

# EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Public Meeting  
Monday, November 10, 2003  
10:00 o'clock a.m.

EVOS Office  
441 West 5th Avenue, Suite 500  
Anchorage, Alaska

## TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

STATE OF ALASKA -  
DEPARTMENT OF LAW:  
(Chairman)

MR. GREGG RENKES  
Attorney General  
State of Alaska

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
National Marine Fisheries Svc:

MR. JAMES W. BALSIGER  
Administrator, AK Region

STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT  
OF FISH AND GAME:

MR. KEVIN DUFFY  
Commissioner

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
U.S. FOREST SERVICE

MR. JOE MEADE  
Forest Supervisor  
Forest Service AK Region

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR:

MS. DRUE PEARCE  
Senior Advisor to the  
Secretary for Alaskan  
Affairs,  
U.S. Department of Interior

STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT  
OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION:

MS. ERNESTA BALLARD  
Commissioner

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

1	TRUSTEE COUNCIL STAFF PRESENT:	
2	MS. GAIL PHILLIPS	Executive Director
3	DR. PHIL MUNDY	Science Director
4	MS. CHERRI WOMAC	Administrative Assistant
5	MS. PAULA BANKS	Administrative Assistant
6	MS. BRENDA HALL	Administrative Assistant
7	MR. ROD BOCHENEK	Data Systems Manager
8	MR. MIKE SCHLIE	Data Systems Assistant
9	MR. PETER HAGEN	NOAA
10	MR. CRAIG O'CONNOR	NOAA
11	MR. CRAIG TILLERY	State of Alaska Department of Law
12	MR. DOUG MUTTER	Department of Interior
13	MR. MICHAEL BAFFREY	Department of Interior
14	MS. CAROL FRIES	AKDNR
15	MS. MARIA LISOWSKI	General Council's Office Department of Agriculture
16		
17	MR. KEN HOLBROOK	U.S. Forest Service
18	MR. STEVE ZEMKE	U.S. Forest Service
19	MS. GINA BELT	Department of Justice
20	MS. DEDE BOHN	U.S. Geological Service
21	MR. DAVE IRONS	U.S. Geological Service
22	MS. MARIANNE SEE	AK Department Fish & Game
23	MR. RON KLEIN	AK Department Environmental Conservation
24		
25		

1	<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	
2	Call to Order	04
3	Approval of Agenda	07
4	Approval of Meeting Notes (September 3, 2003)	07
5	<u>PUBLIC COMMENT</u>	
6	John Gerster	11
	Stacy Studebaker	12
7	Tom Royer	15
	John Devons	18
8	Ken Adams	20
	Patty Brown-Schwalenberg	23
9	Gary Kompkoff	28
	David Bank	31
10	Larry Evanoff	32
	Robert Heinrichs	32
11	John Boon	35
	Pat Norman	36
12	Walter Parker	47
13	Executive Director's Report	49
14	Introduction of Proposed FY2004 Work Plan	67
15	Discussion of State Trustee Offered Work Plan	130
16	Approval of FY2004 Work Plan	302
17	MOA with Alaska Marine Highway System, DOT and Council	303
18	Approve a Report on Organizations, Their Funding and Scientific Work Entailed	305
19	Adjournment	308
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

2

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12

13  
14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 (No audible response)

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: If not, then I'm going to  
3 move to the approval of the agenda for the previous  
4 meeting. Are there any comments on approving the agenda  
5 from any of the Trustees?

6 MR. DUFFY: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. This  
7 is Kevin Duffy from Fish and Game. Did you mean amendments  
8 to the agenda for this meeting?

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, on the first issue,  
10 is -- yeah, approval of the minutes from the -- oh, the  
11 agenda for this meeting, yeah. I thought we were on the  
12 notes for the previous meeting. Sorry. You're right. Are  
13 there any comments about today's agenda?

14 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in  
15 a little discussion, and then deciding where to place it in  
16 the agenda. As a number of people know, the State has  
17 somewhat of a different perspective than the proposed Work  
18 Plan in front of the Trustee Council for consideration, and  
19 I'm trying to figure out where we would fit that discussion  
20 into this agenda. It could come under the -- in relation  
21 to the introduction of the proposed FY 04 Work Plan from  
22 Dr. Phil Mundy. We could incorporate it into that  
23 discussion there. It might be the appropriate place to do  
24 it, but I'd like to hear from other Council members how  
25 they think we ought to proceed.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: That seems like an  
2 appropriate place to me or, number 5, discussion and  
3 approval of the FY 2004 Work Plan, where I would assume  
4 Trustees would have an opportunity to submit additions or  
5 amendments or substitutions to the Work Plan. Any other  
6 comments?

7                   MR. MEADE: My only comments, Mr. Chair, is  
8 I've not had adequate opportunity to review any proposal  
9 and so if, in the discourse, there could be a pretty  
10 thorough expression of that done, with the lack of any  
11 prereading information. I attended a staff forum here  
12 about a month ago to be fully briefed on the contents  
13 within what has been put forward as the Executive  
14 Director's recommendations, and if this is a subset of that  
15 if we can just help articulate that as we go through in  
16 discussion that would be most helpful for me.

17                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: I think we can identify  
18 those item by item at the time. I don't think we need to  
19 change the agenda. I think that the items four and five  
20 we'll just anticipate receiving modifications to the staff  
21 Work Plan at that time.

22                  MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman.....

23                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh.

24                  MR. DUFFY: .....I would move to approve  
25 the agenda, subject to the discussion we just had.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: All in favor, say aye. I  
2 don't think we need a recorded vote on this.

3                   IN UNISON: Aye.

4                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. The agenda is  
5 approved. Now, we can move to the approval of the previous  
6 meeting's notes, which is where I started out, and any  
7 comments on the notes from the previous meeting?

8                   MS. BALLARD If they need to be approved, I  
9 move approval.

10                  MR. DUFFY: Second.

11                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any objection?

12                  (No audible response)

13                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: No objection being heard,  
14 the meeting notes from the September 3rd, 2003, meeting are  
15 approved. And now, we'll move on to the second agenda  
16 item, which is public comment. We're going to keep public  
17 comments to five minutes and we're going to strictly  
18 enforce that because we've got a lot to do today and we're  
19 hopeful that we can complete our work by 4:00 this  
20 afternoon and we've even included a working lunch. So  
21 recognizing the commitment of time ahead of us, we'll keep  
22 the public comments limited. Is there anyone on-line,  
23 first, that would like to make a public comment?

24                  MR. DORMAN: Yes.

25                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Please identify yourself.

1 MR. DORMAN: I'm Craig Dorman, vice-  
2 president for research for the University of Alaska's  
3 statewide system.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Please proceed.

5 MR. DORMAN: Last Thursday, I visited your  
6 Executive and Science Directors to discuss the impact on UA  
7 researchers of the delay in implementation of the Fiscal  
8 Year '04 Work Plan. I also sent you a letter as Chair of  
9 the Government's Committee of the Alaska Ocean Observing  
10 System, which is our State's component of the national  
11 Integrated Ocean Observing System initiative. I won't  
12 reiterate today either of these communications, but I do  
13 urge you to address the concerns expressed in them in your  
14 deliberations, and I would appreciate a response. Plus,  
15 another important issue, and that's the responsibilities  
16 associated with the sponsorship of research. I speak as a  
17 public citizen. That is, one with decades of experience  
18 managing and overseeing many hundreds of millions of  
19 dollars in Federal research, as well as the institutions  
20 and their scientists that support such programs.

21 The first point is that your Fiscal Year  
22 '04 Work Plan, while it is still draft, was completed and  
23 the results have been promulgated in such a way as to  
24 require commitment to you by the performers you have  
25 selected -- any of them that were in the second year of

1 their performance. By virtue of their commitment to you,  
2 they've lost the opportunity to offer their services to  
3 other worthy sponsors. Significant changes at this point  
4 deprive not only those performers of the funds needed to  
5 support themselves, their staff, their students and their  
6 institutions but, also, the State and the nation of their  
7 services in other programs to which they could have  
8 applied. That's why your Fiscal Year 04 commitments may  
9 not be legal. You do have an obligation to consider the  
10 impact of change on others. If you do decide to change  
11 your plans, I urge you to make a public statement about  
12 your policy on your obligations as a sponsor. One reason  
13 for doing this, for your own sake, is that if you are  
14 perceived as arbitrary or dealing in bad faith you risk  
15 losing the willingness of the best researchers -- those  
16 with opportunities elsewhere -- to undertake your tasks.  
17 The best researchers work only for credible, trustworthy  
18 sponsors. It's a two-way street. You can always find  
19 someone to do your work; but, in the vernacular, you'll be  
20 bottomfeeders.

21                   Second, your Work Plan has been carefully  
22 developed over several years with external peer review and  
23 national academy guidance. Since your research has such  
24 fundamental important legal, financial, and ecological  
25 implications, any significant change to that plan as you

1     apparently have intent to discuss -- no matter how worthy  
2     you personally believe it to be -- should be subjected to  
3     an equally rigorous external peer review.  Neither  
4     individually nor as a group does your Council have adequate  
5     breadth and depth of scientific expertise to be able to  
6     afford the luxury of less than the best possible advice  
7     from the practicing scientific community.  And since you  
8     work by consensus, it states in any Work Plan which you do  
9     approve of the scientific credibility and integrity not  
10    only of yourselves but the organizations you represent,  
11    including the Departments of Interior, Commerce and  
12    Agriculture.  You may, of course, choose to take a totally  
13    different course of action than previously planned for  
14    purely political, financial or litigatory [sic] reasons.  
15    But then, I'd urge you to be clear on your rationale for  
16    that decision since it will have ramifications for  
17    precisely those same purposes.  However, if you propose to  
18    base a change on scientific or regulatory arguments then I  
19    would urge you to obtain, before approval of any work,  
20    external review that is at least on a par with that which  
21    has led to the current plan.

22                   Finally, if you accept any of my arguments  
23    as valid, then I would urge you to seriously consider  
24    implementing the Fiscal Year 04 Work Plan with the  
25    performers alerted to a strict limitation of your

1 obligation to this year while you discuss and then validate  
2 any major changes. And if you missed any of this, I would  
3 be happy to fax you a copy.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you very much, and  
5 you stayed right within the five minutes, so I appreciate  
6 that. Anyone else on-line that would like to make a public  
7 comment?

8 MR. GERSTER: Yes. This is John Gerster.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, John, go ahead.

10 MR. GERSTER: I'm on the Public Advisory  
11 Committee, and I'd just like to state that I know Brett  
12 Huber will be giving our official Public Advisory Committee  
13 report later. But I wanted to state as an individual I was  
14 very impressed with how the Public Advisory Committee  
15 worked together and worked over the GEM project and the  
16 Fiscal 2004 Work Plan and I'd like to state that it was my  
17 sense that the Public Advisory Committee was very, very  
18 supportive of the Fiscal '04 Work Plan and I would hope  
19 that you would not alter this and that you would continue  
20 to support the GEM program. Thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Anyone else  
22 on-line that would like to make.....

23 MS. STUDEBAKER: Yes. This is Stacy  
24 Studebaker from Kodiak.....

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

1 MS. STUDEBAKER: .....and thank you for the  
2 opportunity to speak today. I'll be speaking primarily  
3 about habitat protection since other members of the Public  
4 Advisory Committee and Brett will be addressing other  
5 issues today through correspondence and, hopefully, here in  
6 person. I've been a member of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill  
7 Trustee Council Public Advisory Group for the last eight  
8 years representing recreational users. It has been a honor  
9 and a privilege to serve my community of Kodiak and the  
10 interests of my constituency.

11 When the public was surveyed in the early  
12 90's following the settlement by far the majority favored  
13 spending the money on three things, in the following order  
14 of priority: restoration of the affected area and species;  
15 permanent habitat protection of some lands affected by the  
16 oil spill to permanently protect their natural resources;  
17 and scientific research to study the effects of the oil on  
18 the injured species and ecosystem in the spill area. That  
19 was the clear mandate of the public and one which I  
20 sincerely hope you will honor as we move into the future.  
21 But I noticed in the EVOS Work Plan for 2004 that zero  
22 funds have been allocated for the habitat protection  
23 program, and at a Trustee Council meeting this summer there  
24 was a vote to abolish the program that, fortunately,  
25 failed. Both of these decisions were made without any



1 prior notice to the general public or debate among the  
2 members of the Public Advisory Committee.

3           It seems to me that if you anticipate this  
4 great of a change in the established policy of the  
5 allocation of EVOS funds that the public or, at least, the  
6 Public Advisory Committee should be notified and have time  
7 to discuss it and decide if that change is in the best  
8 interests of the public and the resources we are charged to  
9 be stewards of. The habitat protection program was  
10 implemented to acquire through purchase private lands  
11 affected by the oil spill. Many of these choice parcels  
12 are now public lands and managed for habitat protection of  
13 natural resources for the use and enjoyment of all  
14 Alaskans, tourists, and future generations. This has been  
15 an enormously popular program, especially the small parcel  
16 acquisition program, which uses funds each year to buy  
17 parcels of land less than a thousand acres in the oil spill  
18 area that are of particular recreational and ecological  
19 importance to coastal communities, thereby benefiting  
20 hundreds of local Alaskans.

21           Two small parcels on Kodiak Island that  
22 were affected by the oil spill and nominated for the small  
23 parcel acquisition program in 1995 have high recreational  
24 and resource value to the people of Kodiak because they are  
25 accessible from our limited road system. These two parcels

1 are Termination Point and Long Island. The former Trustees  
2 and EVOS staff evaluated these lands, ranked them at the  
3 top of the list and promised Kodiak that they would  
4 purchase them. Unfortunately, the owner of both parcels,  
5 Lesnoi Native Corporation, has been involved in an ongoing  
6 litigation with rancher, Omar Stratman, and the title  
7 hasn't been clear to make a purchase. Someday, I hope, the  
8 title will be clear for Termination Point and Long Island,  
9 and I hope you will honor the wish of the former Trustees  
10 and the people of Kodiak to purchase these recreational  
11 lands that are so important to our community.

12 As you know, the former Trustees have  
13 purchased many important lands in the Kodiak archipelago  
14 over the last 10 years that are crucial for the permanent  
15 protection of old growth Sitka spruce habitat that is home  
16 to brown bear, elk, salmon and many bird species affected  
17 by the oil spill. Through years of coordinated  
18 negotiations with local government, resource agencies,  
19 native corporations, local, state, and national  
20 conservation groups, the EVOS Trustee Council has been  
21 working to protect prime habitat on North Afognak Island.  
22 We thank the former Trustees deeply for the work that they  
23 have done and encourage the new Trustees to honor their  
24 predecessors by convincing the Governor to reverse his  
25 decision to block the sale of the North Afognak land. His

1 unanticipated decision was a terrible blow to our  
2 community, who backed the sale a hundred percent. It was  
3 the farsighted decision of the various Kodiak native  
4 corporations who own the land to sell it and develop it in  
5 this way, thereby protecting the resources for future  
6 generations of hunters, fishermen, subsistence users,  
7 tourists, bears, elk, eagles, and marbled murrelets.  
8 Thanks again, and I urge you to openly discuss with the  
9 Public Advisory Committee and inform the general public of  
10 any plans you may have for changing the allocation of EVOS  
11 funds.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Is there  
13 anyone else on-line that would like to make a public  
14 comment?

15 DR. ROYER: Yes. This is Tom Royer.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, Tom, go ahead.

17 DR. ROYER: Yeah, I'd like to present some  
18 comments on a longtime series and how EVOS sponsored GEM  
19 science programs will fit in with other science plans in  
20 the North Pacific. I'm Professor Emeritus at the  
21 University of Alaska in Fairbanks and, presently, a  
22 professor of oceanography at Old Dominion University. I'm  
23 continuing to carry out oceanographic fieldwork in the Gulf  
24 of Alaska and presently supported under US GLOBEC.

25 Historically, in December 1970 I began

1 sampling near Seward that has developed into the Gulf of  
2 Alaska Station One Hydrographic Time Series, now known as  
3 GAK1. I also served on the National Research Council  
4 committee that reviewed the GEM Science Plan. I presently  
5 serve on the EVOS Science and Technical Advisory Committee,  
6 the Science and Technical Committee of the Oil Spill  
7 Recovery Institute and the science panel of the North  
8 Pacific Research Board. In addition, I'm the Chairman of  
9 the new National Research Council committee on the review  
10 of the western Alaska salmon and the restoration plan for  
11 that salmon.

12 First, with regard to longtime series, no  
13 matter much how money is offered yesterday's data cannot be  
14 bought unless those observations were made. They remain  
15 forever lost. We cannot separate human induced effects  
16 from natural variability without making observations prior  
17 to, during, and after an oil spill or similar event. Data  
18 gathered as the pipeline was completed and since then is  
19 priceless, yet those data are not all that expensive to  
20 obtain in a systematic manner. The GAK1 time series has  
21 allowed us to identify seasonal changes in the ocean  
22 conditions in the northern Gulf of Alaska and responses to  
23 the insofar seen and long-term changes in the marine  
24 environment over the last 33 years.

25 It appears that the Gulf of Alaska is

1 warming, with the upper layers becoming fresher and the  
2 lower layers becoming saltier. The average temperature  
3 gain in the upper 250 meters, or 800 feet, is about one and  
4 three-quarters degrees. Measurements and linkages with  
5 biology and fisheries need to be investigated. I want to  
6 emphasize that ocean observations are rare. There are only  
7 two long-term water column hydrographic time series in the  
8 northeast Pacific. That's Ocean Station P and the GAK1  
9 Station.

10                   It is necessary and cost effective to use  
11 platforms such as volunteer observing ships, ferries,  
12 research vessels and moorings to make such measurements.  
13 An oceanographic observation network such as that enjoyed  
14 by the meteorological community does not exist. There are  
15 several programs that support oceanographic research  
16 programs in the EVOS GEM region. OSRI is focusing on the  
17 Prince William Sound atmospheric and oceanographic  
18 observations and modeling. That program does not have a  
19 longtime series and depends on the GAK1 data to place their  
20 observations in proper context. The NTRB is still  
21 developing their science plan in concert with the National  
22 Research Council, but I assume that they will focus on  
23 those portions of the ocean that are not in the GEM region  
24 and design a program that complements the GEM Science Plan.  
25 The AYK Salmon Science Plan will focus on the Bering Sea,

1 but it could depend on the upstream GEM coastal  
2 observations for its analyses. The U.S. GLOBEC Northeast  
3 Pacific Program sponsored by the National Science  
4 Foundation and NOAA enters its last field year and will  
5 enter into the analysis phase in 2005. Finally, the U.S.  
6 component of the Global Ocean Observing System, of which  
7 Alaska Ocean Observing System is a part, will promote  
8 coastal observations. What I want to emphasize is the  
9 coordination between all of these programs is essential,  
10 and the GEM program serves as a leader in these efforts.

