that I'm sure of. And, you see, there's no independence of thought. That's the way it's all possible that this could have gone on for this long. And, of course, amazingly, and just to let the rest of you know, we have mailed 60 copies of everything that's gone on for at least a decade. So one of my jokes is somebody does know how to read. I mean, people have read that stuff and I think there are people that have boxes full of it. Of course, I have so many files and transcripts it's ridiculous.

You know, it is a great compliment, and I say this humbly, do you know how many millions have been spent on me? I mean, it's really kind of comical. Don't ever think I enjoy it, but when you know who you are, and

all you can do is try. And I'm an American that loves my country. I know that where I live there is no education. I have sued the university and I don't think anyone else will ever try. My husband is still not licensed. At the end of my suit against the university, that was as long ago as 1986, I had to write a check for \$17,151. I mean and then I see about -- and I have files and I just kind of clip out stories about Exxon. You know, can we realize how much a billion dollars is? And I don't think those of us that are working people -- I find it unfathomable how much one billion is. And, of course, Exxon has put out that they want to settle for 25,000,000. One billion is a thousand million. And let's think this way. I used to always have a joke and I'd say, I can't count that many But, see, I've been on the Anchorage School Board and so what I used to -- well, everyone talks millions and billions. And I think they might have in the Legislature, Drue.

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 so when people kept talking million and billions I thought, well, I better listen to what they're saying, so I'd bring my calculator, I'd add up and cross reference, nothing even added up over there at that school district, and I was supposed to be their puppet. I don't think so, I'm not going to be somebody's puppet. Now, I'll try to be a reasonable person. I don't think we've been

manner. I cannot believe that no one helps. And so I am left with all these wonderful people sitting behind me.

I'm trying -- I want them to understand it, because I also feel like if I don't stay on course it's a flood gate and these judges will treat everybody else the same way. I don't have any answers, I mean, it's amazing. I could never have imagined anything that's gone on.

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

But I always do bring something. know is repetition is good and I know, like, Ms. Brown wasn't here the last time and I know Mr. Rue was on the phone so, you know, I haven't seen you in a couple of I try to come some of the time. And let's really focus on how corrupt our courts are. And what I'm reading is this case is now transferred to superior court. even know what judge's court it's in, I don't think that's been published. I can't know all of this, maybe you know which court and which judge has it. I don't know whether I can even get the file. I mean the police check my name and all the stuff and my name is there and I think it's funny. I really am a college administrator with a Ph.D. that's raising four people over -- down the street. I'm neighborly and I just -- I don't think we should let Exxon get away with all this. That's my opinion, but I don't really believe it's -- I really believe it's going to take

more than just a big paper shuffle, I think it takes new leadership.

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

I do this very humbly, I feel like I have I am the only woman in the race, and that's kind of I never know, because I know I've run for Mayor, and school board recently and, oh, this afternoon I'm on my way to AIDEA, that is the political slush fund, they hand out millions to their fixers and their manipulators, whoever is It's -- I don't whether you -- I going to do something. mean, Drue, I don't know whether you knew this when you were in the Legislature. Go over across from McDonald's on Northern Lights at 1:00 o'clock and see what's going on. They now have a big three-story building of employees. They used to be over on Tudor, I think it was, or International, next to Cattle Company and International. it was a small building, now they like quadrupled or at least they have three times as many employees as they used I don't know whether you focus on all this stuff. to have.

I hope you're having a good day.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mrs. Obermeyer, we don't have any purview over AIDEA. Could you bring it back to the Council and.....

MS. OBERMEYER: Oh, yeah, but, see, you used to, Madam, you have been....

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I'm sorry, I don't

anymore, thankfully.

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

MS. OBERMEYER: And I'm really talking to someone like you. You have been the President of the State Senate, you should have had an overview for at least a decade and something good should have happened. I mean, where is accountability? It hasn't. I don't have any answers for you. I just know that I live in a place where there are about 2,200 State of Alas -- attorneys that are in state that are licensed. Of course, Mr. Tillery is one of them, and there's almost 500 out of 2,200 -- and, see, I can't get their salaries. You, I assume had that when you were in the State Senate, I assume they make up to 100,000 a year, if they play ball. They don't get anything unless they play ball. And if they play ball they get trips, they get whatever they want. I mean, John Steiner's over there at the school board right now. Because I filed for school board, he filed. And, of course, I know the election wasn't fair. And so I don't know whether you even know John, I assume you do. He is the attorney for the airport. I'm worried, you're flying out of here, what's the -- you know, I don't have any answers. I just know that I've watched all of this unfold before my eyes for so many It's beyond belief, because, see, anywhere else we would have gotten a lot of help by now. And I take this as the ultimate challenge because I do know why and that

sustains me, that allows me to continue. It isn't fun being laughed at, but it's happened. You know, going into rooms and having everyone -- have these over-responses. I mean, I've actually been jailed for 29 days. I don't think anybody would have enjoyed that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, of course, I always have a joke. one my students said, I taught at a jail for almost six years before any of this started. I assume you remember, I taught at McLaughlin before I was elected to the school board, and that's when I think we had fair elections. don't even know if they were fair then, I only know I went over there and tried and look what happened. My name was in headlines everyday, now I can't even get my name I mean, my picture was actually in headlines, now my name is not even in the paper. I did, and you might remember, Drue, I did go to Washington, because I told you I was going. I didn't have a chance to say hi to you because I didn't know where you were in Washington, but I did go on Capitol Hill a little bit, you know, not well -you always feel such failure, I would have rather spent more time there, but I was -- I had three of my children with me, so I was really mainly sightseeing and entertaining children. Do you know the syndrome? anyone that raises children does. I had to mainly allow my children to sightsee and stuff. And I think that's only

fair to them.

Although I did do a little bit on Capitol Hill. I even visited Orin Hatch's office, who does he think he's kidding? The Chairman of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, are you serious? He -- the things that that man has done directly. I have his correspondence. That was in the early '90s. So let's head -- there's some level of understanding and decency if there isn't. I have a lot of comfort that I try, that's all I can ever do. So let's see if a whole bunch of things come unraveled.

You know, I also think of this group and the fact that they have so many hits a week it's amazing.

Overnight -- I mean I understood, am I correct, 115 hits a week -- 115,000?

MS. McCAMMON: Not that many.

MS. OBERMEYER: How many?

MS. McCAMMON: I can't tell you right now.

MS. OBERMEYER: You said -- you gave.....

MS. McCAMMON: We gave you a number, but I can't remember what it was.

MS. OBERMEYER: It was over 100,000 a week, whatever it was, and I don't have -- pardon me?

MS. McCAMMON: It was a lot.

MS. OBERMEYER: Yeah, exactly. So if

something -- I don't know how that would happen, but the Internet is such a powerful force. And, of course, have a website, I hope that many lawyers and judges all over our great nation have downloaded that stuff. Again, I always think I should have more stuff on there. I was thinking about putting more on there even yesterday, but I probably have too much as it is, and it's sometimes hard to download, you know, if it's a time of day where there are a lot of people on it you can't even get the stuff downloaded. So whatever -- I hope people look at it late at night and read it over when they have a chance. All I can do is make an example out of myself and that's what I'm trying to do.

And so did you have a question, Senator?

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: No.

MS. OBERMEYER: Well, I just wish you well, I hope you have a very safe journey. Let's let the truth surface for a change. And can we remember that my opponent will be the highest ranking Republican in the U.S. Senate if he gets elected, now that's frightening. Look what he's already done. It's scary. I don't know what to say. I mean, if that's what we want as a country, it's -- I'm only one person, I know I would never let it happen if I had any control over it. Because, you see, we don't even know what's going to happen. We can only ask for somebody with

a good character, and that man does not have a good character. Look at the way he was licensed, as long ago as 1960, he really is one of the biggest frauds or scams in the history of the United States.

2.

And here's the other funny thing, when I talk about him people don't even know his name and I never give it out. I'm not giving out his name. Now, when I've written things I've put his name down because I assume that people that read do know his name, but when I talk to people, what I said on the East Coast is do you know that both of our U.S. Senators are running for office? Do you know that, Mr. Rue?

MR. RUE: Yes. And, Madam Chair, I'm not sure what this has to do with our agenda, but it's.....

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I don't think so either.

MS. OBERMEYER: Well, sir, it has to do with American law and it has to do with accountability.

MR. RUE: I'm not sure that's on our agenda today.

MS. OBERMEYER: Your agenda has to do with the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council.

MR. RUE: It would be helpful to have you tell us what.....

MS. OBERMEYER: And, you see, you wouldn't

have to even be in existence if there was a fair settlement. And would also allow me, sir, politely to say that I see all of this as so ridiculously bureaucratic. Now, I just believe that you do really a lot of good, but you really are State and Federal employees. And so, you see, that's not accountable. You are public employees, you are not -- you do not have independence of thought and so that's one of the reasons I am able to -- well, you see, here's my point, Frank, if you don't do what you're told you will not be Commissioner of Fish and Game, that's my point. You do what Tony tells you to do. And, I mean, not, you know, everyday down to the five minutes, but if you do not go along with your supervisor you're not going to be Commissioner anymore, that's the point. I'm the one that has independence of thought. Now, don't think I enjoy Don't think I have had fun not making any money. We're doing okay, we certainly aren't doing well financially, how could we? All of this has been an effort to bankrupt us for almost 20 years.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But -- and so I just apologize for miscommunication, I said that when I first started coming. You are all public employees, all of you.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mrs. Obermeyer, could you please wrap up? You're out of time.

MS. OBERMEYER: And so that's my point, I

just wanted to say that. And what does it have to do? has to do with independence of thought. I'm the one that comes in that nicely wants to mention these things, because I know the law, and I understand public employment. I have been a public employee, if anything I'm really hoping that you are treated well. I ask for this. But, you see, I've already said there's not going to be a lot of good that's going to happen, especially at this university, because I sued them and no one else is going to. I don't expect you to understand any of it. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mrs. Obermeyer, please

wrap up.

MS. OBERMEYER: And would you forgive me, as another professional woman, I am a college administrator with a Ph.D., I will leave what you want to call me to you, but I'm an educator. And thank you for hearing me.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Thank you. Any other public comment?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay.

Anybody on the line? MS. McCAMMON:

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: No, we've already did There was not anyone and nobody has joined because we would have heard a beep.

> MS. McCAMMON: Okay.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: That brings us to approval of the GEM Program document.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. McCAMMON: Yes. Madam Chairman, in your packet there is a copy of the revised first five chapters of the revised GEM Program document. There's an outline that shows the complete document and so just for the sake of saving a few trees of paper, we didn't copy chapters six, seven, eight and nine, which basically are unchanged from the version you saw before. primarily the scientific background, which covers the physics, the biology, the human uses and economics of the Gulf of Alaska, the modeling chapter and the data management information transfer. And then there was an introductory chapter in chapter six, so those aren't included, the appendices are not included either. And also we don't have the acknowledgements and the executive summary because the executive summary still needs to be rewritten.

But what you have is basically the heart of the revised GEM Program, following the National Research Council's Review Committee, chapters one through five.

Chapter one goes through the vision of the program, which includes mission, goals, governance, funding, geographic scope and kind of the legacy of the past where -- basically describing the origins of the program.

Chapter two goes through the conceptual foundation and the central hypotheses, which is basically the scientific heart of the program.

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

Chapter three talks about the tools and strategies that the program will use, and these include things such as using gap analysis, monitoring research, modeling, data management and information transfer. does highlight, and I want to call your attention to this, on page -- the two key strategies, and this is on Page 34 The main strategy for potential for in chapter three. resource management applicability is unchanged, that's been in there before, but we did significantly add to the strategy of incorporating traditional knowledge and community involvement. And so this piece is in there in And we see community involvement, this section. traditional knowledge and also using information to develop resource management applications as being key strategies in developing the program over time.

Chapter four goes through program implementation, and this is basically the beginning of a science plan for the GEM Program. This chapter will probably be obsolete tomorrow in the sense that the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee will be working on it, the Public Advisory Committee will be working on it, refining the questions, developing and making

recommendations on which variables should be monitored, at which sites, in order to answer what questions. And so this is really a working chapter and it's the beginning of the overall GEM Science Plan.

And then chapter five talks about program management and goes through how the program will be administered, the relationship between the Trustee Council, staff, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, the Public Advisory Committee, public review, all of the subcommittees. Again, a major section on Page 66, on public and community advice and involvement and the commitment to that. And it also describes the role of scientific advice review and management, the role of the GEM Science Director, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, the various subcommittees and work groups.

Pretty much -- most of the information in here is pretty substantially similar to information that's been in earlier versions. It's been significantly reorganized, I think, in order to highlight and, hopefully, to be a little be easier for people to look at and understand and be able to respond to. But basically a lot of the information is still the same, with the addition of major sections on community involvement, traditional knowledge.

And with that I'd be happy to answer any

questions you might have.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Ouestions? Maria.

MS. LISOWSKI: Molly, as I understand it, we're still waiting to get final comments from the NRC on the document; is that correct?

MS. McCAMMON: We have received the prepublication version, which is 99.9999999 percent the final document. All that's really being changed now is they're correcting some typos, they're adding a couple of sentences to clarify some things that we ask questions about. There were a couple of -- in some comments on the science background, there were a couple of errors and they corrected those so, in essence, it is their final comments.

MS. LISOWSKI: So substantively we've basically received what we're going to receive from them?

MS. McCAMMON: Substantively, yes, we have.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any other questions?

MR. RUE: Quick question.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Yes, Mr. Rue.

Commissioner.

MR. RUE: Yeah, thank you. Molly, I see the subcommittees as the key to fleshing out the specifics of chapter four.

MS. McCAMMON: That's correct.

MR. RUE: And we've got nominations -- what

do we have two months?

A Same Same

MS. McCAMMON: Two months for nomination, until September 3rd and then it's -- you know, if there's not a suitable pool, then there will be additional recruitment and.....

MR. RUE: Go back out.

MS. McCAMMON: .....go back out, yeah.

MR. RUE: Yeah, right.

MS. McCAMMON: And there's still a question in terms of how many of those subcommittees. Originally it had been our thought about doing one for habitat, watershed, nearshore, offshore and Alaska Coastal current. In discussion with the STAC there was some -- well, first of all, there was concern about how to administer and manage that many committees, number one. And then number two, whether that many subcommittees were actually needed.

MR. RUE: Yeah. Because I'm thinking of the interface between science and management, which is one of our goals here.

MS. McCAMMON: Right.

MR. RUE: You know, not just doing things for science or just for management. And those committees is a place where you can have managers, et cetera, sit down with scientists and work on questions.

MS. McCAMMON: Right.

MR. RUE: Work on the hypotheses, what are the things we really need to know, what are we doing, what are you doing. And if it's one big committee -- I mean, I can imagine with the Department of Fish and Game, I have folks who are worried about watersheds, other folks who are worried about issues offshore more, and finding one or two or three people to all sit on one committee. It would be hard to find one person to sit on that committee who could represent all the interests you might even want from someone like Fish and Game, much less at DNR or other manager types who aren't really plugged into the process, perhaps, as well as the -- they could be with the committee So it's more a question than -- I sort of like structure. the idea of the committees by habitat type, because it has a logic, but it is fairly large and unmanageable. perhaps, we'll just have to see how it works out and who gets nominated, but that's something I'm worried or thinking about as we move ahead here because I do think that's where the rubber meets the road is in those committees and having good people there to help us work through the theory and the initial hypotheses to here are priority areas where we think you need work. we're going to get that kind of advice.

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: And the nominations do come back to the Trustee Council.

MR. RUE: Right, right, I know. 1 2 MS. McCAMMON: And that would be in 3 September. And I think there was also some thinking on the part of the STAC that a lot of the work would be also done 4 in these targeted workshops that we've done, which has a 5 6 larger pool of people and you really do get a real mix of stakeholders, community people, managers, scientists and 7 really have that kind of interaction. So it'll be kind of 8 9 a mix of that. 10 MR. RUE: Uh-huh. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mr. Balsiger. 11 MR. BALSIGER: Would you remind me of the 12 13 terms of the appointments of these? I know it was in the announcement, but I..... 14 MS. McCAMMON: The subcommittees would have 15 16 renewable three year terms. The STAC has a four year term, 17 but they're staggered..... Thank you. 18 MR. BALSIGER: 19 MS. McCAMMON: .....some are two, some are 20 four. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Further comments or 21 22 questions? 23 (No audible response) CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And do you want us to 24

take action on approval?

25

1	MS. McCAMMON: Yes, please.	
2	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any further discussion?	
3	Do we have a motion? Commissioner Rue.	
4	MR. RUE: I move that we approve the Gulf	
5	Ecosystem Monitoring Research Program chapters presented t	
6	us today, which I believe were chapters one through five.	
7	MS. McCAMMON: It would be the entire	
8	document.	
9	MR. RUE: The entire document that we have.	
10	Oh, actually, let's approve the whole thing. We don't have	
11	to come back to this.	
12	MS. BROWN: Include 21 pages of acronyms.	
13	MR. RUE: Right.	
14	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: You're not going to	
15	tell her to start over?	
16	(Laughter)	
17	MR. RUE: Let's approve the Gulf Ecosystem	
18	Monitoring Research Program.	
19	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Do we have a second?	
20	Let's do.	
21	MS. BROWN: Second.	
22	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We do have a second.	
23	Any discussion?	
24	(No audible response)	
25	CHATRWOMAN PEARCE. All those in favor say	

aye.