11 In summary, the GEM science program has  
12 been carefully developed with input from the National  
13 Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council. GEM  
14 is in a position of leadership with its support of long-  
15 term observations that are vital to all the upcoming  
16 science studies. A coordinated interdependence of these  
17 programs with the GEM program is critical to the success of  
18 them all. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you, Dr. Royer. I  
20 just want to remind all the folks on-line that if they  
21 speak or speak in the background that they can be heard at  
22 the meeting. Anyone else on-line that would like to make a  
23 public comment?

24 MR. DEVONS: Yes. This is John Devons.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, John, go ahead.

1 MR. DEVONS: Yeah. I'll keep it short.  
2 I'm John Devons, the Executive Director of the Prince  
3 William Sound Regional Citizens Advisory Council and a  
4 member of the EVOS Public Advisory Committee. I want to  
5 thank EVOS and the GEM program for their past funding of  
6 our long-term environmental monitoring project. Although  
7 we didn't get funded this year, I want to state that it is  
8 very important that we use these funds to (indiscernible -  
9 phone beep) funds, and I think GEM has done a good job in  
10 this regard.

11 I only recently learned of the possibility  
12 that the plan could be changed, and it is very difficult to  
13 comment on a plan or a change that one knows nothing about,  
14 other than by rumor. It is worrisome, though, if the plan,  
15 which has been done along scientific guidelines, is changed  
16 without having the public input. You have a Public  
17 Advisory Committee that has worked on and made  
18 recommendations, and I think it would be a grievous mistake  
19 to alter the plan without allowing your policy advisory  
20 committee an opportunity to respond to this, and I  
21 appreciate you giving me an opportunity speak. And, of  
22 course, being the Regional Citizens Advisory Committee,  
23 we're very interested in seeing that the public has input  
24 into the expenditure of funds.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Thank you. Anyone

1 else on-line that would like to make a comment?

2 MR. ADAMS: Yes. This is Ken Adams in  
3 Cordova. I'd like to offer some comments this morning.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Go ahead.

5 MR. ADAMS: Ken Adams. I'm a fisherman in  
6 Prince William Sound -- longtime fisherman. I have a  
7 background in marine science, and I and my partner are  
8 coordinators of an EVOS supported project entitled  
9 Fisheries Management Application. I would like to offer a  
10 few comments, first, from a regional perspective, and then  
11 I'd like to conclude with a general statement and I hope  
12 that some of these comments might be helpful, especially to  
13 some of the new EVOS Trustee Council members.

14 There can be no doubt that Prince William  
15 Sound was the most thoroughly and hardest impacted by the  
16 EVOS event in 1989. It took several years, but in '92 and  
17 '93 we had wholesale pink salmon return failures. Also, in  
18 '93 we had a herring resource population failure, and that  
19 herring resource has not yet recovered. As a consequence  
20 of these return failures, beginning in the fall of '93  
21 there was a major planning effort to produce an ecosystem  
22 investigation. That program was entitled the Sound  
23 Ecosystem Assessment or SEA, or S-E-A, call it as you will.  
24 That program was funded by the Trustee Council from '94 to  
25 '99. It was deemed the flagship of the Trustee Council



1 research effort and had been intensively peer reviewed and  
2 given a thumbs up. The National Research Council was one  
3 of those bodies that intensively -- pardon me, I'm getting  
4 a little bit off the track here.

5 In any case, we in the resource dependent  
6 community are appreciative of some of the results of the  
7 SEA. One was to help with a fundamental understanding of  
8 the Prince William Sound ecosystem, especially a  
9 determination of the factors that were involved in or  
10 influenced the survival of juvenile pink salmon and  
11 herring. However, there were additional goals of the SEA  
12 program which were not achieved, and outstanding among  
13 these is the goal dealing with utilization of this new  
14 information to more accurately predict the fisheries'  
15 production in Prince William Sound. This was not achieved,  
16 nor was the goal to establish an ecosystem database for the  
17 Sound for improved management, enhancement and restoration  
18 activities. Our EVOS supported project -- Fisheries and  
19 Management Application -- revisits the SEA and seeks to  
20 correct this lack of achievement for these additional goals  
21 which have been overlooked.

22 There can be no doubt that in this state --  
23 probably for the last 10 years, anyway -- that salmon  
24 fisheries are in a major turmoil. Granted, there has been  
25 great impacts from farmed salmon production, but abundance

1 of wild fish still remains problematic. There can be  
2 variation by area or within an area the same species over  
3 time. What I'm alluding to is accurately forecasting  
4 salmon returns. It's a very difficult process, and it is  
5 one that verges on being on a melding between an art form  
6 and witchcraft.

7 We in Prince William Sound, I think, are in  
8 a pretty enviable position. We have insights in how the  
9 ecosystem functions. We also have the need for utilization  
10 of these insights to aid improved forecasting. A good case  
11 in point, this past summer we experienced in Prince William  
12 Sound an amazing strength of pink salmon return. It came  
13 in approximately twice what the preseason midpoint forecast  
14 number was. We see that the developing GEM program is a  
15 means for helping us in the resource dependent communities  
16 to resolve some of our ecosystem related problems, and we  
17 specifically request your support for application of  
18 scientific research results for the resource dependent  
19 communities, particularly improving salmon return accuracy.  
20 We see that GEM is the vehicle that we can do this. Thank  
21 you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Anyone else  
23 on-line that wants to make a public comment?

24 (No audible response)

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Well, with that,

1 we've concluded the comments of those who have joined us  
2 over the phone line. Is there anyone here present at the  
3 meeting that would like to make a public comment? Please  
4 come on up to the microphone so that we can record your  
5 comment. Please introduce yourself.

6 MS. BROWN-SCHWALENBERG: Oh, thanks. Hi,  
7 my name is Patty Brown-Schwalenberg. I'm the Executive  
8 Director of the Chugach Regional Resources Commission, the  
9 natural resource intertribal organization that works with  
10 the seven tribes in Prince William Sound and lower Cook  
11 Inlet on natural resource and environmental issues. With  
12 me today, I have Gary Kompkoff, the Chief of Tatitlek;  
13 Patrick Norman, the Village Chief of Port Graham and, also,  
14 the Chairman of our Board; Robert Heinreichs, the President  
15 of the Native Village of Eyak; John Boon, from the Valdez  
16 Native Tribe; Larry Evanoff, the Village Chief of Chenega;  
17 and they will be addressing various issues regarding the FY  
18 04 Work Plan, which I will explain later.

19 What I would like to discuss with the  
20 Trustee Council at this time is the review process under  
21 the Work Plan, as well as some specific issues. The  
22 community involvement program, which -- it started out as a  
23 community involvement, which is now the tribal natural  
24 resource stewardship and tribal involvement in the GEM  
25 program -- started out in 1995, and it was an effort to try

1 to get the communities more involved in the restoration  
2 program which was currently being conducted by the Trustee  
3 Council. That continued on for a number of years. When  
4 the restoration program began winding down in '99 and 2000,  
5 GEM was gearing up, and so the funding was significantly  
6 reduced to the communities to be involved in the process.  
7 But we started focusing more on capacity building at the  
8 community level so that they could be involved in the GEM  
9 program, and so the program took a little bit of a shift  
10 into tribal natural resource capacity building.

11 The project that we submitted for funding,  
12 we were listed in the solicitation as a continuing project.  
13 So we were a little surprised that we were recommended for  
14 do not fund for FY 04. In addition, we received a call  
15 from the Department of Administration saying that they're  
16 holding back \$60,000 of the FY 03 funding until they get a  
17 final report. We've never received a letter saying this is  
18 the final year of the project and that they needed a final  
19 report. We're a small organization and we really can't  
20 afford to extend that kind of money out there and so I've  
21 sent an e-mail to Phil Mundy but haven't gotten a response.  
22 So I don't know what to do about that, but those kinds of  
23 issues are something that really needs to be resolved. I  
24 mean, if we're not a continuing project, we should get a  
25 letter stating such; and, if this is the final year of our

1 project, we should get a letter stating that and that a  
2 final report is due a certain time. The guy at the  
3 Department of Administration told me the report was due  
4 September 15th. Well, we didn't even know anything about  
5 it, so we're still -- you know, we feel that this should be  
6 a continuing effort, irregardless of the community  
7 involvement plan that we're working with the Center for  
8 Alaskan Coastal Studies on. I don't think that community  
9 involvement should stop while that report is being reviewed  
10 and put together, but there are some valid points in the  
11 report that I think need to be addressed once the report  
12 does get finalized.

13 In regards to the review process, looking  
14 over the STAC comments of all of the projects, it doesn't  
15 seem that they are consistent with each other. Some  
16 projects were praised for things in one proposal and not  
17 recognized in another proposal, or projects were  
18 recommended for funding whose PIs have not submitted annual  
19 reports for a number of years. I think that the review  
20 process should include people that are knowledgeable in  
21 traditional knowledge on the STAC Committee, and I think  
22 that the review process should be fair and equitable. And,  
23 one final comment, that the combination of -- I think the  
24 GEM program should be a combination of research and  
25 monitoring as well as restoration so that there's some

1 proposals that are funded that can do some on-the-ground  
2 work and provide some immediate information to the  
3 communities and to the State and Federal management  
4 agencies now. I think there needs to be a combination of  
5 more global and on-the-ground work.

6 In regards to community involvement, I  
7 think we need to establish a criteria for community  
8 involvement. Some of the proposals just merely state,  
9 well, we have community involvement in our proposal and  
10 we're going to go to these communities and we're going to  
11 do this, but there's no proof that that's been done. And  
12 we know that some of the PIs have just merely placed a call  
13 to the communities and said will you support this proposal  
14 and they said, well, send me something about it and they've  
15 never heard anything back and then they put it in their  
16 proposal that, okay, we've contacted these communities and  
17 they're supporting -- you know, they're going to be  
18 involved in this project. That's not what community  
19 involvement means, and merely stating isn't enough. I  
20 think something needs to be put in place to hold their feet  
21 to the fire that, if they're going to tout community  
22 involvement in their project, then they need to do just  
23 that.

24 And we need to design a structure that  
25 evaluates community involvement on its own merits and not

1 according to a system designed for scientific projects --  
2 the whole issue of qualitative versus quantitative  
3 analysis. I mean, how do you rate if someone was involved  
4 or not or if a community felt involved versus, you know,  
5 how many reports did they submit? You know, it's kind of a  
6 difficult situation, but I don't think it's fair to hold  
7 community involvement to the same standard as a scientific  
8 project when you really can't measure them in the same way.  
9 There's got to be some kind of a way developed to measure  
10 them on an equal basis, but that they have separate  
11 standards, I guess, and that's about the gist of my  
12 comments.

13 I'm hoping you got copies of the letters  
14 that I sent to the Trustee Council on September 3rd and  
15 October 16th or 17th, and that really outlines the majority  
16 of my comments that I really don't want to get into right  
17 now. But I hope that you've read those letters and will  
18 take them to heart when deciding on the Work Plan, because  
19 I think it's really important that we continue to be  
20 involved in the GEM program.

21 Gary Kompkoff is going to be talking about  
22 the tribal natural resource plans. Larry Evanoff will be  
23 talking about the Wisdom Keeper workshops and the proposed  
24 work that we are proposing to do in FY 04. John Boon Will  
25 focus on traditional knowledge and the value of

1 incorporating that into the science programs. Pat Norman  
2 will be discussing the WisdomKeeper workshop that was held  
3 in Port Graham as well as the review process and the tribal  
4 involvement in the GEM program project, and Bob will be  
5 talking about the importance of involving communities in  
6 the GEM program and the research that is conducted in and  
7 around the traditional use areas of the communities. So if  
8 you have any questions of anyone after that you can feel  
9 free to ask.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

11 MS. BROWN-SCHWALENBERG: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Hello.  
13 Introduce yourself -- and just ask you to keep your  
14 comments to five minutes.

15 MR. KOMPKOFF: Don't worry about going over  
16 five minutes. I'm Gary Kompkoff. I'm the Chief of  
17 Tatitlek. It's a position that I've held for almost 30  
18 years now, so I've been around long enough to see  
19 development before the oil spill and watch the history of  
20 the Trustee Council and the people that have been involved  
21 with it.

22 I guess I find it disturbing that after all  
23 these years I'm sitting here -- or the tribes of the  
24 Chugach region are sitting here once again defending  
25 community involvement and the importance of community



1 involvement. I would have hoped by now that we've been  
2 able to communicate the importance of traditional  
3 ecological knowledge and the way that it could work with  
4 western science to benefit everyone that's working on the  
5 effects of the oil spill. Everyone is aware of how much  
6 traditional knowledge exists in the Native communities, and  
7 I don't understand how you can expect that you can take  
8 advantage and benefit from that traditional knowledge  
9 without community involvement. I don't understand why  
10 there's a do not fund recommendation on the proposal for  
11 community involvement. I think we've made it clear over  
12 the years, and we've proven that traditional ecological  
13 knowledge is just as important as western science in many  
14 cases in a lot of these projects and programs that are  
15 going on, especially related to the GEM program.

16 The Village of Tatitlek is very early in  
17 developing its tribal natural resource management program.  
18 We just finished the Native Village of Tatitlek Tribal and  
19 Natural Resource Management Plan and it's a document that  
20 was written with only the tribe in mind and we did that  
21 intentionally. We didn't want to write a plan worrying  
22 about what everyone was going to think of the plan. We  
23 wrote it based on what our traditions are. We didn't  
24 involved State and Federal agencies, the Trustee Council or  
25 anyone else in developing this plan. We involved our

1 elders, we involved our subsistence hunters and fishers,  
2 and we used their knowledge and the generations of  
3 experience that we have in managing natural resources.  
4 That's what we used to develop this plan.

5 I think it is unfair for the Trustee  
6 Council to think that this plan is going to be complete  
7 only when it has the Trustee Council's approval. This is a  
8 tribal natural resource management plan. It can be used as  
9 a resource by the Trustee Council and its investigators  
10 when devising or developing programs under the GEM program.  
11 It was just really disturbing to read comments that say,  
12 you know, that it's not complete until it's approved. The  
13 tribal natural resource plan that we've developed and the  
14 plan that we have finally printed is probably never going  
15 to be complete. Every five years, every three years, it  
16 will be revised, and situations change. So it's a document  
17 that's going to be evolving, and we do hope that the  
18 Trustee Council and the scientists and researchers will use  
19 it as a guide, and we hope that as a region we can be  
20 involved in the GEM program. I think it would be  
21 beneficial to everyone. Not just the tribes or not just  
22 the Trustee Council, but everyone that uses the Gulf of  
23 Alaska, and those are my comments. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Do we have  
25 another presentation following?

1 MR. BANK: Hello. My name is David Bank,  
2 and I'm the Executive Director of the Nature Conservancy.  
3 A couple of years ago, the Nature Conservancy and the  
4 Conservation Fund entered into an agreement with the  
5 Trustee Council to acquire small parcels in the areas  
6 affected by the spill. Since that time, we have acquired  
7 three parcels totaling approximately \$200,000, primarily in  
8 the Anchor River area. These parcels are very important to  
9 the local community for hunting and fishing access, and  
10 they contribute to the local economy there. All of these  
11 parcels were identified by Fish and Game and DNR as  
12 important to the local community and to the resources  
13 affected by the spill.

14 We brought these parcels to the Trustee  
15 Council in December of 2002. I believe we've been on the  
16 agenda at least three other times, and I noticed today that  
17 we're no longer on the agenda. We're not offended by this,  
18 but at the same time we have significant costs associated  
19 with these properties. So far, we've accrued about \$7,000  
20 in interest expenses on the three parcels that we have  
21 acquired. I would urge the Council to quickly review these  
22 parcels to extend the grant for three years to allow us to  
23 continue to acquire small parcels under the terms of the  
24 agreement. All of these parcels will come before the  
25 Trustee Council and can be decided on as individual units.

1 So we believe we are working in cooperation with the  
2 Council and urge you to continue with this agreement.  
3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you, David.

5 MR. EVANOFF: Hello. My name is Larry  
6 Evanoff. I'm from Chenega Bay. One of the main objectives  
7 of a Chugach regional resources project is the continuation  
8 of the WisdomKeeper workshop series. We have learned  
9 through the past two workshops that there is interest in  
10 conducting research and monitoring in the Chenega Bay area.  
11 This workshop would provide an opportunity for our  
12 community to be more involved in the GEM program, and by  
13 not supporting this project this workshop will not happen.  
14 The Chenega Council has an operating environmental program  
15 and has two staff personnel in that project. We have staff  
16 available that can work and will work with the GEM  
17 researchers. I'm afraid that, you know, not supporting  
18 this program that the communities will look at the Trustees  
19 as not supportive of community involvement. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you.

21 MR. HEINREICH: Hi, I'm Bob Heinreichs.  
22 I'm President of the Native Village of Eyak. We're located  
23 in Cordova. We have 500 tribal members.

24 I'm a little concerned that this community  
25 involvement program is recommended not to be funded again

1 and one of the comments I had heard earlier that no  
2 proposals were coming out of it. Yet, our tribe turned in  
3 many, many proposals over the years and the only one we  
4 ever got funded, I believe, was the Elders/Youth  
5 Subsistence Conference and we asked for technical  
6 assistance and the only technical assistance we ever got  
7 was from, I think, Don Calloway from National Park Service.  
8 And we would turn them in every year, and people would say  
9 how come you keep turning those in? You know you're not  
10 going to get funded. And we kept turning them in, and then  
11 one day we said that's it. We've wasted enough time  
12 turning proposals in because we never get technical  
13 assistance and we never get funded.

14                   Unfortunately, what those proposals did was  
15 it ended up meeting with other outfits, and we were funded  
16 to do research on the Copper River on chinook research and  
17 lower river test fishery and we've run those projects for  
18 three years and they have been fabulously successful.  
19 We've run them cheaper and better than any government  
20 agency could do because that's our homeland. That's our  
21 country. We know how to get things done there. I've been  
22 on the Board of Directors of Chugach, Alaska, for 11 years,  
23 and I was drafted by my friends and relatives because the  
24 company had filed bankruptcy. We have turned it around,  
25 paid off our bankruptcy debt and we're on track to hit 500

1 million in revenues this year from government contracting  
2 and I've learned a lot and the whole thing is you have to  
3 be able to do it better and cheaper and, if you can do  
4 that, you can get more contracts.

5 Well, our tribe has taken that same  
6 attitude. We had a guy that was funded from somewhere that  
7 came up from Texas, flew into Cordova, and he was doing sea  
8 otter research there. He never talked to us one time. We  
9 never knew anything about it. We have our own sea otter  
10 plan in our tribe, and some years there is 10 or 15  
11 thousand sea otters in the bay there. But I was amazed  
12 that somebody from Texas would come up to do research on  
13 them and not even come and talk to us.

14 We really need to have the communities  
15 involved. Our tribe and the other tribes in the Sound and  
16 our region are the indigenous people of this area. Our  
17 traditional homeland that we've used for the past 10,000  
18 years is Prince William Sound, the Gulf of Alaska and the  
19 Copper River Delta. To not have us involved in these  
20 research projects that affect our lives is disrespect to  
21 us, and I'll leave you with one final comment. I was very  
22 pleased to see Governor Murkowski dig his heels in and say  
23 no more money for buying private lands and locking them up.  
24 Unfortunately, while I was really proud of him for saying  
25 that and doing it, it was like closing the barn door after

1 the horses were gone because there was hundreds of millions  
2 spent locking up private land. So that's all I got. You  
3 got any questions?

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any questions?

5 (No audible response)

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: No. Thank you very much.  
7 Appreciate the comments.

8 MR. BOON: Good morning. My name is John  
9 Boon. I'm the Vice-President of Valdez Native Tribe. I  
10 make a living off of subsistence living, which is seals and  
11 sea otters is what I specialize in. I've seen funding come  
12 and go with, like, the Harbor Seal Commission -- funding  
13 came and gone on that. Same with the Sea Otter Commission.  
14 And I still make a living off of seals and sea otters in  
15 the Sound and it's sort of disturbing to see when I'm  
16 running around most of the spring, winter and fall areas  
17 and I come across research groups that we don't even know  
18 that they are in the areas doing research and we don't have  
19 any local people on any of them. But, we're supposed to  
20 move aside for these people to go ahead and do their  
21 research, but at the same time our own traditional  
22 ecological knowledge is sitting on the beach having our  
23 funding cut all of the time and we're supposed to sit  
24 around and be grateful for this and it's really hard to sit  
25 here and face the Board who is supposed to be representing

1 the impacted areas. And, at the same time, we keep  
2 bringing in these projects that none of our communities  
3 even know about, and it is confusing to some. Like,  
4 myself, I'm the Vice President of our organization.  
5 They'll come to me and say, well, John, how come you don't  
6 know anything about this? You're part of the Subsistence  
7 Division. And we don't even catch wind about it until  
8 afterwards or we see them running around out there in the  
9 Sound.

10 I would like to see a lot more involvement  
11 from the communities. It's a tough one to face when I have  
12 to face the 450 people that I live with, and they ask me,  
13 well, how come we're not doing anything on this? And I'm  
14 here to ask you. That's all I have. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you.

16 MR. NORMAN: Hi, my name is Pat Norman.  
17 I'm from the Village of Port Graham. As Patty said, I  
18 serve as Chief for the village council there and, also,  
19 Chairman for the Chugach Regional Resources Commission  
20 which assists all the seven villages within the Chugach  
21 area in issues regarding natural resources.

22 One project that was funded by the Trustee  
23 Council was the WisdomKeeper workshop series in the region,  
24 which started out in Tatitlek, and the information and  
25 response we got from how that workshop there was



1 participated in by the science and the Trustee Council,  
2 along with the children in the schools from there was that  
3 it sparked high interest in my village for having the same  
4 thing where we gather our elders' knowledge along with  
5 questions that the young people have. And then, those my  
6 age that kind of have some information on how the elders --  
7 what they know about the past and what we know about  
8 current management of resources down there. But then, in  
9 talking with the elders and requesting that a workshop be  
10 held in Port Graham, we brought the elders together and  
11 asked them to tell us what resources in our bay were they  
12 interested in learning more about. And, over time, and  
13 then during the workshop, they told us directly they were  
14 interested in why some of our resources had gone downhill,  
15 let's say, from 1964 going forward and us waiting for them  
16 to come back wasn't working. And what they want to know  
17 now is to learn more about why those resources may not be  
18 coming back, in terms of a question, and wondering within  
19 the Port Graham Bay itself what may be happening in Port  
20 Graham that is inhibiting the return of species like clams  
21 and cockles and crab and what may be affecting some of the  
22 salmon and halibut resources that we subsist on.

23 So the topic of the workshop was reviving  
24 traditional management practices within our area and how  
25 our elders in the past managed the resources so you didn't

1 overharvest them, and one of the things that came up from  
2 the discussion was that our traditional knowledge is based  
3 on a whole lot of observation. It's watching and, as  
4 you're harvesting, your time is spent observing how much is  
5 left -- if young ones are coming back. And one of the main  
6 points of how our management of the resources was done was  
7 that they didn't harvest things in the summertime, and they  
8 specifically told us that the thought was that that was  
9 when the species were spawning and going through the cycle  
10 of putting larvae and stuff out into the ocean. That's  
11 from traditional knowledge to where you jump into science  
12 -- is, from our point, it was we know they need to spawn so  
13 during that time we'll not bother them. But we really  
14 didn't know what happened, other than we waited till  
15 October or November to start harvesting again.

16               So what we think -- or, what now, through  
17 the GEM program, is that this larval stage where the  
18 species spawn and they go up into the water column and then  
19 come back down to recruit down in the bays is an important  
20 part that we can't observe through just our watching it.  
21 It needs to be something that's studied by science, where  
22 you can pull these larvae out or see if they're recruiting  
23 onto beaches and how they flow in the bay. What it means  
24 then, overall, is that we need to know what is the water  
25 flow in Port Graham in terms of its relationship to

1 flushing out into Kachemak and what Kachemak Bay and Cook  
2 Inlet does to what is happening directly in Port Graham in  
3 terms of the water moving?

4 In the beaches in Port Graham, our concern  
5 is that the species that we harvest aren't coming back. So  
6 we need to be able to study the whole beach structure from  
7 intertidal down into the low tide area where we dig clams  
8 and see what the recruitment actually is coming back, and  
9 there are studies in Kachemak Bay going on that can apply  
10 to us. There's studies where they're studying the whole  
11 beach structure, and that can happen in Port Graham.  
12 They're studying what's happening in the water column. We  
13 can use that in Port Graham in determining this larval  
14 recruitment. We're also wondering about if contaminants  
15 are hurting this stage, this larval stage. So we're  
16 looking at our own issues with our sewer outfalls in the  
17 bay. But there's also the idea of using these cards and  
18 also seeing how the Port Graham Bay's currents work.

19 The GEM program can help Port Graham elders  
20 and young people learn what's going on, and then end result  
21 is that we want to be able to tell -- or go to the State or  
22 the Federal government and say this is what's happening in  
23 Port Graham. We want the species to come back, and here is  
24 some options on how to do that. This comes through the  
25 studies that can happen through community involvement and

1 the GEM program.

2 In working towards that direction, there  
3 was two proposals that were submitted and didn't get a to  
4 fund note. One was a community science dialogues proposal  
5 from Rick Foster at ADF&G, and I think this was through the  
6 Kachemak Bay Research Reserve. What we were trying to do  
7 with this program -- and we were supportive. They did ask  
8 us about this proposal, but it kind of fits with the topics  
9 that were discussed above in the GEM program on getting our  
10 elders and young ones talking with the scientists and  
11 learning from each other. The other one was through the  
12 Kachemak Bay Research Reserve also, and this was to study  
13 metals coming out of our watersheds in -- well, they were  
14 going to do it in Kachemak Bay. It also involved Port  
15 Graham and Windy Bay and Rocky Bay in terms of studying  
16 what was coming out of the watersheds up above, which adds  
17 to what we're trying to find out about Port Graham Bay and  
18 what effects those may be having to the environment so that  
19 we can at least understand, you know, what may be happening  
20 there.

21 From the workshop we had in Port Graham, we  
22 came up with 11 potential projects, and this was just with  
23 the scientists that were there and all of it around the  
24 discussion about the questions our elders had and, also,  
25 the four current ongoing projects, which was a Bidarki

1 study that was funded by the Trustee Council and there was  
2 a couple of others. But we ask you to consider that the  
3 questions that we have in terms of the environment may not  
4 necessarily fall under the request for proposals things  
5 that you send out, but they are questions that we want  
6 answered within our environment that we're dealing within  
7 and, from there, it will eventually tie in with the larger  
8 picture that I think GEM is trying to establish. So we  
9 urge you to reconsider those areas for funding again.  
10 Thanks.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Any other  
12 comments to be had?

13 MS. SALASKY: Yeah. I'm calling in. I'm  
14 on the teleconference part. Can I make a very short  
15 comment? My name is Cheryl Salasky from Chugach School  
16 District.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Do you mind?

18 MR. LAVIN: No.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: We had someone sitting at  
20 the table, but go ahead, Cheryl. Why don't you make your  
21 comment, and then we'll go back to the table.

22 MS. SALASKY: Okay. I'm happy to wait.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: No. The.....

24 MS. SALASKY: I just can't see what's going  
25 on, so that's okay.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh, no. I understand.  
2                   Why don't you go ahead.

3                   MS. SALASKY: Okay. This will be very  
4                   brief. My name is Cheryl Salasky, and I've been the Youth  
5                   Area Watch coordinator for the Chugach School District.  
6                   This will be just a brief heartfelt plea, and that is that  
7                   nine schools throughout Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet,  
8                   and Resurrection Bay have participated in this Youth Area  
9                   Watch Program for the past eight years. It's been an  
10                  educational program in the schools of oil spill affected  
11                  areas, and it's been well received by students, parents,  
12                  teachers, scientists and community members alike. In fact,  
13                  last year we had 90 applicants for our 30 positions in the  
14                  program. It's been a terrific opportunity for students to  
15                  work directly on meaningful research with scientists  
16                  investigating real life questions. Students then take the  
17                  skills learned from those interactions and apply them to  
18                  restoration projects that may come up within their own  
19                  local communities. Basically, I just urge you to  
20                  reconsider funding for this, and I did want to say that  
21                  even if you're not able to fund it at the full level  
22                  requested that we would be more than happy to rewrite the  
23                  grant at a reduced level. So as long as we can continue  
24                  pairing students with community members, scientists and  
25                  their schools in conducting research for their very own

1 communities. That's it. Thanks.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Thank you. Go  
3 ahead.

4 MR. LAVIN: Thanks. I'm Pat Lavin. I'm an  
5 attorney and Prince William Sound Project Manager for the  
6 National Wildlife Federation here in Anchorage and also a  
7 member of the Trustee Council Public Advisory Committee and  
8 I wanted to talk briefly about three things and I think the  
9 theme that runs through all three is a notion of an open  
10 dialogue and process more than anything else. I think  
11 there's a good tradition with the Council when dealing with  
12 the issues of relatively higher public importance -- you  
13 know, kind of the big things -- that there's a good  
14 established record of public discussion that, particularly,  
15 from my standpoint as a Public Advisory Committee member,  
16 of vetting of issues through the PAC and with the public,  
17 but at least the PAC when you approach the relatively  
18 larger, direction setting decisions. And so I think that's  
19 the theme that runs through all of this, but the first one  
20 I want to mention is the Work Plan -- kind of the big issue  
21 for today -- and it's kind of news to me that there's  
22 something of an alternate -- sounds like maybe an alternate  
23 Work Plan. I don't know. I don't think anyone has really  
24 seen that, and maybe it's just a discussion and more of a  
25 tinkering of what's been proposed. I don't know. But, to

1 the extent you were to consider any significant sort of  
2 sweeping change in the FY 04 Work Plan, I would urge  
3 against that. Some of the previous speakers have given  
4 some pretty good reasons why.

5           There's a lot of time and effort put into  
6 setting GEM up and getting this far, and this is kind of  
7 the first year of implementation of that. Scientists have  
8 committed themselves in some ways, et cetera, and I think  
9 if -- it's fine to entertain changing direction and such,  
10 but I think at this stage of the game probably not for FY  
11 04 and, perhaps, a thing to do there might be to launch a  
12 discussion in over a greater length of time than just  
13 today, which could undo years and years of work in a couple  
14 of hours right here today. So I urge you not to do that.  
15 I don't know if that's on the table, but just in case it is  
16 I needed to say that.

17           One other thing about the Work Plan. If we  
18 do hear from our PAC Chairman about the PAC sense of the  
19 Work Plan you may not hear anything about the lapsed or  
20 deferred funds from FY 03. I don't remember that coming up  
21 in our August meeting when we went through this Work Plan.  
22 That's probably because that wasn't calculated yet; but,  
23 now, there's a number. We know there's some deferred funds  
24 left over from FY 03, and I would urge you to take a look  
25 at some of the deferred projects then that we didn't know



1 we had an availability to go with and fund and that the  
2 STAC and the Science Director and maybe the Executive  
3 Director -- I can't remember -- had every intention of  
4 funding, if we had the money. Now there's a little bit  
5 more money to work with. So that's something I hope you do  
6 have a chance to look at today and fit in some of those  
7 that could be funded a little sooner than later. And one  
8 that I'd mention is the killer whale research project --  
9 Craig Matkin -- which is an inexpensive ticket item. It's  
10 \$19,000 or so. It allows him to keep up what is one of the  
11 few real longtime series whale observation data sets dating  
12 back to the late 70's. We don't have that kind of time  
13 series in very many cases. This is inexpensive and fairly  
14 easily done and not a whole lot of money. So I urge you to  
15 consider that and, especially in light of the timing of the  
16 NOAA fisheries' recent decision to list the AT1 stock of  
17 transient killer whales in Prince William Sound as  
18 depleted; that will benefit that depleted stock of whales  
19 having Craig or somebody with his group over in Prince  
20 William Sound doing whale observations, and I think that's  
21 something that GEM should be aware of as a monitoring need  
22 as we go forward as well. So please take a look at that  
23 one.

24 Other speakers have also spoken about the  
25 Small Parcel Program. We heard briefly from Mr. Bank about

1     that.  The main thing I want to emphasize with that is  
2     along the same lines -- is a departure from the whole Small  
3     Parcel Program, if that's under consideration, would be a  
4     relatively big decision that I hope you would vet before  
5     the PAC before making, and we have not been presented with  
6     anything to that effect.  So I hope that that can happen,  
7     and that's also a low cost or no cost thing for the Council  
8     to just keep in place and no obligation to enter into any  
9     particular purchase.  But, when a good one arises with a  
10    willing seller and a willing buyer and a happy public, it's  
11    nice to have the option to do that, and I don't think it  
12    costs anything to keep that option available to you.

13                   And the last thing I want to say, also  
14    along the lines of an open dialogue, is in connection with  
15    the reopener clause of the settlement with Exxon that I  
16    know you're aware of.  It's sort of shrouded in mystery.  
17    It would be nice to perhaps at the symposium coming up --  
18    or take advantage of some opportunity to discuss what the  
19    Council thinks or what the scientists have found as damages  
20    that might pertain to that clause and give the public some  
21    sense that it is being looked at.  I think there's a sense  
22    that it is, but nobody knows where or how or what.  So  
23    that's the plea for that, and I thank you for your time.

24                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Thank you.  Anyone else  
25    here today?

1 (No audible response)

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, with that, I think  
3 we've con -- oh, not yet. Hello.

4 MR. PARKER: Walter Parker, the North  
5 Pacific Research Board, Oil Spill Recovery Institute Board  
6 and the Prince William Sound Science Center Board. I'm  
7 speaking for myself.

8 I think Tom Royer and Craig Dorman clearly  
9 laid out the scientific elements of what we're trying to  
10 achieve. The three Boards, working with GEM, have made a  
11 really massive effort to integrate the science program.  
12 The great advantage that OSRI and the NPRB share with EVOS  
13 is that they have small foundations producing a small  
14 amount of money each year, but if it's coordinated and used  
15 in the right spots it can provide continuity, as was  
16 pointed out many times. The critical thing is continuity  
17 on these data sets. Otherwise, we're still going to be  
18 where we've been. I've been at this now for about 52  
19 years, since the Wildlife Research Center was established  
20 at the University of Alaska. During that time, in '71 to  
21 '74 I headed up the Law of the Sea Project where we had to  
22 go back into the 30's and try and pull together the  
23 information for the United States to take into the third  
24 Law of the Sea conference and, at the same time, we were  
25 trying to pull together the information for the first

1 Magnuson Act, and I was on the Board of Fish and Game then.  
2 So these data sets have a criticality to me.

3 More recently, on the Arctic Research  
4 Commission, as we pulled together the Arctic Climate Impact  
5 Assessment we're starting to pull together some good data  
6 streams, which it's my goal to integrate what the National  
7 Science Foundation and others are funding in the study of  
8 environmental change in the Arctic with what we're all  
9 doing in fisheries here. So I hope that you can make a  
10 maximum effort at keeping GEM as a major player as we go  
11 forward in this, and thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Anyone else  
13 on-line or here that would like to be heard in public  
14 comment?

15 (No audible response)

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, with that, I'll  
17 close the public comment session. I think the comments  
18 have been very good and given us some things to follow up  
19 on, I think, at this meeting and a future meeting. I'll  
20 have to ask those on-line now that the public comment  
21 period has ended to withhold their conversation, if they're  
22 listening.

23 (Off record comments)

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: We'll ask all the folks  
25 on-line that can mute their phones to do so, so that their

1 conversations don't disturb the meeting, and we'll move now  
2 to the Executive Director's comments. Gail Phillips, you  
3 want to give us your report?

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. First of all,  
5 I'd like to thank the Trustees for rescheduling this  
6 meeting so quickly after the October cancellation. I  
7 appreciate that very much. Our first topic to bring you up  
8 to date on is the investment training seminar and an  
9 investment update, and I've asked Paula Banks to come and  
10 make a brief report on that.