1.5

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: It has been approved.

MS. McCAMMON: Yea!.

(Laughter)

MR. RUE: Good job, Molly and Phil. Can we comment after the fact?

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Yes, Commissioner.

MR. RUE: I should have said I appreciate all the work that went into this by you and Phil Mundy and others. I do think it's a good document, I've read it, it made sense. I actually got it and that's how I came to the conclusion the subcommittees are really important, because there's a lot here, but there's still a lot more detail that needs to be worked out and that's where the real fun will happen, but this is a good way to organize our thoughts and focus this, so I appreciate all the work you all did. It's a good job.

MS. McCAMMON: Well, I appreciate all the work of the staff, too, and Phil has just done an enormous amount of work on it. Bob Spies has done an incredible amount of work in getting the conceptual foundation pulled together, Sandra Schubert, Katharine Miller, Bob Walker,

all the people who wrote various sections of it, it really has been a work from a number of people.

MR. RUE: I think it'll be a good example for others. I know at the NPRB we're sort of looking at how do we do science planning. We won't necessarily follow with the pack, but it is a very -- I think it's a good way -- it's a good thing to have out there, not only for ourselves, but for others who are struggling with some of the same issues.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any further comments?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: That brings us to the Revised Operating and Report procedures.

MS. McCAMMON: Yes. The next item on your agenda, Revised Operating and Report procedures. You were briefed on these at your last meeting. I just wanted to highlight a few items and make note of some of the more significant changes.

In the General Operating Procedures, it provides for a chair to alternate meeting to meeting between State and Federal Trustees, which has been the current practice, and I thought that was actually in the procedures, it hasn't been, but -- unless you want to make someone permanent chair, but that's -- I thought we would just memorialize.....

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Let's see who would we choose?

(Laughter)

MS. McCAMMON: ....the current practice.

MR. RUE: Dave Gibbons

MS. McCAMMON: Yes, Dave Gibbons, the Forest Service Chair shall be the permanent chair.

MS. LISOWSKI: But not his alternate.

(Laughter)

MS. McCAMMON: There's a section on Page 4, under Proposal Solicitation and Review, to allow the Trustee Council to approve funding a project for a single year or for multiple years. We don't describe the process, the direct process of multiple year funding in the procedures. We're still working on those, the details of how that would actually work, but it gives the ability to do so.

The Financial Procedures, there are no substantive changes since you saw them. There is one small change, when I read through it, on Page 5 of the Financial Procedures under Lapse, number three, the close-out period. There had been a question, I believe, by Mr. Tillery and I think we did a better job of clarifying this, but when I read it again last night I was still a little confused, so I did have a little bit of different language just to

clarify. During the months of October, November and 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

December, and in parenthesis, through December 31st, agencies may pay from funds from the fiscal year that just ended on September 30th, an expense that was undisclosed during the fiscal year. In addition, agencies may establish obligations to accommodate an expense that was undisclosed during that fiscal year, period.

When you start talking about prior year funds it gets a little confusing about what prior year you mean, so I thought that might clarify.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Is that just for the Federal? The State fiscal year ends in July.

MS. McCAMMON: No, we're on -- all of the oil spill programs are on the Federal fiscal year, so that applies there, too.

MR. BALSIGER: So that language you just read is not here, it's an adjustment to this language?

> That's an adjustment, yes. MS. McCAMMON:

MR. BALSIGER: Okay, thank you.

MS. LISOWSKI: Could you read that one more

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time? MS. McCAMMON: During the months of

October, November and December, and in parentheses, through December 31st, agencies may pay from -- strike the prior year -- funds, and then add, from the fiscal year that just

ended on September 30th, an expense that was undisclosed during the fiscal year, period. And then, in addition, agencies may establish obligations to accommodate an expense that was undisclosed during that fiscal year, period. And then delete the just ended.

So that's the Financial Operating procedures. And then the Report Writing procedures, the significant changes there were in the number of copies of the final report, down from 31 to 21, we're not such a popular document as we once were. So there are just fewer libraries requesting paper copies of the reports. All of the reports are available on our website, so that's getting a lot more use.

We also significantly changed the annual report due date, distribution and the report form. And those changes are all included under Report Writing, Section C. As I mentioned the last time you met, the annual report, in the past, has not been due until April 15th and usually by that time proposals have already been submitted, often the reports are late, and they haven't been very user friendly to the peer review process, so we've changed them significantly, made them a lot shorter, they're due earlier. We hope that it'll expedite and improve review.

And these have all gone through agency

review, all of these changes. And then we do have the data policy, which is a separate item. But those are the main changes to the procedures.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Questions?

MS. McCAMMON: Since you last saw them.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any questions? Mr.

Tillery, you have a puzzled look.

1.8

MR. TILLERY: Well, I'm trying to figure out that you have the annual reports by September 1, which is still after we'll have our primary Work Plan meeting, is that not right; don't we usually do that in August? And is this intended to sort of catch the December meeting?

MS. McCAMMON: Let me go through that, do you remember what page? Where's Sandra? She's not even in here when I need her.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Page 15.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Let me -- the way we have it is that the annual reports are basically used to highlight any problem and so the review of the Council would still -- let me look back through this. I think we did September 1 of each fiscal year -- the Trustee Council would make their decision on the basis that there are no problems and that everything is on track and that there are no changes and so it would give an ability to withhold funds starting October 1 if there were any changes to go

back to the Trustee Council. So it's more for an internal office review is the way it would be used. And the only way to make it even go before the Trustee Council would be so early that it would basically be meaningless.

MR. TILLERY: Right, that's why I was kind of wondering because we have a hard time getting these things anyway.

MS. McCAMMON: Correct. So.....

MR. TILLERY: But certainly by December we could....

MS. McCAMMON: We have only had, I think, through this review process maybe two projects that have either had significant problems, were stopped midstream or had to really have some kind of serious redirection. It's only been a handful, one, two, three projects, and so we don't foresee this happening very often, but it does give some method, some way to hold the PIs accountable.

Did you have anything on this, Sandra?

MS. SCHUBERT: No, I'm sorry, I didn't hear
the first part of the.....

MS. McCAMMON: The question was on the September 1 due date for the annual reports and how that ties in if the Trustee Council takes action earlier, and it was more of an internal -- for us internally through the peer review process and through the staff reviewing them

and project management. 1 2 I quess that one thing that MS. SCHUBERT: 3 we've been talking about is that there could be approval that's contingent on a satisfactory report and so on, since 5 the money isn't actually released until October. 6 MR. TILLERY: That's what I was just kind 7 of thinking, would we want to make it sort of part of 8 the.... MS. McCAMMON: It would probably be one of 9 10 the contingencies. MR. TILLERY: Pro forma for all of them, 11 12 yeah. So you might want to make sure you put that into that annual Work Plan resolution. 13 14 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any other comments or questions? 15 16 (No audible response) 17 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Do we have a motion to adopt the changes? 18 19 MR. RUE: Madam Chair, perhaps before we 20 put the motion.... CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Commissioner. 21 MR. RUE: .....do we need to, perhaps, add 22 that last piece to the motion? That Craig just made, the 23

contingent -- I mean we had all assumed that funding was

contingent on satisfactory or.....

24

25

1	MR. TILLERY: Madam Chair, I don't think we
2	need to add it to these or to a motion, I think we just
3	need to remember when we come around for the Work Plan to
4	put it in that resolution.
5	MS. BROWN: Well, I'll move that we
6	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Commissioner Brown.
7	MS. BROWN: I'll move that we adopt the
8	Revised Operating and Report procedures as laid out in the
9	Executive Director's June 27th memo, as well as the
LO	language change that was read on the Financial section.
L1	MR. RUE: Second.
12	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We have a motion and a
13	second, do we have discussion?
L4	(No audible response)
15	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: All those in favor say
16	aye.
17	IN UNISON: Aye.
18	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed?
19	(No audible response)
20	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Hearing none, the
21	Revised Operating and Report procedures and the additions
22	that were told to us have been adopted.
23	So do you want to go executive session or
24	go to the next
25	MS. McCAMMON: Probably data policy, yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Let's go to number seven on the agenda, approval of the new Trustee Council data policy. And there are rules, do we need a motion to change order on the agenda?