11 MS. BANKS: Good afternoon. My name is  
12 Paula Banks. That's B-A-N-K-S, for the record. I'll keep  
13 this brief, as we have a great deal to cover in a very  
14 short time period.

15 On the 26th of September, Michael O'Leary,  
16 the Executive Director and Vice-President from Callan  
17 Associates gave a training presentation to the staff and  
18 the investment working group members, and it was also open  
19 and available for the Trustee Council members to attend.  
20 His presentation was designed to give us, as custodians, a  
21 better understanding of investment strategies. He touched  
22 on capital market theory, asset allocation concepts,  
23 historical perspectives, endowment and foundation spending  
24 policies, market projections and alternative asset  
25 allocation policies. To sum it up, basically buy low and

1 sell high.

2 All jokes aside, serving as custodians for  
3 the EVOS fund is a very serious responsibility, and even  
4 though we have money managers to manage the fund, it is  
5 very important that we, as staff, and the Trustee Council  
6 have a firm understanding of investment strategies and have  
7 a responsibility to continue our education and to keep up  
8 with the current market trends. I also recently attended  
9 an asset summit allocation seminar in San Francisco, and  
10 the message again was echoed -- understand what your money  
11 managers are doing and keep up with the current market  
12 trends, and that's all I have for today.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Any questions for Paula?

15 (No audible response)

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Thanks very much, Paula. As  
17 you are all aware, coming up in March this year will be our  
18 15th year anniversary. We will be doing some plans for  
19 acknowledging that anniversary, and I've asked Cherri to  
20 give us an update on that.

21 MS. WOMAC: We actually went out for  
22 proposals in assistance in putting together something for  
23 the 15th anniversary and we're going to use Alaska Design  
24 as the person that will help us design a CD that will be  
25 available for the public and a PowerPoint presentation that

1 Gail and Phil can take to communities to talk about the  
2 15th anniversary. And some of the things that we want to  
3 cover on the CD that -- there were some questions at the  
4 end of the video for the 10th anniversary and we want to  
5 answer those but start off with, like, where are we today,  
6 a recap of all of the financial transactions and of the  
7 land purchases, how the recovery has progressed, how the  
8 focus has changed from restoration to the research and  
9 monitoring, what we've learned and been able to pass on and  
10 use elsewhere, how the economy of the spill area has  
11 rebounded, what research we're doing now to affect the  
12 economics of the spill area, and some other points that may  
13 arise. And I know that Ernesta wants the DEC Office to  
14 work with us in putting together this information, so I  
15 will contact you or a representative from your office to  
16 see what your input is.

*Ballard not Phillips*

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Greg, what I had asked and  
18 what seems appropriate isn't so much that we would have any  
19 particular oversight or direct participation, but that the  
20 Oil Spill Contingency Planning Program that was put in  
21 under State law be included in the 15th anniversary  
22 presentation, because I think it's important for people to  
23 know what has changed from the regulative community and  
24 preparedness point of view. It's a fairly significant  
25 change from the regime 15 years ago. That was what I



1 asked, that we have that piece clearly articulated.  
2 MS. WOMAC: Any questions?  
3 MS. PHILLIPS: Any questions of Cherri?  
4 (No audible response)  
5 MS. PHILLIPS: Thanks very much, Cherri.  
6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: When do the presentations  
7 begin?  
8 MS. WOMAC: We're hoping it will be around  
9 March.  
10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: March.  
11 MS. WOMAC: About the anniversary.  
12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So you hope to have the  
13 products completed when?  
14 MS. WOMAC: In early February.  
15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.  
16 MS. WOMAC: I can't remember the deadlines.  
17 We'll have a couple of revision dates with the person that  
18 we're working with.....  
19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.  
20 MS. WOMAC: .....so that we can review it  
21 before it goes.....  
22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And the Trustees have an  
23 opportunity to review that before it goes final?  
24 MS. WOMAC: Yes.  
25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, good. Thanks.

Ballard not  
Phillips



1 MS. PHILLIPS: Greg, if it's simple to do  
2 -- Cherri, could you tell us what the questions are at the  
3 end of the 10th year film that you are seeking answers to?  
4 I mean.....

Ballard not  
Phillips

5 MS. WOMAC: I am.....

Ernesta  
not Phillips

6 MS. PHILLIPS: .....were there two or three  
7 of them written down?

8 MS. WOMAC: Well, I wrote them, yeah.

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Would you -- if everyone  
10 else was interested?

Ballard not  
Phillips

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure.

12 MS. WOMAC: Well, I think it's like how has  
13 the recovery progressed. I haven't looked at the video  
14 recently. That's mainly the only one, and see where we are  
15 now.

Ballard not  
Phillips

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Maybe if you refresh  
17 memory you could just send us the -- or even send us the  
18 video.

19 MS. WOMAC: Okay. I can provide that for  
20 you, yeah.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: That would be good. Then we  
22 can see for ourselves. Thank you. The video is a very  
23 interesting video that everybody should look at every once  
24 in a while. And, as Cherri stated, as we go through with  
25 putting the documents together for the 15th anniversary

1 we'll send out the drafts to the Trustees so you'll all  
2 have the input, and if you have any other ideas what we can  
3 do to acknowledge the 15th anniversary please let us know.

4 A couple of meetings ago, I think it was  
5 Drew had asked about information on the ARLIS contributions  
6 and the contribution percentages. We sent that out to  
7 everybody. I thought it was in your packets today. I'm  
8 not sure that it is, but that was an information piece. If  
9 you don't have it or still need it, please let me know.

10 Also, the report on overdue projects is  
11 enclosed for your information, and those are the projects  
12 that the final reports were due on those projects by now.  
13 We do not have them. We are withholding funding for any  
14 further payment on continuing projects until we do get the  
15 project reports in that are anticipated and expected to be  
16 in.

17 At this time, too, I would like to  
18 introduce -- we do have a new employee. He's our new data  
19 analyst, Michael Schlie (pronunciation).....

20 MR. SCHLIE: Schlie.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: .....Schlie is our new data  
22 analyst and we're very happy to have him on and, boy, he's  
23 got his hands full already and has just already gotten to  
24 the point where the workload is over his head. So we're  
25 real happy to have him on board.

1 MR. SCHLIE: Thank you. I'm very happy to  
2 be here.

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Brett Huber had  
4 intended to be here today to give the PAC report.  
5 Unfortunately, his travel schedule didn't allow him to be  
6 here. He has submitted a PAC report that each of you have  
7 in your packets. He does want this to be part of the  
8 record, and I think it's just -- probably the most  
9 important thing is, I'd just like to reiterate, that he  
10 says I think it is important to reiterate the Public  
11 Advisory Committee's unanimous and strong support for the  
12 proposed draft Work Plan before you begin adoption today.  
13 And, if you have a moment, I would appreciate everybody  
14 going through his remarks.

15 Also, enclosed in your information today is  
16 documents for the lease paragraph for the FY 05 invitation.  
17 That's just an information piece. And we did have a  
18 Scientific Committee meeting in Seattle on Friday. We  
19 don't have the report ready on that meeting yet, but will  
20 have it to you in your packets or for the next meeting.  
21 And then, the last item that I had to bring up today again  
22 was the Trustee Council chair rotation, and I think,  
23 Ernesta, would you do a discussion on that?

24 MS. BALLARD Maybe I'm just a convening  
25 junkie. I think that groups do better if they have some

1 consistency in leadership, and I understand from the  
2 assembled lawyers that we have written policies which do  
3 this rotation every time and it seems to me disruptive and  
4 that a person who is Chairman is more than just Chairman  
5 Pro Tem, as Greg found out this morning when he walked in  
6 and sat down and had to assume the Chairmanship -- that  
7 there's the opportunity to work with Gail to be sure that  
8 the agenda is well drawn and that communications are timely  
9 and appropriate. And, I mean, the reason organizations  
10 have a Chair is because that is a function which needs to  
11 be fulfilled on behalf of the Council.

12 It would make far more sense to me that we  
13 rotate annually than by meeting, and I don't know whether  
14 the others assembled are even interested in that. I've  
15 talked to some of you separately about it. I don't know  
16 what we would have to do legally by way of changing our  
17 procedures, but I would feel far more comfortable with some  
18 continuity in the leadership of the Council.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, since the question  
20 has been asked, Gail, do you have an answer on what we  
21 would have to do to change the procedures?

22 MS. PHILLIPS: No, but I could sure call on  
23 Craig Tillery and ask him what that would be.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Craig, do you want to  
25 give us some.....

1                   MR. TILLERY: You would just have to vote  
2 and change the procedures, basically.

3                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any discussion? Drew.

4                   MS. PEARCE: I think that the continuity  
5 aspect is admirable and probably a good idea. I'm  
6 wondering if we would be better off to nominate a State and  
7 Federal co-chairs, and whichever one got to the meeting  
8 first could chair the meeting. That's probably the lesser  
9 impact by having Gail have a single point of contact for  
10 the State side and the Federal side, since our agencies'  
11 and our responsibilities and our Trustee responsibilities  
12 on our side differ somewhat from the State's  
13 responsibilities in terms of our agencies. I wonder if  
14 that might give Gail, then, a specific person amongst the  
15 Federal people and a specific amongst the State people. It  
16 could be her immediate contact, and it would be that  
17 person's responsibility to convene the other two Trustees  
18 if we have a question that needs to be spread just beyond  
19 that person. I don't know, Gail, if that would make you  
20 feel like you had better input.

21                   MS. PHILLIPS: That would be great. That  
22 would work fine with me. I think Joe has some.....

23                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Joe.

24                   MR. MEADE: I also think that Ernesta's  
25 suggestion is very important for that consistency and

1 continuum. I do also like Drew's suggestion. That was  
2 actually one I was going to bring before us and suggest the  
3 co-chair approach. That way, Gail will have consistently a  
4 contact with both the State and the Federal Trustees and  
5 really encourage that we have collaboration and  
6 communication ongoing as we come into these meetings in an  
7 official way. So, to me, it's not as important, perhaps,  
8 how and who chairs. We see that you're doing a great job  
9 thoroughly prepared as you came in for this morning. But  
10 what's most important is that we have that conduit for  
11 good, effective communication before the meetings and as we  
12 come to the discussions.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah. I'd like to agree  
14 with that myself. In the other Boards that I sit on, the  
15 role played by the Chair -- particularly, preparing for the  
16 meetings -- and a co-chair, I think, is a good idea also.  
17 And then, of course, the co-chairs would have to work out,  
18 I think, between themselves prior to the meeting who would  
19 Chair and I'd rather have that determined prior to the  
20 meetings than at the meetings and so that would be the  
21 suggestion I'd make. And then, I think, as points of  
22 contact for the Executive Director I think it makes a lot  
23 of sense. Kevin.

24 MR. DUFFY: So the concept that Drew Pearce  
25 put out there is one of co-chairs but not necessarily one

1 or the other being assigned the chairmanship of the actual  
2 meetings for a year. I just want to be clear what we're  
3 setting up.

4 MR. BALSIGER: We take turns.

5 MS. PEARCE: I thought that the two co-  
6 chairs.....

7 MR. DUFFY: So we would continue to rotate?

8 MS. PEARCE: .....could work that out  
9 amongst themselves.

10 MR. DUFFY: Okay. So the two co-chairs --  
11 all right, I just wanted to be clear on what we're doing  
12 here.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah. We're formulating  
14 our motion here. I'd like to make the suggestion that we  
15 move away from the idea that we would have to rotate and  
16 that the co-chairs would simply work that out prior to the  
17 meeting so that you could have -- you know, just because of  
18 travel schedules or, you know, something might come up. We  
19 don't want to be stuck with that requirement. I'd like to  
20 see us get rid of the requirement to rotate.

21 MS. PEARCE: I think it's important to  
22 always have somebody who's present chair the meeting,  
23 because it's so difficult to try to chair something from a  
24 distance, be it 500 miles or 4,000 miles. That might, at  
25 some time, mean neither of these actual co-chairs are here

1 to do so. They might both be available by phone. So we  
2 need to leave ourselves the ability to have one of the  
3 other members -- one of the other Trustees just chair the  
4 meeting, if necessary.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Ernesta.

6 MS. BALLARD This discussion is consistent  
7 with my view of the Chairmanship role, which is far greater  
8 than simply presiding in the chair. So I think we're  
9 reaching an agreement -- a consensus, in fact -- that we  
10 would have co-chairs and that the chairmanship of the  
11 meeting would be left up to them, but that they would  
12 jointly assure a smooth flow of communication and a smooth  
13 communication with Gail.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, would someone like  
15 to make a motion? Kevin.

16 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chair, I would like to move  
17 as stated by Ernesta Ballard, that we modify the procedures  
18 to reflect co-chairs on the State and Federal side. The  
19 two co-chairs will work directly with the Executive  
20 Director on agendas and other action items for the Council,  
21 and the two co-chairs will decide prior to the meeting who  
22 is going to chair the meeting. As a fallback -- well, let  
23 me see if I have a second.

24 MR. BALSIGER: I'll second.

25 MR. DUFFY: Just as a clarification --



1     thank you, Jim -- in the situation as described by Ms.  
2     Pearce where neither person might be available, then one of  
3     the other Trustee Council members could, with the  
4     concurrence of those two, also chair the meeting in their  
5     absence.   So.....

6                   MS. BALLARD   Great.

7                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Any discussion?

8                   MR. DUFFY:   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.   This  
9     is a small group.   So when we rotated back and forth and  
10    more or less took turns the nominal role of a Chair as sort  
11    of being outside the discussion and just facilitating the  
12    discussion didn't fall on one particular person.   But if  
13    we're going to identify someone now who is a Chair in the  
14    long run and if there is no rotation necessarily between  
15    the co-chairs I think we should have the understanding that  
16    the Chair is more than a facilitator and is actually an  
17    equal part of the deliberations and the discussions.   I  
18    don't think that needs to be a part of the motion, but just  
19    to say that.   So, for example, if you're the Chair and  
20    chair the next 10 meetings you should be part of the  
21    discussion as much as anyone else and not just to call on  
22    people.

23                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Yeah, I'd agree with  
24    that.   Any other discussion?   Well, if we can change the  
25    rules by taking action, I suggest we take the action.   So

1 there's no further discussion. All those in favor of the  
2 -- do we need to restate the motion, or should we have the  
3 motion read back to us?

4 REPORTER: I can play it back, but I can't  
5 read it back.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

7 MS. BALLARD I think we have the sense of  
8 it.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Does everyone understand  
10 what -- okay.

11 MR. MEADE: I think it's clear.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Then, if everyone  
13 is clear on the motion, all those in favor?

14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Anybody opposed?

16 (No audible response)

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: No one opposed, we've  
18 changed the way we chair the meetings and, hopefully,  
19 provided some increased input and continuity for the  
20 planning of meetings for the Executive Director.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: Do you want to name those  
22 two people at this time?

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, we aren't prepared  
24 to do that today. Why don't we.....

25 MS. BALLARD I think that each of the

1 governments could figure that out themselves and forward  
2 their name.

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah. Why don't we  
5 figure that out and forward our names, or we could even  
6 have a discussion of this in executive session. I think it  
7 would be an appropriate item.

8 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. With that, it's  
10 quarter of 12:00, and have we moved through the.....

11 MS. PHILLIPS: We have moved through  
12 the.....

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....year report?

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, and I believe that  
15 lunch is probably ready. We are prepared to have a working  
16 lunch, if you want to take a short break so people could  
17 get lunch now before we start the Work Plan.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah. Let's take a short  
19 break, and then we'll reconvene in 10 minutes.

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Or maybe 20 minutes, just so  
21 everybody could get their lunch -- 15 minutes.

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah. Reconvene at noon?

23 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. We'll reconvene at  
25 noon.

1 (Off record - 11:45 A.M.)

2 (On record - 12:08 P.M.)

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Well, the next  
4 thing on the agenda is to have Dr. Mundy introduce the FY  
5 2004 Work Plan.

6 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, before we do  
7 that.....

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh.

9 MS. PHILLIPS: .....I've been requested to  
10 read the PAC's response to us and.....

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh, okay.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: .....to put it on the public  
13 record, if that's all right with the Trustee Council.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That's fine.

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Since Brett Huber couldn't  
16 be here, they would like to have it read. And this is from  
17 Brett Huber, the Chairman of the PAC Committee. I think it  
18 is important to reiterate the Public Advisory Committee's  
19 unanimous and strong support for the proposed draft Work  
20 Plan for your adoption today. It is our feeling that the  
21 slate of projects represented in the Work Plan are both  
22 responsive to the invitation for proposals the Council  
23 approved last April, and well in line with the overall GEM  
24 Science Plan. I was involved in both the STAC and PAC  
25 review and found that both groups had very similar vision,

1 priorities and comments on the package of projects. I  
2 think this can probably be credited to great extent to the  
3 exhaustive preparatory work on the GEM program that has  
4 advanced us to this point, the clearly enunciated direction  
5 of the GEM Science Plan and the well articulated roles and  
6 missions of the two groups. The former PEG, and now the  
7 PAC, has participated in this GEM process from the  
8 beginning through numerous workshops with broad involvement  
9 of the scientific, academic and management communities,  
10 many drafts and revisions to the document, and full review  
11 by the NRC, and while we understand that it is not possible  
12 for the EVOS Gem program to be all things to all interests,  
13 we believe that we are well on our way to launching a  
14 cutting edge research and monitoring program that will  
15 provide a great deal of benefit. This benefit will be in  
16 the form of information that will be enjoyed both in the  
17 short and long-term and important to policy makers,  
18 managers, users and the resource itself. As I have  
19 testified to the Council in the past, I think it is  
20 important to balance the long-term monitoring program with  
21 the information and management needs of today. The PAC  
22 shares this perspective, and we believe that the draft Work  
23 Plan represents such a mix of projects as proposed.  
24 Adopting the Work Plan is the next necessary step in  
25 advancing the GEM program, and the PAC urges the Council to

1 do so today. The PAC continues to appreciate the role of  
2 this process and values our opportunity for input into the  
3 Council. We look forward to your continued mutual effort  
4 on behalf of the resources and communities of Prince  
5 William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska, and we wish the  
6 Trustees the best in their deliberations today. Thank you  
7 for passing this message along.

8 And now, I'd like to introduce Dr. Phil  
9 Mundy. I'm pleased to recommend to the Trustee Council  
10 that it take action to fund the programs, the projects that  
11 Dr. Mundy will reiterate today. In addition, I recommend  
12 that the Trustee Council defer action on the 14 projects  
13 that total 2.8 million in FY 2004 to 2006. Deferred  
14 projects may be brought before the Trustee Council for  
15 action later during FY 2004, based on availability of  
16 funding and other considerations. In addition, I advise  
17 you to reject funding for the 14 projects listed below.  
18 Dr. Mundy, our Science Director, will now provide a  
19 detailed briefing on the recommended projects.

20 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
21 Trustee Council, my name is Phil Mundy. I'm the Science  
22 Director for the program. Can everyone on the telephone  
23 hear me, if there is anyone on the telephone? Okay.

24 MS. PEARCE: There is someone on the  
25 telephone, and we can hear you.

1 MS. SALASKY: Yeah, we're here.

2 DR. MUNDY: Okay. So you can hear me okay?

3 MS. SALASKY: You bet.

4 MS. STUDEBAKER: Very well.

5 MR. ADAMS: Yes. Cordova can hear.

6 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Thank you. Mr.

7 Chairman, I'm pleased to have this opportunity to review  
8 and explain the projects recommended for funding and  
9 deferral in 2004, and 2005 and 2006 for the out year  
10 projects. I want to make the point from the outset that  
11 all of the projects before you for funding, fund contingent  
12 and deferral are worthy of funding in FY 2004, as  
13 determined by the review process. However, application of  
14 priorities explained in the Science Plan in view of a \$5  
15 million limit on annual expenditures have caused us to move  
16 less time sensitive projects to the deferred category.

17 Now, in order to leave the lights on for as  
18 long as possible and, also, I know that the sound of the  
19 fan and the projector can be distracting to the people on  
20 the telephone, I'm going to reverse the order. That is,  
21 move the watershed proposals up so that I can show you an  
22 example that I need a PowerPoint slide for, and then I'm  
23 going to move away from the PowerPoint presentation and  
24 turn the lights on and work from the draft Work Plan  
25 itself. So I believe everybody has been given a paper copy

1 of the draft Work Plan today so that you can follow along,  
2 and I'll tell you what page I'm going to be working from.

3 If you'll take a look at the screen here,  
4 to your right we have an example of how the peer review  
5 process helped us compare the proposals and see which ones  
6 were linked and exactly what kinds of information they were  
7 giving us. I have here a representation of a spreadsheet  
8 comparison of FY 04 watershed proposals. In the columns, I  
9 have identified the proposals. This is the Finney/Honnold  
10 complex. This is Knudsen, Walker, Mazumder, Heintz and  
11 Cooper. So we have those columns. I did not include the  
12 proposals in this category that were not recommended for  
13 funding. Over here, we have the different kinds of  
14 habitats within watersheds that the various proposals were  
15 offering to address, and you'll notice this helps us get a  
16 quick, at a glance kind of look at the coverage we're  
17 getting here, because one of the things we wanted and we  
18 asked for in the invitation was a good contrast in the  
19 different kinds of habitats within watersheds.

20 Here, you can see that of all these  
21 proposals we only have two proposals that area really  
22 taking a good look at the lake habitat, and that's the  
23 Finney/Honnold proposal and the Mazumder proposal. The  
24 others are working with various parts of the streams,  
25 wetlands and the nearshore environment. But these two



1 proposals are taking on a habitat that's relatively rare in  
2 terms of these proposals.

3           Also, in the next set of rows down here we  
4 have stable isotopes, and we asked the people in the  
5 invitation to basically tell us how they would measure  
6 marine related effects in watersheds. That is, we're  
7 looking for the effects of changes in the environment on  
8 watersheds and the feedback of that to the productivity in  
9 the marine environment. Here, everybody, as you can see  
10 all the way across the board, is looking at various kinds  
11 of stable isotopes. But only a few of them are actually  
12 looking at -- at that would be, again, the Finney/Honnold  
13 and the Walker proposal -- are looking at these stable  
14 isotopes in terms of water quality parameters, and that was  
15 an important point here. This is ammonium, and this is  
16 nitrate. These are common water quality parameters that  
17 are collected by water quality programs independent of  
18 marine derived nutrients, and this was one of the  
19 requirements here. We wanted to integrate, if possible, or  
20 look at marine derived nutrients in the watersheds with  
21 existing water quality programs. If we can make this link,  
22 that would be very helpful to us because it would certainly  
23 reduce the costs of looking at marine linkages to  
24 watersheds in the GEM program.

25           Now, I don't want to belabor this too much,

1 but I do want to give you an idea of the number of  
2 variables that were involved in this comparison. I'll skip  
3 over their -- most people are looking at salmon. They have  
4 in the rows here lots of different kinds of animals, just  
5 to give you a -- resident fish, halibut, dippers and so  
6 forth. Down in the chemical physical category, this is  
7 where it gets -- again, I have in my presentation here, I  
8 have in the rows chemical physical labels, and then I have  
9 various measures of different kinds of chemical  
10 constituents of water such as NO3, ammonia; ammonium, NH4;  
11 nitrate, total nitrate; silica; total Kjeldahl nitrogen.  
12 There's a whole long list of these various kinds of water  
13 quality parameters, and you can see that there's a lot of  
14 variation. Again, at a glance, looking across the columns  
15 here there's quite a bit of variation in what each proposal  
16 is proposing to look at -- different strategies in terms of  
17 their way of evaluating this.

18               So, the reason I started with this is that  
19 this is an example of how the proposals in the suite are  
20 interrelated and how they have been compared and contrasted  
21 and the level of detail that's necessary in the peer review  
22 process to make these comparisons. We've done our best to  
23 see that in the watershed arena and in other arenas that we  
24 have enough geographic contrast, that we have enough  
25 different looks at the problem so that we don't wind up two

1 or three years down the road with not enough information to  
2 answer the questions that we're asking in the GEM program.  
3 Okay. With that, unless there are any questions from the  
4 Council members on this spreadsheet or this approach, I'll  
5 ask for the lights and.....

6 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, we don't have  
7 that spreadsheet here, do we?

8 DR. MUNDY: No. Sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I  
9 may?

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh.

11 DR. MUNDY: Dr. Balsiger, this is a  
12 document that was used during the peer review process, but  
13 it's not -- we generally don't release that information,  
14 unless it's requested. All right. If you'll take the  
15 paper copies of your draft Work Plan and refer to the table  
16 of recommendations for the watersheds on page 34, I want to  
17 walk you through exactly what it was we asked for -- a very  
18 brief summary of that -- and then talk about the projects  
19 that have been recommended.

20 So the watershed proposals were supposed to  
21 show how and where to measure the best indicators of marine  
22 related biological production in watersheds, including  
23 within an existing water quality monitoring program. Three  
24 areas were emphasized in the invitation. Number 1,  
25 detection of marine related indicators such as stable

1 isotopes of nitrogen, carbon and sulfur. Community based  
2 sampling strategies for sampling marine related indicators.  
3 We are concerned that we have community based sampling  
4 programs because we think that this is one of the most cost  
5 effective ways to get the job done. And, number 3,  
6 including marine related variables in an existing water  
7 quality monitoring program. So, again, our strategy is if  
8 we can make the connection to water quality parameters that  
9 are commonly measured we can generally kill two birds with  
10 one stone and save a lot of money. We can answer water  
11 quality questions that are important to other people and  
12 not to GEM, per se, and also look at the marine related  
13 linkages that have been specifically identified as of  
14 interest to the GEM program.

15           The five watershed proposals recommended  
16 for funding represented a well coordinated and an  
17 integrated package of research to be conducted throughout  
18 the spill affected areas that will lead to the  
19 implementation of a basic GEM watershed monitoring program  
20 in FY 2007. So, we're looking at the Finney, Heintz,  
21 Honnold, Knudsen and Walter proposals in the watershed  
22 package and also looking at Cooper, which was submitted  
23 under community involvement but which is basically a water  
24 quality monitoring project, as part of the watershed  
25 package. Geographic coverage has provided for a broad

1 variety of coastal watersheds adjacent to Prince William  
2 Sound, Cook Inlet and Kodiak. All recommended projects  
3 except Heintz offer to study stable isotopes as indicators  
4 of terrestrial marine linkages. However, the studies offer  
5 complementary coverage of different types of watersheds  
6 such as I pointed out in my illustration -- headwaters,  
7 mid-reaches, mouth, delta and even nearshore marine  
8 environment, and a broad variety of species and chemical  
9 observations as well.

10 So, the Prince William Sound proposal on  
11 watersheds is Knudsen's; the Cook Inlet is the  
12 Walker/Heintz proposal; and the Kodiak area is covered by  
13 the Finney and Honnold proposal, to get all of the areas  
14 and locations in the spill affected area. So four of the  
15 five proposals recommended responded to the request for  
16 community based sampling strategies for sampling marine  
17 related indicators -- that was one of our three areas that  
18 were emphasized in the invitation -- and they also  
19 responded to including marine related variables in an  
20 existing water quality monitoring program. That is,  
21 Finney, Honnold, Walker and Heintz were directly responsive  
22 to two of our three criteria. The Heintz project alone  
23 offers an immediate management application through measures  
24 of the allocation of marine derived resources among growth  
25 and bodily structures of fish that can be used to

1 understand survival and survival species is basic  
2 information for fishery managers and we believe that this  
3 can be translated directly into regulations. Taken  
4 together, the five recommended projects would provide  
5 enough information in three years -- that's FY 2004 through  
6 2006 -- to design sampling for terrestrial marine linkages  
7 that would lead to a call for proposals for a GEM watershed  
8 monitoring program in FY 2007.

9           We've pointed out in the Science Plan that  
10 these areas that we're looking at -- the watersheds, the  
11 Alaska Coastal Current, the nearshore -- aren't all at the  
12 same level of development in terms of our understanding of  
13 the science; and, therefore, we're going to get there at  
14 different times in these projects. We think the watersheds  
15 can start in 2007. It may be possible in the nearshore  
16 area, where knowledge is better developed, for example, for  
17 us to start even earlier than that to recommend the  
18 monitoring program. So we are moving in a very deliberate  
19 fashion, a very careful fashion to set this up.

20           Now, I also point out that modeling is  
21 going to be an important feature not only in the watershed  
22 area but, also, in all of the other areas for understanding  
23 exactly how the impacts of oiling on individual species  
24 relate to the environment parameters that we're measuring.  
25 And this is something that has never been done in a

1 systematic fashion in this area before, and we believe that  
2 this will have a lot of spin-off. This will help us  
3 understand the difference between human impact and oil  
4 impacts, but it will also have a lot of spin-off benefits,  
5 we think, for natural resource management, particularly for  
6 birds, fish and mammals and for agencies that deal with  
7 birds, fish, and mammals on a regular basis.

8 We all know the stories of declines in sea  
9 lions and looking at what the fisheries might have to do  
10 with it and those effects are confounded by environmental  
11 problems and these are classic problems that we deal with.  
12 We had the same problems in the oil spill in trying to  
13 prove damages looking at declines. Even though we had lots  
14 of carcasses to start off with, trying to explain why these  
15 things didn't recover required a lot of environmental  
16 information that just wasn't available.

17 Okay, now, again, I'll give you a wrap-up  
18 about the deferred projects because we are -- as I said, we  
19 do have some deferred projects that could be funded and  
20 would be good parts of the program, but for one reason or  
21 another were not ready to go. And this deferred project in  
22 the watershed area is Mazumder, and we believe it would  
23 make an excellent addition to the package of watershed  
24 proposals. However, the budget submitted in the revised  
25 proposal commingled matching and EVOS TC funds so that it

1 was unclear what objectives could be accomplished in the  
2 absence of the matching funds. So we weren't advising you  
3 to take a risk that the people who were putting up the  
4 matching funds would or would not show up with the funds,  
5 we wanted to be able to evaluate what the Trustee Council  
6 would be buying in the absence of the matching funds, and  
7 that wasn't possible in this particular proposal. I  
8 believe that Dr. Mazumder had -- and this is a cooperative  
9 project with Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the  
10 Kenai River Sportfishing Association. I believe they have  
11 submitted a revised budget in this case.

12 Okay, Mr. Chairman, if it's your pleasure,  
13 I can stop at the end of each section and see if there are  
14 questions, or I can push forward.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Why don't you just push  
16 forward, and then we'll interrupt you as you go?

17 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And other Trustees feel  
19 free, if you have a question about a particular comment or  
20 a statement. I just think it's better than.....

21 MS. BALLARD So you just want us to jump  
22 in? I want to just jump in.....

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

24 MS. BALLARD .....on Mazumder. I was  
25 curious who the matching partner would be, if the match



1 came through?

2 DR. MUNDY: Yes. Mr. Chairman, in response  
3 to the question, I believe that these matching funds were  
4 designated to come from the Kenai River Sportfishing  
5 Association. They have an environmental fund that's based  
6 on the fund-raising event, The Kenai Classic.

7 MS. BALLARD And do you know how much they  
8 asked for, Phil?

9 DR. MUNDY: I think they're looking for  
10 approximately \$100,000.

11 MS. BALLARD From the Kenai?

12 DR. MUNDY: From the Kenai River  
13 Sportfishing Association.

14 MS. BALLARD Okay. Thanks.

15 DR. MUNDY: All right. Now, if now in your  
16 draft Work Plan you would turn to page 21 and refer to the  
17 table of proposals on page 21. I'm going to return to the  
18 alphabetical order that we've used to describe the  
19 different parts of our program here, and I'm going to be  
20 looking at the Alaska Coastal Current. And, of course, the  
21 Alaska Coastal Current is that area close to the shore --  
22 and, in fact, it runs rights up to the shore -- that  
23 contains a lot of the glacial runoff and is so important  
24 biologically in so many different ways. So the top  
25 priority for GEM in the Alaska Coastal Current starting in

1 FY 04 is to initiate the process that leads to collecting  
2 basic physical observations in, particularly, temperature  
3 and salinity, and biological observations using optical  
4 measures that are cheap, such as fluorescence, from a  
5 vessel of the Alaska Marine Highway System or other ships  
6 of opportunity operating in the waters of Prince William  
7 Sound, the outer Kenai Peninsula, lower Cook Inlet and  
8 Kodiak. Observations on these basic variables will be of  
9 use to a range of scientists, resource managers and members  
10 of the public for multiple purposes, and they are  
11 fundamental to the future GEM modeling program that I just  
12 mentioned earlier. As part of this objective, continued  
13 development of the vessel of opportunity projects deploying  
14 the continuous plankton recorder and thermosalinograph into  
15 long-term projects is desirable. Another priority for FY  
16 04 is to begin applying monitoring results to management of  
17 development activities in the Alaska Coastal Current.

18               Seven projects in the Alaska Coastal  
19 Current area of the invitation are recommended for funding,  
20 and these are the ones in your table here. Six of the  
21 seven proposals recommended for commitment of funding in  
22 the Alaska Coastal Current respond directly to the top  
23 priority of the Science Plan, which is to use ships of  
24 opportunity to acquire basic physical and biological  
25 observations. These proposals are those of Batten,

1 Bechtol, Cokelet, Okkonen, Stabeno and Willette. The  
2 seventh proposal -- that's Weingartner's proposal -- is  
3 acquiring basic physical and biological observations from a  
4 mooring, which is affectionately known as GAK1, and this is  
5 the one that Dr. Royer talked to you about by telephone  
6 this morning. GAK1, as Dr. Royer mentioned, is the second  
7 oldest continuous set of oceanographic observations in the  
8 North Pacific. Taken as a whole, the seven ACC projects  
9 recommended for funding provide the starting point for the  
10 backbone of long-term biological and physical observations  
11 to drive the GEM biophysical modeling effort.

12 As I mentioned, we have never had the  
13 opportunity to put together all these observations in a  
14 biophysical model before, and biophysical models are useful  
15 in a number of contexts, one of which is running them in  
16 sort of simulation mode so that you can see if you really  
17 need all of the observations that are coming in. You can  
18 run them in a simulation mode, remove observations, and see  
19 if it makes any difference in your ability to draw  
20 conclusions. So the idea of having a biophysical model  
21 like this will be of use not only to our program -- to the  
22 GEM program -- but to other agencies as well, because we'll  
23 be able to take a look at the distribution of the  
24 environmental monitoring and the biological monitoring and  
25 ask questions that directly affect cost -- you know, that

1 dramatically affect cost in these areas.

2 Now, talking about the deferred projects,  
3 of the four projects recommended to be deferred, two are  
4 directed at one of the top priorities in the Science Plan,  
5 understanding the exchange of water, nutrients and carbon  
6 between the Alaska Coastal Current and Prince William  
7 Sound. This is the Vaughan project and the Kline project.  
8 Voluntary observing ships would be developed inside Prince  
9 William Sound by the third deferred proposal -- this is the  
10 Bird proposal -- and Prince William Sound is a geographic  
11 area not yet addressed by the other vessel of opportunity  
12 proposals now recommended for funding. The fourth deferred  
13 project, which was also mentioned in testimony this  
14 morning, would continue a longtime series on killer whales.  
15 This is the Matkin proposal. Although the Matkin project  
16 was not found appropriate to the purposes of lingering oil  
17 investigations, it is desirable to have this time series  
18 continued under the ACC and, also, it's a relatively minor  
19 cost overall. So we believe that the addition of the  
20 deferred ACC projects would complete the basic geographic  
21 coverage for the voluntary observing ship program for the  
22 spill affected area and provide the start on a data set  
23 that is essential to understanding changes in salmon and  
24 herring resources in Prince William Sound, as well as  
25 fluctuations of bird and mammal populations in the northern

1 Gulf. Continuation of the killer whale time series at the  
2 proposed price is a bargain.

3 Okay, that concludes my presentation on the  
4 Alaska Coastal Current.

5 MR. MEADE: Dr. Mundy?

6 DR. MUNDY: Yes.

7 MR. MEADE: Don't I recollect that the  
8 vessel of opportunity that associates with State Marine  
9 Highway vessels -- isn't there a pretty critical -- a  
10 pretty sensitive time frame there, as far as the dry-dock  
11 and the ability to get those ships or those vessels  
12 outfitted to do the research?

13 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, please.