MS. McCAMMON: Unh-unh. (Negative)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. Different people handle things differently, you never know.

Okay. Data policy.

MS. McCAMMON: Okay. You do have a revised data policy before you and there are -- it's a little bit different than the one you have in your binder. And the main change is the one in the binder referred to the draft GEM data policy, the GEM Program, GEM projects, the GEM data system manager, and we wanted to make sure and clarify that this is the Trustee Council data policy. GEM is a piece of it, but it's the Trustee Council data system manager, is the Trustee Council's projects, so it not just those that are GEM, it also includes lingering oil injury, it's the entire program. So those changes were made consistently throughout.

There's also one additional change under the data preservation policy and this talks about you're currently under court order that all samples and documents collected as part of any Trustee Council sponsored restoration program, including GEM, must be retained. All

1 data normally must be preserved and requests to destroy 2 samples and documents must follow the Trustee Council's -and what we have here is the procedures for State agencies 3 4 and their contractors for destroying documents or physical evidence related to the Exxon Valdez oil spill. And then 5 6 it refers that documents must be preserved unless 7 authorization is given the Department of Law to destroy items no longer necessary for restoration or other 8 9 And we do have a request to change that. Department of Justice and Department of Law will be working 10 on these procedures in the next few weeks, and amending 11 12 There are some minor amendments here, but basically them. consider them procedures for State and Federal agencies, 13 they would apply to both sides. And it would be procedures 14 for both Federal and State agencies and their contractors, 15 and then authorization must be given by the Alaska 16 Department of Law or the Department of Justice? 17 asking, Craig, would it be or? 18

MR. TILLERY: I think it should be and.

MS. McCAMMON: And, so even if a State agency were to apply for this, it would have to be agreed to by both.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TILLERY: As a practical matter we do that anyway.

MS. McCAMMON: You do that anyway, okay.

MR. TILLERY: And it's better just because

MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, okay. So it would be unless authorization is given by the Alaska Department of Law and the U.S. Department of Justice to destroy items no longer necessary. So this just makes clear that this policy applies to both State and Federal agencies.

MR. BALSIGER: But this refers to a policy that's yet to be developed because right now it doesn't include the

MS. McCAMMON: There is a policy, it would take the change of just adding Federal agencies and adding the Department of Justice phone number on here, so it's a pretty minor change.

MR. BALSIGER: So by approving this, we'd approve that pending change, I guess?

MS. McCAMMON: Yes. The data policy applies to FY03 projects, not current projects, and so it wouldn't take effect until October 1 anyway.

MR. TILLERY: Well, Madam Chair, it's actually -- I mean, it's in effect now, this is an existing court order so these.....

MS. McCAMMON: Well, the court order is, that's correct.

MR. TILLERY: The technical policy isn't,

1	but people have to follow this now, they can't be out there
2	destroying documents and stuff.
3	MS. McCAMMON: Right.
4	MR. RUE: Should send this to Arthur
5	Anderson then.
6	(Laughter)
7	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any further discussion?
8	(No audible response)
9	MS. McCAMMON: And we did follow some of
10	the comments that you had at our last meeting and tried to
11	clean up some of the language and make it a little more
12	straightforward, so you can tell us if that was successful
13	or not. It's still law.
14	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Further questions?
15	(No audible response)
16	MS. McCAMMON: You need a motion on this.
17	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: The change is actually
18	on our sheet, is that the only change?
19	MS. McCAMMON: Right, yes.
20	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay, so the document
21	you have is complete with those handwritten additions of
22	and Federal and the U.S. Department of Justice. Do we have
23	a motion to adopt?
24	MR. RUE: Madam Chair
25	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Commissioner Rue.

1	MR. RUE:I move that we adopt the
2	EVOS Trustee Council data policy dated 7/9/2002.
3	MR. TILLERY: Second.
4	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We have a motion and a
5	second; is there discussion?
6	(No audible response)
7	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: All those in favor say
8	aye.
9	IN UNISON: Aye.
10	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed?
11	(No audible response)
12	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And the motion is
13	adopted and the Trustee Council data policy changes have
14	been approved.
15	MS. McCAMMON: Well, we could go to
16	let's see we wanted to
17	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I think we have
18	executive session first.
19	MS. McCAMMON: I don't think our lunch has
20	arrived yet. And Brad Meiklejohn isn't here. We could do
21	the small parcel Chokwak and the Sitkalidak, those two.
22	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. Then let's go to
23	the small parcel KAP1087.
24	MR. RUE: Is everyone here who needs to be
25	here?

	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Pardon me?
2	MR. RUE: Is everyone here who needs to be
3	here? Is Alex Swiderski here? Where's Alex? No? We
4	don't have Alex Swiderski who's key to Sitkalidak, I think
5	and Chokwak.
6	MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, he probably needs
7	MR. TILLERY: Right, he's working on a
8	resolution for Chokwak.
9	MR. RUE: Is he?
-0	MS. McCAMMON: Oh. Do we need Alex for
.1	Chokwak, too?
.2	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Yeah, I'm just going
.3	to
.4	MS. McCAMMON: Okay. And we wanted to do
.5	injury after executive session.
-6	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Yeah, executive
.7	session. So we can go ahead and go into executive
.8	session
.9	MS. LISOWSKI: We can do executive session
20	and then just
21	MR. TILLERY: Yeah.
22	MS. LISOWSKI:talk and then eat.
23	MS. McCAMMON: But you may not want to go
24	to 1:30, maybe until 1:00.
25	MR. TILLERY: Right, maybe we could just go

1	to 1:00 then and start now and begin.
2	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay, let's do that.
3	MS. McCAMMON: Okay.
4	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Who's got the motion
5	for executive session, do we go through all of that?
6	MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, you need a motion for
7	executive session.
8	MR. TILLERY: Give me just a second.
9	MS. McCAMMON: We need a motion for
LO	executive session.
L1	MR. TILLERY: Yeah, I just
L2	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mr. Tillery.
L3	MR. TILLERY: Yeah, Madam Chair, I would
L4	move that we go into executive session to discuss legal
L5	issues relating to injury status and to the litigation
16	issues.
L7	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: There is a motion for
18	executive session to last until approximately 1:00 p.m.; is
L9	that correct?
20	MS. McCAMMON: Right.
21	MR. RUE: Second.
22	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And there is a second.
23	And I don't know if that's a motion that can be discussed
24	at any

MR. TILLERY: You just need to vote.

MR. RUE: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I was asking if you could do discussion, and I don't suppose you can. If there are no questions, all those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay, we will go into executive session, we should be out by 1:00 and we'll plan to begin the update on the status of injured resources and services at 1:00 or shortly thereafter, we won't begin before. With that we are off.....

(Off record - 11:40 a.m.)

(On record - 1:52 p.m.)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: If we could call the meeting of the Trustee Council back to order, it's is eight minutes until 2:00 in the afternoon. We apologize for running late, we were in executive session discussing injury and litigation concerns.

Next on the approved agenda is the update on status of injured resources and services. And we each just received with our packages and, frankly, most of our packages didn't arrive to us until just the day before the 4th of July or even after, so most of the members have not yet had an opportunity to spend the time we'd to spend,

particularly on the memorandum that was provided to us in response to our questions from the Chief Scientist and also recommendations from the Executive Director. So we are going to not actually take action on that update until the August meeting. But having said that, we are putting that aside. Do any members want to make comments or want to ask for additional information from the staff before that meeting?

1.3

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. That, then, would take us to number nine, habitat protection. And do you want to go down the list in the order -- we have a written report from The Nature Conservancy, which we have been given.

MS. McCAMMON: We do and we have -- and there's one thing I want to highlight there.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: And we have a written report that's being copied from The Conservation Fund and we do have Brad Meiklejohn from The Conservation Fund, who is here. And the idea of these reports is to get back to you the status of the pilot grant that has been underway for the last year. It actually expires at the end of September and so it will be before you to either not extend the grant or consider extending it for the original 1,000,000 or

potentially more. And so we wanted to have you start thinking about this at this time, because if you do want to extend the grant, then we would want to have you consider that at the August 6th meeting, because that's the next meeting before the September 30th expiration date.

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 the one item in The Nature Conservancy report that I did want to call your attention to, Randy did put together a status of the parcels that they are working on, on behalf of the Trustee Council, as part of this grant. And this includes four parcels on the Anchor River and then two parcels on Nuka Island that are owned by the University of Alaska. These have all been before you, I think, at the December meeting. You had these come before you at that time, with the exception of the McGee tract on the Anchor River. And so as part of this process The Nature Conservancy and The Conservation Fund bring these parcels to you, let you know this is what they're working If there are any questions, concerns, problems, if you on. want to say, halt, stop, don't go forward with these, I have questions or concerns, now is the time to do it.

And so you still have final action when they are actually ready to go forward, that you actually approve them, but this, at least, gives them some indication that they are on the right track. So, again, in particular with The Conservancy, the main parcel there is

the McGee tract and it's one of three private parcels at the mouth of the Anchor River that together with the State lands that are already existing there comprise the entirety of the Salt Marsh Estuary and Barrier Beach complex at the mouth of the river. And so they are working with the owner of that parcel right now, it's currently being appraised and that is one that could be coming back to you for consideration.

I just wanted to let you know that they are negotiating with the university on the Nuka Island parcel. With the agreement of the Forest Service they have now entered negotiations and discussions on behalf of the Forest Service and the Trustee Council on the university parcels in Prince William Sound, the Duck Flats parcels and the Jack Bay parcel, so they're working on those, too. Those have previously been approved by the Trustee Council and actually offers were made on those, but they have never been completed. So there's some ongoing discussion there.

And I guess Brad -- there is a report from Brad Meiklejohn with The Conservation Fund, and maybe you can come up here and if there were any -- and go through this since we just got it.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Hello. The Fund is working on three properties, you have of the properties before you today, the Chokwak property, we're here for a

final approval to go forward with making an offer to purchase that property. That property is on the north shore of Kiliuda Bay on the east shore of Kodiak Island. It lies within lands for which there's a pending land exchange between the State of Alaska and Old Harbor Native Corporation. I believe that's also on your agenda today for some additional funding.

The property has good habitat values for eagles, salmon and, I believe, there's quite a bit of herring spawning offshore. And the property has been appraised, we've been through most of the due diligence, there's been a hazardous material site inspection and we're into the final stages. The seller has indicated willingness to sell at the appraised value. So we're essentially prepared to close on that property as soon as we have approval from the Trustee Council.

The other two properties that the Fund is working on, the Kurka property has been before you before, I believe. It's located on the Anchor River just off of the Stirling Highway on the North Fork Road. It's a subdivision of 23 lots, of which 22 are still there, the one was sold and 14 of those lots do front on the Anchor River. I believe you are aware the Anchor is a fairly important river for steelhead fishing and a variety of other injured resources.

And, finally, the third property the Fund is working on is at the Ninilchik River, it's the Swartz property, it's a very small tract of .19 acres. It's adjacent to the Icicle Seafoods property purchased by the Fund last year and for which the Council approved funding. It does front on the Ninilchik River, a fairly important sportfishing river. And the property is currently listed for sale with a broker and the sellers are very eager to sell. I don't have a value estimate at this time, we've requested an appraisal, we have not yet received it. I expect the value to be relatively low for that size tract. The larger Icicle Seafoods property was, I believe, 19 lots of similar size and that was about \$113,000, as I recall. So we're probably in the neighborhood of \$10-20,000 for this property.

Any questions?

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I just have one. On the Anchor River and the Ninilchik River properties has the local government, I assume the borough, expressed interest in the same -- these transactions?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: I don't know that they've expressed any indication one way or the other.

MS. McCAMMON: Did you want something from the borough or the city?

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I was just curious

whether they had -- whether they care.

MR. RUE: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mr. Rue.

MR. RUE: On the Kurka property, you say there was one lot that's been sold?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yeah, Lot 16, it's the back lands. It's in the upper left corner if you orient the map horizontally, it's in the upper left corner and it does not front on the river, it's hillside property.

MR. RUE: Okay, yeah, that's back from the river.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: So that's the only lot that's not available.

MR. RUE: And actually it's less critical for the river.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yeah, it's -- I believe it's been deforest, there was some cutting on the property and that's where the timber was. The subdivision is partially constructed -- that road listed as Wiggle Wort Road has been built, there's a bridge crossing the south fork of the Anchor River there, but the other roads have not been constructed into the subdivision.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: So will the road be -if Fish and Game takes the property, will the road become
part of the State's road? How does this work?

MR. RUE: Good question. I don't know if 2 it's plotted right away and stays with the city or if it comes with the property. Do you know? 3 MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yeah, my understanding is 4 the plot has not been finalized, the plot is still pending 5 before the borough. I believe the road would come with it 6 7 in its current status and would be part of the property 8 acquired. So it would be State managed. The bridge is in 9 very rough shape, it's like a wood plank bridge and I don't 10 think it has much longer life expectancy. 11 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Well, that's the problem, the minute Fish and Game takes it..... 12 13 MR. RUE: You would have to decide what to do with it. 14 15 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: ....the State will have to decide to reconstruct it..... 16 17 MR. RUE: Pull it out or keep it. 18 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: .....because pulling it 19 out would be a huge battle..... 20 MR. RUE: Would it? CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Well, with the fishing 21 community, if you're going to have access for fishing. 22 MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Well, actually it's not 23 24 really -- I think there's access besides that bridge, I

mean, you don't need the bridge to get to the river.

1

25

think in its current status the bridge is a hazard, it's 1 fairly rough. 2 MR. RUE: I guess we'd have to look at 3 4 that. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Well, we're trying to 5 get rid of a bridge in Yakataga and I can tell you when a 6 7 bridge is in a state it's a huge battle. 8 (Laughter) 9 MR. RUE: Sounds like one we got. 10 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Even the State doesn't want us to do it. 11 MR. RUE: Of course. 12 MR. MEIKLEJOHN: You can get to the river 13 14 through a variety of those lots without using the bridge. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: On both sides? River 15 16 access on both sides? 17 MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Well, on one side 18 certainly, I..... We have to evaluate whether we MR. RUE: 19 want to keep it or not, or have the money to keep it. 20 I mean, that's what sportfish access monies can be used for 21 is sportfish access. 22 23 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okav. 24 MR. MEIKLEJOHN: I don't think Anchor is

all that deep.

25

MR. RUE: No.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: I mean, it's pretty wadeable, so if you can get to one side you can get to the other, I would think.

MR. RUE: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And is it Fish and Game's intent to provide public assess for fish.....

MR. RUE: Oh, yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: .....for the fishery?

MR. RUE: Oh, yeah, that's why we'd have

it.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any other questions for The Conservation Fund? Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Yeah, on this Chokwak property, who would pay the owner the purchase price?
Would it be the State of Alaska or The Conservation Fund?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Well, we've done these deals both ways in the past, depending on the matter of timing. Our preference is to not be in chain of title if we can avoid it. We do have a revolving fund that we can draw from. It's possible to have the title go straight to the State and miss The Conservation Fund altogether, but if there's a timing issue that the property needs to close by X date and we don't have the funding yet from the Trustee Council, it's possible for us to take title and convey to

the State at a later time.

MR. TILLERY: I notice the resolution is drafted to talk about purchase by the State of Alaska, which would tend to foreclose that latter option. Do you need something that's more general like purchase....

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: We can certainly assign our contact to the State if that's....

MR. TILLERY: Well, I'm thinking you may very well be right, if for some reason you need to go ahead when the State can't do it. I don't think that's typical, but -- I know we had that problem with the Federal government because of the time it takes money to circulate.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Uh-huh.

MR. TILLERY: But I'm wondering, would there be better language by saying something like to provide funds to the Department of Interior for purchase by or for the State of Alaska or something? Or by the State of Alaska or The Conservation Fund? I mean, should we leave that flexible?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: It would help us if it was flexible?

MR. TILLERY: Does that follow that Mr.

Swi....

MR. SWIDERSKI: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last exchange, but I think the transaction is ready to

close and the only question how long it will take to move the funds through the grant and move on to the seller.

MR. TILLERY: Well, yeah, I'm kind of thinking this is the first of these we've done with the grant. And in terms of just our practice, and this will sort of set the trend we will do. Should it say purchase by the State of Alaska or The Conservation Fund, to allow some flexibility, closing as to who exactly ends up paying the purchase price?

MR. SWIDERSKI: You could strike out both of them, just purchase of the property.

MR. TILLERY: Well, then you have the Department of the Interior, I think, purchasing it.

MR. SWIDERSKI: I guess I would strike out all of it but, sure, you could say Conservation Fund (indiscernible - lowers voice)

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: It really doesn't matter to us. If it's an issue we can delay closing until the transfer can go straight to the State.

MR. TILLERY: Okay. But you think -- I got the impression from your first answer that you generally thought it was a benefit that you had the flexibility to either do it yourself, if you had to step in and get it done, that there was a State government issue.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yeah, it would be nice to

have the flexibility.