15 DR. MUNDY: Yes, there is a -- we are up  
16 against a hard time constraint on the Cokelet -- the  
17 proposal I believe that you're talking about is the Cokelet  
18 proposal and the ferry involved is the Tustamena and the  
19 Tustamena has a course that takes it down the outer Kenai  
20 Peninsula, which is one of the most critically important  
21 areas for production of birds, fish and mammals in the  
22 northern Gulf of Alaska. Although the instruments we are  
23 proposing to put on the Tustamena are relatively simple, we  
24 have to have those vetted by a marine architect because  
25 this is a passenger vessel. So we can't maintain the

1 passenger classification of that vessel unless these  
2 instruments are certified by a marine architect. So we've  
3 never had this problem with the other ships that we work  
4 with because they don't carry passengers. So in order to  
5 do that and to have these instruments at the dock by  
6 February when the vessels goes into dry-dock, we need to  
7 get started as soon as possible. Time is very short.

8 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please.

10 MR. BALSIGER: Dr. Mundy, did the  
11 invitation specifically identify, I guess, as a requirement  
12 that you use ships of opportunity or Alaska ferries, or how  
13 was that worded in the invitation? Do you recall?

14 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Please, yeah.

16 DR. MUNDY: Yes. We gave a number of  
17 examples. We started off with a general paragraph that  
18 said just ships of opportunity. We want you to show us how  
19 to cost effectively collect data from ships of opportunity  
20 in the oil spill affected area. Then, we gave several  
21 examples, one of which cited the Alaska Marine Highway  
22 System, and then another one which cited non-passengers  
23 vessels which, as I've just mentioned, are easier to work  
24 with. So while we didn't explicitly said it had to be -- I  
25 mean, there was no exclusion implied in the invitation. We

1 didn't say it had to be the Alaska Marine Highway System or  
2 any particular kind of vessel.

3 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Dr. Mundy,  
5 what's the ship of opportunity for the Matkin killer whale  
6 project?

7 DR. MUNDY: Matkin is -- the cost of his  
8 vessel -- this is the same vessel that he's used to survey  
9 whales for quite a few years, and it's the one that's owned  
10 by his oceanic society out of Homer. This is a ship of  
11 opportunity in the sense that we're not bearing any of the  
12 costs of chartering that vessel. This is paid for out of,  
13 I believe, stellar sea lion money. So we're just adding a  
14 little money for additional observations here.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Thanks. Go ahead.

16 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
17 If you'll look in your Work Plan booklet on page 23, I'll  
18 move to the community involvement section.

19 Now, I want to emphasize that community  
20 involvement is changing. We have a report that was  
21 prepared by a group of experts that's now in the hands of  
22 the Executive Director and we're working through that and  
23 we're hoping once that report has been accepted in its  
24 final format that the Trustee Council will be able to look  
25 at that with the Executive Director and we can set a new

1 course for community involvement. During our National  
2 Research Council review, we had a lot of comments that were  
3 not all necessarily positive about our community  
4 involvement process and we took those to heart and we are  
5 now working to see that we get a full variety of  
6 communities involved in our activities. Also, as I  
7 mentioned, if this is done properly this can save a lot of  
8 money. So we're hoping that we can get all kinds of  
9 communities in addition to the tribes -- commercial fishing  
10 communities, other community groups -- that are interested  
11 in the environment and collecting that kind of data. So  
12 we.....

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Excuse me, Dr. Mundy.

14 MS. PEARCE: On that topic, would the new  
15 process -- I'm not sure what to call it, but the new  
16 scheme, if you will, cross all of these categories, or are  
17 we just changing the way we do the community involvement  
18 category of proposals? Because I think, personally -- I'm  
19 not speaking for DOI, but that local knowledge is  
20 compelling and would be of use to our scientific forays  
21 into the field, and I would like to see some opportunity to  
22 have the locals more involved in the science.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Please.

24 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman. Yes, on both  
25 counts. Just to restate the question, are we going to be



1 changing not only the mix of communities that we're looking  
2 at but, also, the process for getting communities involved  
3 and, specifically, for bring TEK, traditional ecological  
4 knowledge, into our program? And the answer is, yes, on  
5 both counts.

6 I believe you heard testimony on the Patty  
7 Brown-Schwalenberg proposal, the CRRC proposal that was not  
8 recommended for funding. This, again, was not due to any  
9 lack of commitment on our part to community involvement;  
10 but, rather, looking for more effective ways to do this.  
11 As I said, in the past we've acknowledged the fact that we  
12 have some shortcomings in community involvement, and now  
13 we're addressing those. In the interim, the things that we  
14 had in the past that didn't work need to be discontinued,  
15 and that's where we are on that.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy, I detected in  
17 some of the testimony this morning a fair amount of  
18 frustration from some of the communities with the lack of  
19 involvement from their perspective and the lack of funding  
20 for their proposals. So how do you respond to those  
21 concerns, or what do you think is at the root of the  
22 concerns that are expressed?

23 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Yes, Mr. Chairman, there  
24 are two parts to that. That is, proposals in the past that  
25 were not funded and, now, we face a situation where we just

1 don't have proposals of any kind that we can fund, okay?  
2 That's the problem. The testimony, I believe, that you  
3 heard from Mr. Heinreichs this morning from Eyak and his  
4 frustration that -- he was talking about a relatively long  
5 time period there. He was talking about a time period that  
6 spanned at least half of the 1990's and, as a peer reviewer  
7 in that process, I'm well aware of his frustration and he  
8 was absolutely correct because when he sent that proposal  
9 he took the proposal out of the Trustee Council reference  
10 frame, where it was not deemed appropriate to restoration  
11 activities under the terms of the court settlement, and he  
12 did put it into another venue and it was immediately funded  
13 because it was a good project. So when you have good  
14 projects in the wrong place that does cause some  
15 frustration.

16                   The other thing is that, right now, we are  
17 looking for ways to engage the community so that we can  
18 develop programs that are of interest to them and that  
19 address questions that are relevant to the restoration of  
20 injured resources that come from the communities, and this  
21 is something that was recommended by the NRC and something  
22 that we fully intend to do, but the question of how we get  
23 that done and how we accomplish that is not clear. In the  
24 past, it's been basically on the efforts of individual  
25 members of the community, such as you heard from Pat Norman

1 this morning, who brought a number of proposal during the  
2 1990's from his community to the Trustee Council that were  
3 funded, or individual researchers who do it correctly, who  
4 do it properly. Right now, we're funding a continuing  
5 project by Jennifer Ruesink, and this was referred to in  
6 the testimony this morning as the Bidarki project. And  
7 this is a resource, a segmented -- it's sort of like an  
8 abalone with joints in it and it's on the rocks and it's a  
9 very tasty item and -- but it's an organism that's very  
10 highly rated among subsistence users on the Kenai  
11 Peninsula, but it's not an organism that Alaska Department  
12 of Fish and Game or any other agency has much data on. So  
13 the researcher recognized this, worked with the community,  
14 and we have a project now that will help us integrate that  
15 aspect of harvest of the Bidarki into our nearshore  
16 monitoring program as we move forward. So we view that as  
17 the ideal of what we're trying to do here -- trying to move  
18 forward. That's a question that came from the community  
19 that was clearly relevant to the issues that we're raising  
20 in the nearshore and which put the traditional ecological  
21 knowledge of the community together with the scientists,  
22 and I think it's a win-win situation.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. MEADE: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Go ahead.

1                   MR. MEADE: I'd just like to make a comment  
2 for my fellow Trustees, as well as in respect for the folks  
3 that have come in from our outlying communities that I  
4 really do hope that in the GEM process now and into the  
5 future we can find ways and really, truly invest in ways to  
6 actively engage communities and villages that have been  
7 most impacted in the spill area. I think it's essential.  
8 And equal to that, or, second to that, engaging youth in  
9 ways that help youth gain connections to the science being  
10 gained, as we heard a schoolteacher reference this morning.  
11 I think that's another critical opportunity as we look  
12 forward at how we can, in the research and monitoring phase  
13 of the post oil spill, be able to provide maximum benefit.  
14 I think being able to touch youth with the science and  
15 being able to engage and involve affected communities and  
16 villages is critically important. And I realize from what  
17 -- I've been briefed here a month ago as well as again  
18 today that perhaps some of the proposals weren't as focused  
19 as to what the needs may be, but I'd really urge us to be  
20 able to actively work and mine opportunities with villages,  
21 if you will, to seek their active engagement.

22                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

23                   DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman. Yes, I just want  
24 to point out that we did hear the testimony that you're  
25 referring to as from the Chugach School District this

1 morning, and we did put the Youth Area Watch Program --  
2 it's the DeLorenzo proposal. We did move the DeLorenzo  
3 proposal to the deferred category so that we have the  
4 opportunity to work with the school district on that,  
5 should the Trustee Council decide that it wishes to  
6 allocate the money for that work.

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard.

8 MS. BALLARD This isn't really just for  
9 Phil. It's as much for Gail, I guess, but one of the  
10 things I think would be helpful to us as we go on is to get  
11 a good summary of the capacity building and other direct  
12 grants from all funding sources that go into the  
13 communities that we're speaking of -- and some of them  
14 testified today -- so that we can be sure that we're either  
15 supplementing appropriately or not in competition with  
16 other funding. I know that the IGAP Program has put in a  
17 good deal of capacity building money. DOI, Drew, has a  
18 number of grant programs that are going to tribes and to  
19 Alaska rural residents, and we ought to have a better view  
20 of that entire picture as we go forward because a lot of  
21 what was said today was about workshopping, education,  
22 capacity building, which are specifically also the  
23 objectives of some of these other programs.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

25 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just respond

1 that certainly is something we aspire to. We require, for  
2 example, everyone who submits any proposal to tell us where  
3 other money in the area is being spent that's related to  
4 what they're doing. They don't always know. We have  
5 another way of finding these things out, and that is we're  
6 working on a metadatabase. We have a proposal that I'll  
7 get to later on under the modeling and -- I mean, under the  
8 database management that attempts to track money that's  
9 going into anything that's in an area that we are funding  
10 -- that we're working in -- and that was one of the first  
11 things we did in the GEM program was to sit down and to  
12 attempt to find that money and to identify those projects.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you.

14 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Dr. Balsiger.

16 MR. BALSIGER: Dr. Mundy, it's slightly  
17 different on the funding community proposals in this RFP --  
18 this package -- but, the watershed proposals, one of the  
19 requirements was to work with communities to help sample.  
20 So I guess I would hope that if those are funded and go  
21 through that we make certain that they are genuinely -- the  
22 PIs genuinely work with the communities instead of one  
23 phone call, as we heard this morning. But there's an  
24 opportunity there to involve the communities, I believe.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

1 DR. MUNDY: Yes, Dr. Balsiger, we will do  
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Please proceed.

4 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Mr. Chairman, if I may  
5 continue, I'll talk about the community involvement  
6 proposals that were recommended for funding. We're  
7 recommending four community involvement proposals. We  
8 believe that these contribute directly to the Trustee  
9 Council objectives of involving communities in the oil  
10 spill affected area in decisions on the questions addressed  
11 and the projects implemented. That would be the Adams  
12 fisheries management project; number two, converting data  
13 into products useful to communities and governments -- that  
14 would be the Baird project; and, three, involving members  
15 of the community in collecting long-term data sets relevant  
16 to the Science Plan -- that's Cooper and Schneider, and I  
17 would point out that Schneider's proposal is the Youth Area  
18 Watch proposal from Kodiak. So we have not abandoned Youth  
19 Area Watch but simply are trying to get Youth Area Watch  
20 more in line with developing long-term data sets within the  
21 community that are relevant to GEM. Taken as a whole, the  
22 four community involvement proposals meet the criteria in  
23 the FY 04 invitation for targeting workshops, information  
24 products, and community science meetings that provide  
25 services to communities and stakeholders in the GEM region

1 that are related to marine ecosystem health and  
2 sustainability. Three of the four projects' principal  
3 investigators have excellent records of contributing to the  
4 development of the GEM program -- that would be Adams,  
5 Cooper, and Schneider -- and all four projects show  
6 substantial future utility for implementing the GEM  
7 program. In addition, the four projects are expected to  
8 complement and support the efforts of the Executive  
9 Director to thoroughly examine the role of community  
10 involvement in the GEM program during FY 2004.

11 Now, I'll address the deferred projects.  
12 Addition of the two deferred projects would provide options  
13 for the Executive Director in working with the Chugach  
14 School District in developing a Youth Area Watch proposal  
15 that is compatible with the GEM Program -- that's DeLorenzo  
16 -- and in working with the Chugach Regional Resources  
17 Commission on items of mutual interest in regard to the  
18 commemoration of the fifteenth anniversary of the oil  
19 spill, and that's the second Patty Brown-Schwalenberg  
20 proposal. Mr. Chairman, that completes community  
21 involvement. Okay, I'll now turn to.....

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Mr. Duffy.

23 DR. MUNDY: Oh.....

24 MR. DUFFY: Dr. Mundy, real quickly.....

25 DR. MUNDY: .....sorry.



1 MR. DUFFY: .....no problem, Phil. Phil,  
2 in reading all these proposals as part of the Work Plan,  
3 I'm trying to get my hands around the Ken Adams project.  
4 Could you kind of briefly summarize what the expected  
5 results are for that, because it talks about a predicted  
6 variation in biological production, and I understand that  
7 concept well. Our agency is very interested in fluctuating  
8 returns of Prince William Sound for a whole host of  
9 reasons. And then, in looking through how we're going to  
10 get to that issue, is it really -- is that perhaps a bit of  
11 the misnomer, and it's just more actively engaging the  
12 communities in the commercial fishing industry in the  
13 greater Cordova area in kind of our decision-making  
14 process? What is that about? If you could help me a  
15 little, I think that would help.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Please, Dr. Mundy.

17 DR. MUNDY: Yes, Mr. Chair. Those are  
18 really good questions, and they help illustrate what we're  
19 trying to do with the community involvement program. The  
20 Adams project comes from a group of people who were  
21 instrumental in getting the Sound Ecosystem Assessment  
22 study going back in 1994. So the Cordova fishing community  
23 -- particularly, the commercial fishing community -- has a  
24 really long track record of being actively involved and  
25 wanting to be actively involved in the decisions about the

1 kinds of science that are done in their area. They  
2 recognize that the science directly affects the fishing  
3 regulations and the way in which the resource might be  
4 apportioned to them, and so they really do take an active  
5 role here.

6           The fishing community focused that SEA  
7 project, which was basically an oceanographic project, on  
8 the production of and explaining production of pink salmon  
9 and herring. So this was one of the first times I've ever  
10 heard of a large-scale sort of environmental oceanographic  
11 study being focused on explaining changes in production of  
12 pink salmon and herring. So the Adams proposal -- at the  
13 end of the SEA project, we basically had a lot of tools in  
14 hand. We had data and we had models, but they weren't  
15 being applied to fisheries management. So part of the  
16 promise of the SEA program is that these products would be  
17 applied -- would be applicable to herring and salmon, which  
18 were injured species in the oil spill and communities in  
19 this area that depend on the herring and the pink salmon  
20 certainly were affected by the oil spill. So Adams put  
21 together early on -- although I don't think that we fully  
22 realized that it was a quote/unquote community involvement  
23 project at the time -- sort of a series of workshops to  
24 engage the members of the public in Cordova, the commercial  
25 fishing industry, the aquaculture industry, the lodge

1 owners, and others in a discussion about what kinds of  
2 applications from the restoration studies that were a part  
3 of SEA would be appropriate in the view of the community.  
4 So where Adams is talking about understanding the  
5 variability in the resource and working with that, we also  
6 have had the area management biologist from Cordova and his  
7 assistant area management biologist involved in these  
8 discussions. And it's the view of the community that  
9 understanding variation in the pink salmon, particularly,  
10 is -- I'm sure the Commissioner of Fish and Game is, you  
11 know, better familiar with it than I am.

12                   There were some problems this past season  
13 with the pink salmon resource and with overproduction at  
14 some of the hatcheries and so forth that caused a great  
15 deal of difficulties. And, the pink salmon, in the SEA  
16 program we had a model that effectively predicted for one  
17 year class using oceanographic data and data on survival of  
18 more juveniles the recruitment to the areas from which we  
19 had the more juveniles. So, basically, we found -- we've  
20 demonstrated, okay, so that was once, and so as people who  
21 have been involved in forecasting we should quit while  
22 we're ahead. But the community is very committed to the  
23 idea that we can take these things that we've learned in  
24 the past and move them forward, you know, in the form of  
25 fisheries management applications, and so that was the

1 purpose of this group.

2 MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Phil. That was good  
3 -- or Dr. Mundy. I also see that there was a  
4 recommendation for a reduced funding level from the STAC  
5 Committee based on what was being proposed. So that's  
6 something that we need to wrestle with here, or have those  
7 issues been addressed? Just enlighten me on that, would  
8 you please, Dr. Mundy?

9 DR. MUNDY: Right. We have a -- sorry, Mr.  
10 Chairman. We have a revised proposal from Adams that  
11 addresses the concerns of the STAC. I'm not sure that the  
12 dollar amount came out to be very much different, but we  
13 did work with him and we did work with members of the STAC  
14 to resolve this issue.

15 MR. DUFFY: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Mundy.  
16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you. Okay.

18 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I'll now  
19 move to page 25 in your draft Work Plan, table of  
20 recommendations on data management.

21 Now, the data management area is an area  
22 that we have been frequently advised back during the  
23 restoration program and then, certainly, after we started  
24 the GEM program it's critical to get control of the  
25 information. One of the problems that the Ken Adams group

1 that I just talked about in Cordova was formed to address  
2 was the fact that they felt that the models and the data  
3 from the SEA program were not made available to the  
4 community at that time and that we needed stronger policies  
5 on how we handle our data and getting that information out  
6 to the public and to scientists who are advising the  
7 public. So we invited at this time proposals to construct  
8 a database of metadata, and metadata is just a data  
9 management jargon for data about data -- that is, the  
10 specifications. You know, you get a big stack of numbers.  
11 If you open up the computer file, you'll see a big stack of  
12 numbers, and this tells you what is in each column and how  
13 they were collected and what the limitations on the data  
14 are and that kind of thing, and they also tell you who's  
15 responsible for them. They give you some contact  
16 information. So metadata is getting to be -- is the  
17 buzzword, and for good reason. We really need it. So we  
18 invited someone to construct a database of metadata  
19 describing marine related databases from the northern Gulf  
20 of Alaska relevant to GEM. Working from past and present  
21 efforts of GEM; PICES -- which is the North Pacific Science  
22 Organization, it's an international treaty organization;  
23 the North Pacific Research Board, I'm sure you know; and  
24 the University of Alaska at Fairbanks Institute of Marine  
25 Science; and then, the Pacific Marine Environmental Lab,

1 which is a NOAA operation; and others, we were going to  
2 have this person compile a list of databases related to  
3 physical and biological features of the northern Gulf of  
4 Alaska.