MR. TILLERY: So for that reason it would seem to me that that thing should be in the alternative.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: If we trying.....

MR. SWIDERSKI: I'm not sure if your fix does it. Your fix provides -- especially if the funds would go and purchase by The Conservation Fund the property.

MS. LISOWSKI: There needs to be that additional step that once they buy it, it goes to the State.

MR. TILLERY: So for the State of Alaska?

MS. LISOWSKI: For conveyance to the State of Alaska or something like that, uh-huh.

MR. TILLERY: We wouldn't convey it to ourselves, so....

MS. LISOWSKI: No, but if they purchase it -- they receive the funds and they purchase it, then there has to be -- they have to convey it.

(Whispered conversation)

MR. SWIDERSKI: If The Conservation Fund -the problem that may arise is I don't know how long it will
take to move the funds out of DOI to either The
Conservation Fund or the State or the title company to
convey them to the seller. So you may ask The Conservation

Fund to purchase the property directly from the seller, then what you would be authorizing is a purchase from The Conservation Fund.

MR. TILLERY: No. My suggestion was that you allow for purchase by the State of Alaska or The Conservation Fund for conveyance to the State of Alaska of all the seller's rights and interest.

MR. SWIDERSKI: But that doesn't fix it, which is -- what this says is we resolve to provide funds to the Department of Interior for purchase by the State of Alaska for The Conservation Fund. You still haven't got the funds through quickly.

MR. RUE: So would you say by or from The Conservation Fund?

MR. SWIDERSKI: No, I think.....

MR. RUE: And -- or by the State of Alaska?

MR. TILLERY: No. What I'm trying to say is that Interior can then give it to either the State of Alaska or The Conservation Fund. Providing funds to Interior for the purpose of a purchase by the State of Alaska or The Conservation Fund.

MR. RUE: Doesn't matter if they already bought it, The Conservation Fund has already bought it.

MR. TILLERY: Well, no -- you talking about buying it with their own money?

1 MR. RUE: Yeah, that's what he's saying. MR. SWIDERSKI: Yeah, right. 2 3 MR. TILLERY: Oh, well, that's not what 4 I.... 5 MR. RUE: By or from..... MR. TILLERY: Well, I was talking more 6 7 about giving the money -- it's possible that the money from Interior would go to The Conservation Fund. 8 9 MR. SWIDERSKI: Well, yes, it is, if The Conservation Fund buys it and then the State would buy it 10 11 from The Conservation Fund. MR. RUE: That's why I said by or from The 12 13 Conservation Fund. 14 MR. TILLERY: Well, no, I quess I would perceive The Conservation Fund buying it with the deed to 15 go to the State of Alaska, we wouldn't buy it from them. 16 17 We've done that before where, like, the Federal government bought property with a conveyance to the State of Alaska of 18 a portion of it, and that's what I would anticipate what's 19 going on here. 20 MR. SWIDERSKI: They would pay for the 21 22 property and the title would go to the State. 23 MR. TILLERY: Right, yeah. 24 MR. RUE: Thank you. It sounds like a good

deal, let's sign.

25

MR. TILLERY: No, with Interior funds that 1 go to The Conservation Fund, with a title going to the 2 3 State. MR. SWIDERSKI: Mr. Chokwak would like to 4 close the sale sometime in the next 10 days, which is a 5 little -- his concern is that we don't know if it will take 6 7 two weeks or two months for the funds to move from the Department of Interior to a point where they can be 8 9 conveyed to him. I'm not sure how this addresses this 10 problem. That's a different concern. 11 MR. TILLERY: 12 MR. SWIDERSKI: Right, but that is the 13 concern. 14 MR. RUE: So, Craiq, why don't we say --15 what if they step in, The Conservation Fund steps in, spends their own money, buys the property, why can't we say 16 17 in here it's either going to go through them or to them.... 18 19 MR. MEIKLEJOHN: And we're willing to do 20 that. 21 MR. RUE: ....or the State, either one? 22 MR. TILLERY: Uh-huh. 23 MR. MEIKLEJOHN: We're willing to spend our

It's maximum flexibility.

money up front.

MR. RUE:

24

25

1.	MR. TILLERY: Yeah, that's fine. It's just
2	not drafted that way. Right now it's just got the State
3	buying it.
4	MR. RUE: Okay. Well, so we say to or from
5	or something like that.
6	MR. SWIDERSKI: Frankly, my suggestion
7	would be the Council consider adopting this motion in
8	principle and allow us to work on language satisfactory to
9	everybody.
10	MR. TILLERY: With the idea that it's sort
11	of the maximum flexibility to get it done.
12	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Uh-huh.
13	MR. RUE: If we can do that.
14	MR. TILLERY: Yeah, we'll just need
15	instead of signing it at the end of the meeting it gets
16	circulated.
17	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. And we'll leave
18	that part to the drafters, after we conceptually
19	MR. RUE: Do we need a motion, Madam Chair?
20	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We need a well, do
21	we have any other questions for The Conservation Fund on
22	any of parcels?
23	MR. RUE: I have one.
24	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay.
25	MR. RUE: Madam Chair, one other comment,

this parcel also provides important access to the public lands behind it for hunting and fishing. It's got other attributes, as well, that have been important to us for a long time.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. McCAMMON: Madam Chair, if I could just make some comment, though. Because this is the first parcel that's going through the grant program, and really we haven't -- the whole idea of a pilot grant was to kind of test the process, and we're really stretching that test at this point. My recommendation, at this point, probably to you next month will be to extend the grant and we would need to work with Department of Interior on the process for doing that, but I would like you to consider that and if there are any concerns or questions about that or things that you would like to see differently, to get back to me, because it is something, I think, just process-wise, we'd probably have to get underway pretty quickly.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Did Barry draft that?

MS. McCAMMON: No, it was people here in

Anchorage.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay.

MR. RUE: Madam Chair, are we going to get a discussion from folks that whether they think it's

working? I mean, from my perspective it seems to be working, but I haven't heard from the folks in the trenches that, you know, this a pretty efficient way to do it.

The other thing is the leveraging of other funds was a hope, also the ability to, perhaps, deal with landowners who might want to sell part of the parcel or the Trustees might only want part of a parcel for restoration values and perhaps you could subdivide that parcel and The Nature Conservancy, or someone, could keep the rest, sell it, add to their -- I mean, there are lots of possibilities that we thought this might allow for. Are we going to get a report on whether.....

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I assume if.....

MS. McCAMMON: At some point you would,

yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: ....with the recommendation we would have an analysis of.....

MS. McCAMMON: The problem is we haven't really, I don't think, tested the grant, because we have one parcel.

MR. RUE: Oh, okay.

MS. McCAMMON: That's it.

MR. RUE: There you go.

MS. McCAMMON: This is it. So, I mean, we were hoping to have through the period of a year a little

more action than that, it turned out things take longer, so I think extending it and giving it a little bit longer time to test it and then really analyzing it and seeing whether it should be tweaked or whether it's worthwhile the way it is.

MR. RUE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: But I'd also like to talk to the grantees, also, and see from their perspective what concerns and if there needs to be any tweaking and an extension.

MR. RUE: And when we do that? In August we would take this up then?

MS. McCAMMON: We would have to do that in August, so you would have to take action at that time, so the actual extension could be done just contractually through the people here in Anchorage.

MR. RUE: Okay.

MS. McCAMMON: Get that done and then the question would be extending it for a year, which would probably be -- and we'd have to talk to Brad and Randy about whether it should be a year or six months or what.

MR. RUE: Okay. I understand now. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. Any other questions about the grant?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay, so let's go to small parcel 1087 and we have before us a draft resolution, correct?

MS. McCAMMON: And that's the one that was being discussed.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Right.

MS. McCAMMON: And there is in your packet there is a description of the parcel, it's nearly 160 acres, it is on the north shore of Kiliuda Bay, which is in the middle of the parcel that the State will be acquiring as part of the land exchange with Old Harbor Native Corporation. A lot of the State lands in the Bay have high bluffs and access is not all that easy and so this is one of two inholdings in Dog Bay which would provide important access and also protected moorage to the State owned uplands.

So the parcel includes a salmon stream, which has silver, chum and pink salmon runs, so it also has restoration value for salmon resources and it also has restoration value for recreation services. There is a map that is behind it, and in addition I do have a letter from Marty Rutherford, Deputy Commissioner of Alaska Department of Natural Resources expressing their willingness to assume management of the Chokwak parcel.

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

And so this, in essence, meets the conditions required by the terms of the grant, which is to come forward with an acquisition package to the Trustee Council for your consideration today. So you have the background material and the draft resolution.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And on the draft resolution we need a conceptual motion for adoption; is that correct?

> MS. McCAMMON: Correct.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: For language tweaking on how the property actually will be acquired through the process or how the money, I quess, will move through the process.

> MS. McCAMMON: Right.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Because clearly the property is going to end up in the hands of the Alaska State Department of Fish and Game.

> MS. McCAMMON: Natural Resources.

> CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay, Natural

I'm sorry, I'm still back in Ninilchik. Resources.

Do you have a motion, Mr. Tillery?

MR. TILLERY: I move that the Trustee Council adopt, in concept, the Resolution 02-06, related to small parcel KAP1087, Chokwak, with the understanding that the language relating to the mechanism by which monies will be transferred for the purchase of the property be negotiated among the governments and the grantee in order to provide the maximum flexibility for that language.

And, in addition, this hasn't been discussed yet, but under the THEREFORE clause, subsection (f), it talks about compliance in terms and conditions of paragraph 6(b) of the grant. My understanding is, is that where the terms and conditions relating to things like hazardous materials, survey and NEPA are contained. And in order to make this document more understandable to the public I would like for there to be language added that talks about compliance with the terms and conditions of paragraph 6(b) of the grant relating to, and then include, what -- sort of list what those items are, so that people know that they're in there, you know, without having to go find that separate grant document.

And that would be my motion.

MS. BROWN: Second.

MR. RUE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay, we have a motion and a second; is there discussion?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

IN UNISON:

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed?

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Motion carries.

Which brings us to Sitkalidak. And we have a memorandum.

MS. McCAMMON: There is a memo in your packet. If you'll recall at the last meeting there was a discussion about the Sitkalidak exchange between the State of Alaska and Old Harbor Native Corporation. This is in its last stages before being finalized. And, based on the appraisals by State and Federal review appraisers, it is supposed to be an equal value exchange, but the value of the lands to be conveyed by Old Harbor Native Corporation is \$1,572,000, the lands to be conveyed by the State are \$1,531,000 and there's a difference of \$41,000.

There had been a commitment by The Conservation Fund to secure this extra funding from a private funder, that has not occurred for various reasons, and now the State is asking for funds from the Trustee Council to equalize that land exchange. In this memo it details how the exchange would benefit the State in that it would give title to shoreline lands adjacent to other State owned uplands and providing shoreline access to those uplands. The exchange would benefit Old Harbor Native Corporation by giving it title to virtually all of Sitkalidak Island and basically consolidating its

landholdings there and allowing it to do better planning and better development of its estate.

1.6

The exchange also benefits the restoration of injured resources from the oil spill because it will result in protection of significant natural resources, including harbor seals, bald eagles, chum and pink salmon, there's also Kodiak brown bears and deer. So there is a restoration value there. And also a value to recreational hunting and fishing service by improving the access to that peninsula and State lands on that peninsula.

So it has benefit to Old Harbor, to the State of Alaska and to the Trustee Council for restoration purposes. And we do have Alex Swiderski here with Department of Law, we also have Walt Ebell here representing Old Harbor Native Corporation and available to answer any questions.

MR. SWIDERSKI: I also brought a map of the impending exchange, if that would help.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Alex, any additional comments?

MR. SWIDERSKI: If it's in interpreting the map, the lands that would be acquired by the State are outlined in red, are actually different colors on the map. The lands that would be acquired by Old Harbor are outlined in yellow.

1	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Does this I'm not
2	sure of the right word to use. Would this exchange then
3	give Old Harbor all of its selections or will it still have
4	selections pending?
5	MR. SWIDERSKI: I believe Old Harbor
6	already has all of its selections, all of its entitlement;
7	is that correct?
8	MR. EBELL: That's correct.
9	MS. McCAMMON: Correct.
10	MR. SWIDERSKI: So it won't affect that at
11	all.
12	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. Any additional
13	questions?
14	MR. TILLERY: Madam Chair.
15	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Mr. Tillery.
16	MR. TILLERY: The 41,000 isn't really
17	attributed to any particular spot on this map, right? It's
18	just part of the entire whatever circled in red, we need
19	41,000 to make that up.
20	MR. SWIDERSKI: That's correct.
21	MR. TILLERY: And what is the status of the
22	State land behind there?
23	MR. SWIDERSKI: That land is managed by the
24	Department of Natural Resources, Division of Lands. The

25 majority of it is subject to something called the Terror

Lake Agreement, it's a settlement agreement that was executed in the early 1980s relating to a hydroelectric project. There's a requirement in the agreement that it be managed as wildlife habitat as a defined term under Department of Natural Resources regulations. And the lands that's acquired here would be managed in the same fashion.

MR. TILLERY: So, if I'm correct, essentially the exchange would end up consolidating what is sort of already protected, these inholdings up here, and which would tend to make -- it would be difficult for Old Harbor to use those given the lands around it. It would allow them to concentrate their holdings on Sitkalidak where they hope to develop eco-tourism and other sort of business opportunities. As the State, it then allows them to sort of consolidate their protected -- all the protected status, so.....

MR. SWIDERSKI: My understanding is that what Old Harbor desires to do is develop an eco-tourism business and that Sitkalidak Island would be the center of -- the focus of that business, and by establishing substantially a monopoly of ownership of the island they hope to be more successfully able to do that. The State owns these back lands and the map probably show it as clearly as it would if you were actually on the land, but Old Harbor when selected these lands, selected the interior

of the bays which are really the points where you can get 1 access to these adjacent uplands. And proceeding with the 3 exchange the State would acquire these lands, which provide places for, you know, boats to moor and anchor and people to go ashore, airplanes to land and really with the one 5 6 exception because it's Claudia [sic] Bay or something like 7 that that it seems to really give that kind of access to these State uplands today. 8

2

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any further questions? (No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: I believe we're ready for a motion and then also the proper wording for a motion. Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Madam Chairman, I would move that \$41,000 be provided to the Alaska Department of Natural Resources to be used to equalize the values of the lands on Sitkalidak Island to be conveyed by the State of Alaska to Old Harbor Native Corporation. The lands in Kiliuda Bay to be conveyed to the State.

> MR. RUE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We have a motion and a Is there discussion? second.

(No audible response)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Is this the first of this sort of action where we're unable find funds in any

1 other place on an exchange we -- through funds that the 2 exchange make it happen? 3 MS. McCAMMON: We haven't done an exchange. I think the only other thing that's a little bit similar to 4 it is that with the Kenai Native Association there was a 5 land agreement that was approved by Congress and the 6 Trustee Council contributed a certain amount of funds to it, but it wasn't all of the money that was needed for it, 8 9 so there was that -- that's the only thing similar, although the funds were quite a bit more substantial, it 10 was in the millions as opposed to 41,000, but..... 11 12 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. MS. LISOWSKI: We did a land exchange as 13 part of the Eyak transaction, but there wasn't a specific 14 15 dollar amount associated strictly with the exchange. MS. McCAMMON: There have been some small 16 17 land exchanges as part of the larger parcel deals, correct. 18 To consolidate some of the land ownership primarily. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Any other discussion? 19 20 (No audible response) 21 CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: All those in favor signify by saying aye. 22 23 IN UNISON: Aye. CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Anyone opposed? 24

(No audible response)

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Hearing no opposition, the Trustee Council will provide the \$41,000 so that the State can exchange land.

MS. McCAMMON: We need about a two-minute break to get ready for Bob Spies deal.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Okay. We'll take a two-minute break. Stand at ease.

(Off record - 2:30 p.m.)

(On record - 2:34 p.m.)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Let's bring the meeting back to order. We are at the end of our adopted agenda, but under other business as may come before the Council, I would ask our Executive Director to make a presentation.

MS. McCAMMON: Thank you, Madam Chair. As most of you know, with our program we are in a big transition time right now. We've been really focused for the last 12-13 years on oil spill restoration and that continues to be a major focus, but we are also transitioning into the GEM Program, which is, to a large degree, a real legacy of the Oil Spill Program, it will be looking at the entire ecosystem of the spill-affected region. All of the species within that region and all of the health of the northern Gulf of Alaska.

But as part of that transition there's a little in the changing of the duties and responsibilities of one of the key players in the Restoration Program.

Fortunately this person is not leaving, it's just a little bit of a change so that he can spend more time relaxing and building his new estate on the California coast.

DR. SPIES: Well right now it's a 6x11 shed.

MS. McCAMMON: Right now it's a 6x11 shed, that's the estate. Yeah, he's dealing with permitters and NEPA there.