5 Now, the GEM objective is to create a  
6 comprehensive, web accessible, geo-referenced database of  
7 the marine related physical and biological databases of the  
8 northern Gulf of Alaska. We're going to build on standards  
9 and systems already in place, such as the State of Alaska's  
10 Cooperatively Implemented Information Management System --  
11 that's CIIMMS -- and the STORET database, which is a  
12 database that's developed by EPA. The successful proposals  
13 were expected to describe an approach that assigns  
14 priorities for inclusion of databases based on a  
15 combination of factors such as length of time series, use  
16 in existing physical or biological models and, of course, a  
17 relevance to GEM. The PIs on this proposal are expected to  
18 work with the GEM staff -- particularly, our data systems  
19 manager -- to create a list of predefined criteria which  
20 assigns a quantitative value summarizing the importance of  
21 the data set to specific GEM efforts. And this is, of  
22 course, intended to promote cost efficiencies through  
23 cooperation and coordination and integration with other  
24 efforts in our area, as we talked about earlier today. So  
25 we view the metadatabase solicitation as very important.

1                   Now, in addition to the metadatabase  
2 solicitation, the invitation also asked for a pilot project  
3 to apply an existing database system which is being widely  
4 used throughout the United States to allow the public  
5 access to data that's held by agencies on oceanography and  
6 biology. It's called the Ocean Biological Information  
7 System, OBIS. These OBIS proposals were expected to show  
8 how to set up a regional OBIS node by pulling an instance  
9 of the OBIS database structure. You can tell I didn't  
10 write this. In addition, the proposal would create a plan  
11 to facilitate the absorption into the regional OBIS node of  
12 past, present and future marine taxonomic data collection  
13 efforts. So, just to summarize, OBIS provides advantages  
14 because OBIS already has the nomenclature and the software  
15 and the procedures set up.

16                   We were looking for somebody to come into  
17 our area, take a data set that would be relevant and show  
18 us how to set it up and use it. Once we get it working for  
19 one data set, we can make it work for any data set in our  
20 area and, particularly, for the GEM data stream when it  
21 begins flowing. So these are the types of proposals in the  
22 data management area that we were looking for, and we  
23 actually got three projects and recommended them for  
24 funding. Two of the three data management proposals  
25 recommended for funding directly further GEM objectives by

1 building the database of metadata describing marine related  
2 databases from the northern Gulf of Alaska -- this is  
3 Macklin's proposal -- and by implementing a pilot project  
4 to apply OBIS within the GEM region, and that's Kiefer's  
5 proposal. Both the metadatabase and OBIS projects are  
6 designed to make GEM data and the data of other sources  
7 needed by the GEM model readily and cheaply accessible.

8           The third data management proposal brings  
9 together and makes accessible much of the shoreline mapping  
10 data sets that have been gathered by GEM, the Cook Inlet  
11 Regional Citizens Advisory Council, and others. This is  
12 Saupe's proposal. Developing coordination among shoreline  
13 mapping efforts and making information about all the data  
14 accessible in one place on the web was recommended by a GEM  
15 sponsored workshop earlier this year.

16           And, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any  
17 deferred projects to discuss in this category. I'll move  
18 on to the lingering oil effects.

19           CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, yes.

20           DR. MUNDY: We're on page 27 for the table  
21 of recommendations on the lingering.....

22           MS. BALLARD Phil, can I point out?

23           CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure, Commissioner  
24 Ballard.

25           MS. BALLARD Some of us are reading off of



1 the materials sent earlier, and the pagination is  
2 different. I don't know if anyone else is having trouble  
3 following, but.....

4 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Well, we're moving in  
5 alphabetical order through the Work Plan, and there's a  
6 table of recommendations for each of the.....

7 MS. BALLARD Yeah, I'm okay. I just didn't  
8 know if anyone else was confused.....

9 DR. MUNDY: Yeah.

10 MS. BALLARD .....or if anybody on the  
11 phone was confused, if they had an earlier version. The  
12 earlier versions distributed were paginated slightly  
13 differently than the one you're reading off of. As far as  
14 I can tell, the text is identical.

15 DR. MUNDY: Is anyone on the phone having  
16 trouble with the pagination with the tables that I'm.....

17 (No audible response)

18 DR. MUNDY: Okay.

19 MS. BALLARD Okay.

20 DR. MUNDY: All right. The lingering oil  
21 effects, because of the amount of data we've got and the  
22 amount of history -- we've got 15 years of history, natural  
23 resources damage assessment studies, and restoration  
24 studies. We have singled out the lingering oil effects  
25 area and made it its own area within the GEM program. Over

1 a period of three years, we've now had three workshops to  
2 try to figure out exactly what was the best way to focus  
3 specific studies on understanding the fate and effects of  
4 Exxon Valdez oil in western Prince William Sound.

5 We invited proposals to address the effects  
6 of oil on populations of sea otters and harlequin ducks  
7 specifically because we have evidence of population level  
8 damage in sea otters and harlequin ducks, and we've been  
9 able to put together the evidence of exposure of sea otters  
10 and harlequin ducks to oiling and with the presence of oil  
11 from our earlier survey studies. So we're focusing our  
12 investigations in this area through the invitation on the  
13 Knight Island area. We're focusing it on sea otters.  
14 We're focusing it on harlequin ducks. And some of the  
15 Trustee Council members had the advantage of being in  
16 Seattle this past Friday for a meeting with the PIs where  
17 we heard the results of the 2003 field season.

18 So we want to point out that a couple of  
19 the key studies here -- particularly, that of Rice and  
20 Bodkin -- there are two Bodkin proposals. One is for a  
21 follow-up. It's a relatively small dollar proposal. It's  
22 recommendations on nearshore monitoring and how to  
23 integrate certain aspects of what we've learned in the past  
24 with the current proposal. But the Bodkin and Rice  
25 proposal were recommended for deferral on the advice of the

1 Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee because of  
2 questions that were outstanding at the time of the review.

3           Of those that we recommended, four of the  
4 five recommendations for funding relate directly to the  
5 Trustee Council's basic responsibilities to monitor the  
6 long-term effects of the oil spill and the status of  
7 injured species, and I'm referring here to the Fall, Irons,  
8 Rosenberg and Nelson proposals. The fifth, by Jeff Short,  
9 offers to address the tasks necessary to integrate long-  
10 term monitoring of lingering oil effects into GEM projects.  
11 Taken together, the five proposals address the most  
12 pressing needs of the Trustee Council for linking the  
13 investigations of the restoration program on injured  
14 species to the GEM program, and to meeting basic legal  
15 requirements for maintenance of physical data.

16           Now, as I mentioned, we have three deferred  
17 projects, which are most certainly relevant and would be  
18 useful. That is, to look at the fate of the Exxon Valdez  
19 oil outside of Prince William Sound on boulder armored  
20 beaches where we know that it occurs, but we haven't done  
21 this systematically. That's Irvine's proposal. And then,  
22 the Bodkin lingering oil proposal and the Rice proposal.  
23 These last two proposals may also provide information on  
24 damages that could not have been foreseen at the time of  
25 the settlement of the governments' civil claims against

1       what was then Exxon Corporation.

2                       CHAIRMAN RENKES:   So, that's Irvine and  
3       Bodkin?

4                       DR. MUNDY:   Right.  Irvine is the fate and  
5       effects of oil outside Prince William Sound.  Rice is fate  
6       and effects of oil inside Prince William Sound, and Bodkin  
7       is the biology.  It's otters and ducks.  So outstanding  
8       questions related to the deferral are basically what did we  
9       learn in the 2003 field season, and what could be learned  
10      in the 2004 field season that is essential to the interests  
11      of the Trustee Council?  As the Executive Director pointed  
12      out earlier in the meeting we have had that meeting, and we  
13      are working on a report to the Trustee Council on the  
14      outcome of the meeting.

15                      Mr. Chairman, I'm ready to move on to the  
16      modeling section.

17                      CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Okay.

18                      DR. MUNDY:   Okay.  Now, we were advised by  
19      the National Research Council Review Committee and by most  
20      of our advisors in this process to start trying to use the  
21      data that we've been collecting in an interdisciplinary  
22      biophysical model of the northern Gulf of Alaska.  This is  
23      a very ambitious undertaking, but when you step back and  
24      you look at it you realize that many agencies already have  
25      physical models of the northern Gulf of Alaska.  They

1 already have oceanographic models. And, in addition, quite  
2 a few Federal agencies already have biological models of  
3 the northern Gulf of Alaska. The challenge here is to put  
4 the models that exist for our area together and to start  
5 using these to answer questions about the oil spill and  
6 about the environmental effects of the oil spill. So  
7 that's the thrust of this modeling section.

8           Where we are now is that we have a fairly  
9 rich pool of modelers who sit at State and Federal agencies  
10 and they, for one reason or another, are not talking to  
11 each other and certainly not talking to each other about  
12 solving problems that are relevant to the Trustee Council.  
13 So we put out a proposal. We asked for a team of modelers  
14 to basically set up a community for us that would help pull  
15 in existing models and modelers and focus them on the  
16 questions that are of interest to the Trustee Council that  
17 are defined in the Science Plan, and we actually did get  
18 two proposals. They are related. Again, this is similar  
19 to the Finney/Honnold situation where we have two  
20 researchers at different institutions, and administratively  
21 it's just easier to run two different proposals rather than  
22 putting them in the same proposal. So the McNutt and  
23 Schumacher proposals are basically describing complementary  
24 activities designed to assemble the team necessary to  
25 produce the GEM biophysical model, and to conduct the

1 workshops necessary to begin the consensus building process  
2 in the scientific and other types of communities for these  
3 models. We expect that the community assembled by McNutt  
4 and Schumacher will be able to provide guidance to the  
5 EVOS, STAC and staff on how to craft future invitations for  
6 proposals in support of the modeling effort and in support  
7 of all of our other efforts and to contribute for  
8 development of invitation for proposals for monitoring in  
9 the four habitat types.

10 We have no deferred proposals in this  
11 category, Mr. Chairman. I'm now ready to move on to the  
12 nearshore.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

14 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
15 just can't quite resist the need that I have to argue that  
16 these various modelers do talk to each other and the fact  
17 that they haven't developed a universal model that works  
18 for the universe isn't because they don't talk to each  
19 other and I'll argue that more over a beer or something  
20 some other time, because I think there is coordination.  
21 But my specific question would be if this is an  
22 infrastructure model or a system developed coordination or  
23 cooperation between the various models that may have been  
24 developed exactly correctly independently because of a  
25 whole bunch of reasons, how does this relate to

1 Schumacher's proposal to the North Pacific Research Board  
2 to develop an infrastructure model relating models from the  
3 different agencies? You know, I know I'm on that Board, so  
4 I should know the answer, but I've got to have help.

5 MS. BALLARD But the rest of us don't, so  
6 thank you for asking.

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

8 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Dr.  
9 Balsiger. The universal model, I think, will remain  
10 illusory for some time now. We're hoping that we can get  
11 them to take all of these wonderful sort of hypothetical  
12 models that everybody has got rolling around out there and  
13 forge them into something that will work for us, you know,  
14 in our area and in our specific questions. So they do talk  
15 to each other, but they talk to each other much better when  
16 they're being paid to do so. So the communication is much  
17 more effective.

18 MS. BALLARD There you have it.

19 DR. MUNDY: Then, I believe that Dr.  
20 Schumacher's -- Two Crow's model for the North Pacific  
21 Research Board is basically the same thing he's doing for  
22 us, except that the geographic scope of the North Pacific  
23 Research Board effort is, of course, much broader, and  
24 we're hoping that some economies and some efficiencies of  
25 scale have been provided to the North Pacific Research

1 Board as a result of our effort.

2 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 MS. BALLARD A couple of questions. Is  
4 this Two Crow?

5 DR. MUNDY: Yes.

6 MS. BALLARD Is Schumacher Two Crow?

7 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please.

9 MS. BALLARD Well, there's two parts to the  
10 question. One is the private enterprise with whom he's  
11 associated, and what is the Alaska university with whom  
12 Lynn McNutt is associated?

13 DR. MUNDY: Okay. Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Please, uh-huh.

15 DR. MUNDY: Two Crow is a former NOAA  
16 employer, a physical oceanographer who was known as Dr.  
17 James Schumacher, who is one of the most respected physical  
18 oceanographers in the North Pacific. After his retirement  
19 from NOAA, he adopted the name Two Crow, and that's the  
20 name he prefers to be known by now. And, as I say, he's a  
21 private consultant. So Two Crow Enterprises is his -- he's  
22 a.....

23 MS. BALLARD So the private enterprise is  
24 just him?

25 DR. MUNDY: It's a sole proprietor, as far



1 as I know. The university that Lynn McNutt is associated  
2 with is the University of Alaska Fairbanks Geophysical  
3 Institute.

4 MS. BALLARD Okay. Thanks.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Please proceed.

6 DR. MUNDY: Okay, Mr. Chairman. I'll now  
7 move to the nearshore area. As I mentioned, the nearshore  
8 area scientifically is one of the most advanced areas where  
9 we have the clearest picture of what it is we're trying to  
10 do. That's by no means clear totally at this point, and we  
11 were able to start quite a few of these projects during the  
12 second half of FY 03 under what we call GEM Phase II. So  
13 we invited proposals to analyze the information needed to  
14 support resource and environmental management decisions for  
15 human activities in the nearshore. The proposals were  
16 asked to build on the GEM program document and analyze  
17 information needed to support resource and environmental  
18 management decisions for a range of human activities, such  
19 as oil and gas development, seafood processing, tourism and  
20 recreation.

21 Now, we also asked people to work in close  
22 cooperation with State and Federal agencies that are  
23 actively engaged in resource and environmental management  
24 activities and, reviewing the current scientific  
25 literature, the analysis was expected to identify gaps by

1 comparing information needed by managers to that actually  
2 available. So we expected primarily to add some new  
3 dimensions to our nearshore program. We felt that the  
4 basic biological information on invertebrates and fish and  
5 mammals in the nearshore was fairly well developed, but we  
6 had some areas such as seafood waste discharge where those  
7 parameters are not in the monitoring program and we wanted  
8 to incorporate those. But we also certainly wanted to  
9 continue the projects that were started during FY 03.

10 So we have five nearshore proposals  
11 recommended for funding, and most of you will find those on  
12 page 30 for the table. But, in any event, they follow  
13 right on the modeling that I just talked about. We expect  
14 these to lead to designs for nearshore monitoring stations  
15 and strengthened community involvement in nearshore  
16 investigations -- these are Bishop, Konar and Ruesink --  
17 and we expect these to continue and provide results to us  
18 so that we can set up monitoring stations in FY 2005 or  
19 2006. One of these projects' -- that's the Bodkin --  
20 nearshore proposal is a conclusion of an effort to build a  
21 geographically referenced database of past nearshore  
22 investigations to guide site selection and design of  
23 nearshore monitoring stations. So, again, we're fairly  
24 well advanced in the nearshore program, and we're looking  
25 at trying to figure out where we're going to put these

1 monitoring stations. The fifth project recommended for  
2 funding -- this is by Thorne -- adds the dimension of  
3 seafood waste discharge monitoring to research into the  
4 design of nearshore monitoring stations not present in any  
5 of the other nearshore projects. So this is a human impact  
6 that's certainly of concern to coastal communities, and we  
7 didn't have the parameters that would normally be monitored  
8 there in our other nearshore studies and are interested to  
9 know how to incorporate those. So, taken together, the  
10 five nearshore proposals recommended for funding provide a  
11 strong start to implementing the nearshore monitoring  
12 program, making it likely that the nearshore will be the  
13 first of the habitat types to enter the monitoring phase  
14 envisioned in the Science Plan.

15           The presence of a nearshore synthesis  
16 effort in FY 2004 -- and that's Eckert, in the synthesis  
17 section we'll be discussing shortly -- combined with  
18 earlier planning efforts that were funded by the Trustee  
19 Council led by Carl Schoch, Ginney Eckert, Tom Dean and Jim  
20 Bodkin, makes the nearshore habitat the most advanced. As  
21 a result of these five projects, the synthesis project, and  
22 their precursors, the call for nearshore monitoring  
23 implementation proposals could be part of the FY 2006  
24 invitation for proposals.

25           Now, we have two deferred projects that

1 I'll address, and we feel that these could well be added to  
2 the program and make it stronger. Addition of one of these  
3 two deferred projects would initiate the much needed formal  
4 coordination of nearshore mapping efforts, and this is the  
5 Couvillion proposal. This was recommended by a workshop  
6 that we held earlier looking for suggestions on how to put  
7 things together. It was successful, for example, in  
8 getting the Alyeska data from shoreline mapping that we've  
9 never had before made available to everyone. But,  
10 unfortunately, this was not part of the Science Plan, and  
11 to get under the \$5 million cap, we moved to defer anything  
12 that wasn't explicitly mentioned in the Science Plan. We  
13 feel very positive about the Couvillion project, and if  
14 money is made available to fund some deferred projects we  
15 would put that very high on the list. And this kind of  
16 support goes well beyond that provided, but would be  
17 complementary to this low cost website that Susan Saupe is  
18 going to put up that I talked about earlier under data  
19 management.