But I think it's really appropriate that this is Bob's last meeting in person before the Trustee Council with the official title of Chief Scientist. He will continue to -- fortunately for all of us, continue to work and give his expertise to the Trustee Council as Chair of the Lingering Oil Effects Subcommittee and that, I think, we're really grateful that he's going to be serving in that capacity.

But I don't think when you look at recovery of the spill-affected region -- I think a lot of that recovery -- I mean you can't say it's really due to a person, it definitely is Mother Nature, but certainly Bob's contribution has been enormous. I don't think I've met someone who has looked at all sides of an issue with such balance, with such integrity, who has always been willing to provide information to do what needed to be done,

whether it was on a weekend or a holiday or extra hours or jump on a plane to come up here. This is somebody who has really devoted the majority of his professional -- kind of the peak of his professional career to restoration of the oil spill area. It has not been an easy task. He's been shot at by both side, whether it be Exxon on one side or environmental groups on the other side. And throughout it all I think Bob has just been remarkable for maintaining his integrity and just keeping true to his belief in terms of what the science it telling him and what he, as Chief Scientist to all of you, has told you.

And so that's my speech. So thank you,
Bob. I couldn't have done any of this without you, so I
really appreciate everything you have done.

(Applause)

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And we have other comments from other Council members. Mr. Rue.

MR. RUE: I guess I didn't come with a prepared speech, I never do, and I can't top Molly. I've been here for, what, almost eight years now and then earlier than that with the Habitat Division when the first started getting going. And I know certainly in my time here Bob has always been a critical part of the decision-making process and I think we have truly relied on -- the Council has truly relied on your expertise, and wouldn't

have a lot of the good things it's done without your advice, and it's always been good advice. We haven't always followed it, but it's always been good advice.

(Laughter)

MR. RUE: No, actually we have most of the time followed it, but it has been good advice, it's been really important to the folks sitting at this table to have you available and have you do the work you've done. So thanks for a lot of good support. Haven't said enough, I'm sure, over the years.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Further comments? Mr. Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Yeah. Bob has been with us a long time, and I've been here since the first days of the spill in the litigation mode and Bob was here. As I recall your first contract was with the Department of Law, with a contractor to the Department of Law on the spill, sort of as our legal Chief Scientist, and then he evolved into the restoration Chief Scientist as some of us sort of went from litigation to restoration. He's done so very gracefully and properly. During the time here, which has been, I guess, basically since '89, he has provided good advice, he's brought credibility, I think, to the program. When we have been under attack from Outside he has brought a willingness, which has been very important, to say no to

people in the greatest extent possible, suppress politics in the budget process. Some people will remember that there was a problem at one time with sort of the horse trading in the budget and I think, to a large extent, that's been eliminated because of people like Molly and Jim Ayres, but also primarily because of people like Bob Spies or primarily Bob Spies being to willing to say, no, this is my recommendation and here's what it is.

I have been particularly pleased with the way that during these meetings when things have gotten tense or testy, he's never responded in a tense or testy manner, but rather has come back calmly and logically pointing out the errors of my logic and has done so very well. And it's also been interesting to watch him become an Alaskan, almost at times. I don't know if he gets a PFD, but he's been seen walking around with a set of crampons and an ice ax, so he must have learned something while he was up here. So, Bob, it really has been a long time, but it has been a great time and appreciate all you've done.

DR. SPIES: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Other comments.

Commissioner Brown.

MS. BROWN: I'll just be brief since it's all be said better, just thank you, just even personally

because, you know, for those of us who are not well steeped in science, but who need to rely on balanced, steady, constant, thoughtful analysis, you've been our beacon. And we could rely on you, we knew it was always based on sound logic and that is credible and valuable in the job we have to do and we couldn't have done it without you, so thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Jim.

MR. BALSIGER: Well, with certain exceptions, I'm one of the newer people here and so just for a couple of years.

(Laughter)

MR. BALSIGER: So I don't have the background of all you who tied everything together in the beginning, but it was useful from my perspective to come in to have everything and brought together from a good science, unbiased standpoint, starting this process. Not coming to the meeting spending hours and days going through the material, but you could do it hours rather than days, I guess, because of the way you packaged it, and I appreciated that, so thanks. I second what the other people have said as well.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Thank you. Any comment?

MS. LISOWSKI: Well, as the last Council

member here, I guess I should say on behalf of Dave Gibbons and myself we certainly have been involved in the oil spill for a very long time at the same time that you pretty much started and we appreciate all of your assistance, your objective and thoughtful review of the science and assistance to both Dave and I, so thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And I would just say that on behalf of the Department of the Interior and both the present Secretary, but I'm also sure the previous Secretaries, would thank you for your service. I found that since that awful morning in 1989 that so many of us who were there in differing capacity at the very beginning have continued to find ourselves associated with the ongoing work of the Exxon Valdez restoration over the years, and many and differing ways it's brought people together and it will just keep weaving in and out of each other's lives. So I'm sure we will see you again, still working with the Exxon Valdez in just differing capacities and continuing on into, goodness knows how far, but it is something that in some bizarre ways has brought a lot of Alaskans and even non-Alaskans together as Alaskans.

Mr. Rue.

MR. RUE: Madam Chair, I think that's a very good point. And you should feel proud that you built something positive out of a very negative experience.

1	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: That's true.
2	MR. RUE: I mean I still feel the emotions
3	of that time in '89 and to have something positive, like a
4	research legacy, information coming out of that, that's a
5	very good point and you should feel proud that we've built
6	something good out of a pretty awful situation.
7	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And if you wouldn't
8	mind coming forward, we have something to give you.
9	MS. McCAMMON: Two things.
10	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: We got a certificate of
11	appreciation, signed the present members of the Trustee
12	Council.
13	DR. SPIES: Oh, fantastic. All right.
14	MS. McCAMMON: We have the original
15	poster
16	DR. SPIES: The original
17	MS. McCAMMON:which will have framed
18	down there, we didn't want to frame it up here since it's
19	been
20	DR. SPIES: Everybody signed it.
21	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: So we'll get that to
22	you.
23	MR. RUE: Theresa didn't.
24	(Laughter)
25	MR. RUE: Sorry.

DR. SPIES: Now that's a healthy ecosystem.
(Laughter)

MS. McCAMMON: Those killer whales. And then as a reminder of Prince William Sound, the Harleys.....

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. SPIES: The harlequin ducks.

MS. McCAMMON: ....the hadu's, yes.

DR. SPIES: That's a nice print.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Over the fireplace.

DR. SPIES: Well, thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Thank you.

It's -- I guess I should say a DR. SPIES: word or two. It's been about a third of my career, actually. When I got the phone call in '89, I didn't really expect to here, you know, 13 years later, still doing things in connection with the spill. But things evolved and I thought, well, it's going to be a month or two or maybe a year or two involved and I was helping the State out with some advice on oil pollution. This has occupied my career through the middle part, but it's been more than kind of a scientific odyssey, it's been kind of an odyssey where, I think Frank talked about it, where we took something that was kind of chaotic and was a tragic event and we actually helped a lot of people shape it into something that's pretty positive.

1	You know, given through Molly's leadership
2	and the Council and the mission of Jim Ayres and also the
3	foresightedness of various Councils, including your own,
4	that kind of took this and built this into a program that
5	really has some integrity, I think, particularly with the
6	GEM Program, which has really been a strong component for
7	quite a few years. That is really going to be a legacy for
8	the future you can all be proud of. I feel privileged to
9	be a part of this process and I'm privileged to be part of
10	the Alaskan family up here in natural resources and I hope
11	I'm around for at least a few more years to participate in
12	this some more.
13	So thank you very much.
14	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Thank you.
15	(Applause)
16	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: Do we have anything
17	else to come before the Council?
18	(No audible response)
19	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE: And our next meeting is
20	a teleconference meeting on August
21	MS. McCAMMON: 6th.
22	CHAIRWOMAN PEARCE:6th, which is a
23	Tuesday, correct?

MR. BALSIGER: 2:00 o'clock p.m.

MS. McCAMMON:

Yeah.

24

25

## CERTIFICATE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2 ss. 3 STATE OF ALASKA I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for 4 the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify: 5 6 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 4 through 85 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council's Meeting recorded 7 electronically by Salena A. Hile on the 9th day of July 2002, commencing at the hour of 10:45 a.m. and thereafter 8 transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability. 9 THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the 10 request of: EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL, 451 W. 5th 11 Avenue, Suite 500, Anchorage, Alaska 99501; 12 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 18th day of July 13 2002. 14 15 CERTAFAED TO BY: SIGNED AND, 16 Kolasinski 17 tary Public in and for Alaska 18 Commission Expires: 04/17/04 19 20 21 22

23

24

25