20 The other deferred project is looking more  
21 and more time sensitive now that we've had our lingering  
22 oil spill meeting in Seattle, and that is the Devons'  
23 project that was deferred. We've been exploring a  
24 partnership with the RCAC. We funded them last year on  
25 their LTEMP project to get some ownership in the data, and

1 we think that there's quite a bit that can be done with the  
2 LTEMP project based on what we learned in Seattle just this  
3 past Friday to help us understand what's going on with the  
4 areas that are still heavily oiled down on Knight Island  
5 and some of the biological results that we're seeing down  
6 there. So we have a fairly clear idea now of how the LTEMP  
7 project might be augmented and modified to serve the  
8 purposes of the Trustee Council, and that's what we were  
9 looking for. So those are the two deferred projects,  
10 Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

12 DR. MUNDY: I'll now move into the  
13 synthesis area. The synthesis area is one that we view as  
14 being highly important because this takes off where the GEM  
15 program document scientific background left off. We made  
16 an effort during the early stages of the GEM program to  
17 pull together all of the relevant scientific information to  
18 find out what projects were being funded, what agencies  
19 were doing what, and to bring all this information together  
20 and focus it on developing the gaps that we've identified  
21 and used to prioritize our activities in the Science Plan.  
22 Now, we would like to make sure that we are incorporating  
23 the most up-to-date information from the broad scientific  
24 literature into our activities; but, also, making good use  
25 of the information being produced. We're going to be

1 producing information from the GEM program, and we want to  
2 make sure that we have a mechanism in place to bring that  
3 information to bear on designing our program and holding  
4 down our costs and making sure that we're measuring exactly  
5 what we should be measuring. So the synthesis was invited  
6 to -- envisioned sort of having a senior researcher at a  
7 government agency or faculty member assisted by a junior  
8 assistant or a graduate student who would work with us and  
9 develop a synthesis document and come to the annual meeting  
10 and present the latest results in these areas to the annual  
11 meeting and then, every two to three years, publish a paper  
12 that we could point to in the scientific literature that  
13 would show people what we were doing. We think this is  
14 probably a very good way to proceed and keep things  
15 relevant, because the cost of these projects are typically  
16 quite reasonable. Unfortunately, we only got a very  
17 limited response in the synthesis area. I don't what the  
18 problem is here, but we're not connecting.

19 We did recommend two proposals for funding,  
20 and we see these as essential to guiding the development of  
21 the Science Plan. But one of these is an ongoing project  
22 -- one that was started earlier -- and it's by Dr. Bob  
23 Spies for synthesis of restoration information. We got a  
24 brand new proposal that was very timely, fortunately, from  
25 Eckert to do the nearshore. And, as I say, we're very far

1 ahead in the nearshore efforts, and the fact that she  
2 stepped forward and agreed to do the synthesis effort at  
3 this time works out very well for us. One of the reasons  
4 that Bob Spies' document is expected to be very useful to  
5 us is that in preparing the GEM program document we relied  
6 mostly on published literature -- from the scientific  
7 literature, and at that time -- the time we were doing that  
8 synthesis, which was concluded in FY 2001 -- the results  
9 from our major restoration ecological studies -- the Sound  
10 Ecosystem Assessment, the APEX Predators and the Nearshore  
11 Vertebrate Predators were really not available to us in  
12 published form. So we're hoping that the Spies synthesis  
13 effort will help us take advantage of that restoration  
14 information, particularly.

15 Now, we had a watershed synthesis proposal,  
16 which also would have been timely. It would have been very  
17 useful to us, if not this year then certainly shortly, and  
18 that is the Merritt proposal for watershed synthesis. But  
19 there were enough questions about the methods and the  
20 approach that we felt that funding at this time --  
21 recommending a direct fund was not appropriate, and we  
22 asked for a deferral to -- perhaps we can work out an  
23 arrangement. There is a deferred project in this area.  
24 It's labeled synthesis, one more, and it's the Mann  
25 project, and the Mann project is a kind of synthesis. It's

1 a long-term synthesis project looking at geologic  
2 information from lake cores and so forth. It's a very good  
3 project, but it wasn't exactly something that we felt was  
4 time sensitive. It's very good data. These are excellent  
5 researchers. They've published in places like Nature and  
6 Science, and the Public Advisory Committee strongly urged  
7 us to reconsider our do not fund on this. We added this to  
8 the deferred project list, in the event that -- because  
9 it's something we definitely could use. It's a longtime  
10 time series on salmon and would definitely be relevant to  
11 salmon management, but fiscal constraints really precluded  
12 a direct fund recommendation.

13 With that, Mr. Chairman, my presentation on  
14 the FY 2004 Work Plan is concluded.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

16 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, if I could.  
17 Dr. Mundy, on that last section, the Spies proposal -- the  
18 part that we have in the Work Plan -- and, if you read  
19 through the STAC recommendation, it kind of -- perhaps you  
20 could help me a little bit with this. It says that this  
21 proposal falls under the list of proposals submitted last  
22 year for multiple years but still needed to submit a  
23 proposal this year. So it's the same proposal as last  
24 year. We funded it last year. And I understand it's not  
25 done, but can you give us a little bit of the funding



1 history? I seem to have a recollection we funded this the  
2 previous two years, and there's no indication of progress,  
3 and I'm wondering total -- I can't tell what the total  
4 funding is, based on this request for \$201,000.

5 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please.

7 DR. MUNDY: Yeah, you're correct. We have  
8 funded this in the past, and one of the questions that we  
9 did have was what kind of progress was being made. We  
10 wanted to make sure that if we invested an additional year  
11 that we were going to get a product. We have, of course,  
12 had a long working relationship with Dr. Spies, so we're  
13 not too concerned in that regard. But if you'll note the  
14 Executive Director's recommendation down at the bottom of  
15 -- I hope it's page 107 of the draft Work Plan.....

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

17 DR. MUNDY: .....and we've asked and  
18 received that the proposal revise to incorporate  
19 milestones, timeline, detailed budgets and a current  
20 outline of the manuscript. And the requirement was met in  
21 a number of ways, but one of the ways was all of the  
22 products -- the work products, the chapters for this book  
23 -- are now on a website. It's password protected because  
24 the authors are fairly sensitive about this, but the  
25 Executive Director and I have both been able to visit this

1 website, look at the contents of these chapters and satisfy  
2 ourselves that serious progress is being made.

3           There are quite a few what I would describe  
4 as top academicians involved in this writing effort, and so  
5 the schedule is not exactly as crisp and tight as we would  
6 like it to be. But we believe we are making progress, and  
7 we also have the controls in place to make sure that we get  
8 a product at the end of it.

9           CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

10           MR. BALSIGER: Just to follow up then, at  
11 the end of it would be at the end of this \$207,000 funded  
12 project, and we wouldn't expect to see this again next year  
13 -- looking for money -- even if it's not completed?

14           DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

15           CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please.

16           DR. MUNDY: It should be com -- absolutely  
17 not, but it will be completed.

18           MR. BALSIGER: Thank you.

19           CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard.

20           MS. BALLARD I'm confused about this book.  
21 Who owns the rights to this book, and who will receive the  
22 royalties from it?

23           DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

24           CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, please.

25           DR. MUNDY: Commissioner Ballard, normally

1 in a scientific publication the -- you know, such as  
2 Springer Verlag or something like that, the scientists  
3 contribute the copyright to the publisher. So I'm not -- I  
4 believe that the American Fisheries Society has been  
5 approached. For example, the American Fisheries Society  
6 may be the publisher of this book. If they are the  
7 publisher of this book, they would keep the copyright.  
8 They are a non-profit professional organization,  
9 professional society. They are not a for profit  
10 organization. That's the way scientific publishing goes.  
11 But, in response to your question, I don't think that's  
12 part of the contract. I don't think that's an issue that  
13 we've addressed in the current contract, and perhaps it  
14 should be.

15 MS. BALLARD I realize I'm coming in many  
16 years late on it, but it seems very bizarre to me that  
17 we're paying for research in response to proposals to  
18 provide information to the Trustee Council which is then  
19 going to aggrandize somebody else in its publication. It  
20 just seems very odd to me. I don't get it.

21 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, may I respond?

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, please.

23 DR. MUNDY: Yes. I can see that point of  
24 view, Commissioner Ballard. However, what we get out of it  
25 is we have all of these results that are now in a lot of

1 different final reports and a lot of different scientific  
2 journals. We have that in one place. It's published and  
3 it's made available to libraries and people can call us and  
4 we can tell them where to purchase a copy. And, as I said,  
5 typically the -- I can tell you as an author of scientific  
6 publications myself the fame and glory aspect of it is  
7 really heavily overrated. I mean, it's true that the  
8 copyright does reside with the publisher. But, again, the  
9 authors don't get any royalties out of this and, in  
10 general, I doubt that scientific publishers actually make  
11 very much money out of these things. And certainly, if  
12 it's a publisher like the American Fisheries Society, it is  
13 a non-profit, a private non-profit, and they're not allowed  
14 to make money out of it.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy. I'm sorry, do  
16 you have another question?

17 MS. BALLARD I guess I'll just conclude my  
18 conversation with Phil on this subject by saying that I  
19 think as EVOS has evolved away from fulfilling the  
20 specifications of a natural resources damages program and  
21 into a research program we've taken on characteristics that  
22 are foreign and strange -- at least to me, as the State  
23 Trustee -- and I'll just need to learn and understand that  
24 better. In a typical restoration program, you wouldn't be  
25 in this situation, I don't think. So I suppose there's a

1 good deal of learning and understanding I still need to do.  
2 It doesn't make me feel anymore comfortable.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy, I was just  
4 wondering. Following up on that question, it made me  
5 think. The synthesis is a product that's being produced  
6 for the EVOS Trustee Council. We're paying for it, and  
7 they're providing it to us, right?

8 DR. MUNDY: Are you speaking of the Spies  
9 synthesis?

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, the Spies synthesis.

11 DR. MUNDY: Yes, that's correct.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And so the responsibility  
13 to negotiate whatever our arrangement is to select the  
14 publisher and negotiate the arrangement for the publisher  
15 that would fall to the Trustee Council, since it's going to  
16 be our -- we'll own, essentially, the product?

17 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, that's not the  
18 current arrangement. In the case of the other book that we  
19 have out there -- the book that describes the restoration  
20 program, Mission Without a Map, that was the case.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh.

22 DR. MUNDY: In this case, it being a  
23 scientific publication -- and Dr. Spies is the editor of a  
24 number of different scientific journals, so he has a lot of  
25 experience in this area. And so we had not thought about

1 doing that ourselves, because that requires quite a bit of  
2 legwork and, also, quite a few contacts because, as I say,  
3 this is not generally viewed by publishers as a moneymaking  
4 venture. So it would be more or less trying to find  
5 somebody who would take it, rather than getting people to  
6 bid on it. So that could be the arrangement, if that was  
7 the Trustee Council's wish. However, that is not the  
8 current arrangement.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any other questions about  
10 the summary of the Work Plan.

11 MS. PEARCE: I have one related to the  
12 lingering oil meeting and report on Friday. Did I  
13 understand that you are now working on a report to the  
14 Council from that report -- from the Friday meeting?

15 MS. PHILLIPS: That we will prepare.....

16 MS. PEARCE: That you are?

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

18 MS. PEARCE: Will that include  
19 recommendations of some of the projects that were on that  
20 deferred until that meeting happened last -- to move over  
21 to the fund list?

22 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes.

24 DR. MUNDY: Yeah, you used the pronoun you,  
25 and that's -- I'm not working on that report. That will be

1 Dr. Spies' responsibility to come up with that as Chair of  
2 the Lingering Oil Subcommittee.

3 MS. PEARCE: But not recommendations for  
4 it?

5 DR. MUNDY: Well, we will -- I believe  
6 that, in principle, that as a result of the meeting that we  
7 are -- and I'm just giving you my opinion as the Science  
8 Director. I believe that the recommendation on funding the  
9 Rice and the Bodkin proposal will be positive. However, we  
10 don't know what they will be doing at this point in time.  
11 In other words, the specifics of their sampling protocols  
12 for the 2004 season are still up in the air, and I  
13 discussed that with the PIs late Friday afternoon, and we  
14 agree that that is the case. The PIs themselves are not  
15 exactly based -- they haven't sifted through all the  
16 information that we got, you know, as a part of the  
17 discussion themselves. So that's one of the reasons for a  
18 deferred recommendation. We can't put a contract together  
19 because we don't know exactly what the deliverables  
20 are.....

21 MS. PEARCE: Okay.

22 DR. MUNDY: .....at this time. But I'm  
23 certain that there will be a positive recommendation on the  
24 funding at some point. It's just that we haven't been able  
25 to work out the details of the contract yet.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy, I'm a little  
2 bit lost coming in in the middle of a process as we have,  
3 and there was a comment made in the public comment section  
4 of the meeting about FY 03 funds, FY 03 funds maybe left  
5 over, relooking at deferred projects from FY 03, and then  
6 the possibility of funding those projects. Could you  
7 explain that to me? I'm not sure I understand.

8                   DR. MUNDY: Okay. Yes, Mr. Chairman.  
9 First of all, we don't have deferred projects from FY 03  
10 that are on the table today. We have projects that were  
11 started relatively late in FY 03 that are proposed as  
12 continuing projects, and all of those, I believe, do have  
13 fund recommendations on them. The Trustee Council has  
14 before it the issue -- in putting together our Work Plan,  
15 we worked under the assumption of a \$5 million annual cap  
16 on spending. We also have brought to the Trustee Council's  
17 attention that due to differences in our operations in FY  
18 03 that were due to the transition to a new Executive  
19 Director and a new Trustee Council that we were unable to  
20 spend a very large portion of our budget. Nonetheless, we  
21 believe that if we were given the opportunity to -- and  
22 that money was authorized by the Trustee Council under the  
23 cap for that year, we felt that if -- we were understaffed  
24 and we had some delays, and we felt that if we were given  
25 the opportunity to spend that money that was lapsed



1 basically under the \$5 million cap in FY 03 in FY 04, we  
2 could get back up to speed. That is, we could regain the  
3 ground that was lost in FY 03, which is the reason that we  
4 didn't spend the money. There were things that we needed  
5 to do that we weren't doing. So we proposed the idea for  
6 the Trustee Council's consideration of the expenditure of  
7 the funds. We have an estimate of that. And, also, at the  
8 time of the original proposal, we didn't know exactly what  
9 it was -- we could do some back-of-the-envelope  
10 calculations -- but we do have a relatively precise  
11 estimate of that amount of money now.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Thank you.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: Greg -- Mr. Chairman, you'll  
14 see that that's for discussion in item number 6.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: All right.

16 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Commissioner Duffy.

18 MR. DUFFY: Thank you. Dr. Mundy, step  
19 back to our previous conversation about the scientific  
20 information we heard Friday in Seattle. If I as a Trustee  
21 Council member were inclined to support one of those  
22 projects that was deferred, whatever the category was, but  
23 yet we don't know what the Work Plan is, how would you  
24 suggest that the Trustee Council deal with that timing  
25 issue?

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

2 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah.

4 DR. MUNDY: Yes, Commissioner. In the  
5 past, the way that we've dealt with it is the staff will  
6 work with the PIs and we will bring that to you as soon as  
7 it's ready and it could be handled as part of a set of  
8 deferred proposals that you're now considering for funding.  
9 For example, as part of a telephone conference call or  
10 something like that. In other words, it would be something  
11 that's been approved in principle, something that's been  
12 approved in concept, but yet is not at the level where we  
13 can write a contract and specify the deliverables. When we  
14 get to that point, we would send that around to the  
15 Trustees, make you aware of that, and then you would need  
16 to -- as I say, this is what has happened in the past --  
17 and then you would need to schedule a vote on that.

18 MR. DUFFY: So we could signal our support  
19 at this meeting, if we were so inclined, if there was  
20 consensus reached on that among the Trustee Council  
21 members. At some point after the terms of the contract and  
22 the deliverables were negotiated you would come back to us,  
23 and we would give the thumbs up or thumbs down?

24 DR. MUNDY: (Nods affirmatively)

25 MR. DUFFY: Okay. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Commissioner  
2 Ballard.

3 MS. BALLARD Yeah. I'm glad we went back a  
4 little bit, because I want to go back to the two topics of  
5 the lingering oil and the synthesis work. One of the  
6 things that's uncomfortable for me is the concept of  
7 addressing important issues which fall right to our Trustee  
8 responsibilities, as outlined clearly in the legal  
9 documents and in the underlying law -- to mesh that with  
10 this we don't know what the PIs are going to do. We have  
11 to wait and see. These are very difficult paradigms for me  
12 to put together. I'm a regulator. I'm accustomed to  
13 figuring out what I've got to do and directing contractors  
14 to accomplish it. This has evolved into a research program  
15 in which we ask a question and wait for proposed answers  
16 and hope to find in those answers the tools we need to  
17 fulfill our responsibilities, and we had two fairly stern  
18 lectures this morning about our responsibilities as they  
19 pertain to being sponsors of research. And while I  
20 understand the frustration of the research community at  
21 the, perhaps, awkward behavior of the Trustee Council as  
22 sponsors of research, I find myself in an awkward situation  
23 as a Trustee and as a person responsible for some very  
24 clear direction under court order dealing with a situation  
25 where we don't know what we're going to hear, that we don't

1 know what tasks are going to be undertaken, and we don't  
2 know what work is going to be proposed, and I'm just sort  
3 of sharing with the rest of you. I suspect that the other  
4 new Trustees are having a bit of the same paradigm clash  
5 here as we work our way into it. In these two areas,  
6 particularly, the synthesis and the lingering oil, I really  
7 feel the responsibility to drive, not to follow. And I'm  
8 not sure how we're going to work that out, but here we are  
9 today trying to do that. That wasn't a question, Phil.  
10 You don't have to answer it.

11 DR. MUNDY: I was hoping you would say  
12 that.

13 MS. BALLARD Dr. Mundy, excuse me.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any further questions for  
15 Dr. Mundy?

16 (No audible response)

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: If not, that was a good  
18 presentation. Thank you.

19 DR. MUNDY: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And it might be helpful,  
21 I think, since we're going to have some discussion of this  
22 -- of the proposal and some Trustee discussions of  
23 consideration of individual studies as we go on for you to  
24 remain at the table, since we.....

25 DR. MUNDY: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I don't know what  
2 everybody else will bring up, but that way we can have some  
3 exchange. Is that okay with all the other Trustees?

4 IN UNISON: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Thanks. And I'll  
6 recognize Commissioner Duffy.

7 MR. DUFFY: Well, Mr. Chairman.....

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh, I'm sorry. Did.....

9 MR. DUFFY: .....question. We.....

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Hold on one second.  
11 Trustee Pearce, did you have a comment?

12 MS. PEARCE: I was going to ask if we could  
13 take a five-minute break?

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh. We could have a  
15 five-minute break. I think we'll take a five-minute break,  
16 and then we'll return.

17 (Off record - 1:42 P.M.)

18 (On record - 1:57 P.M.)

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. I think we're all  
20 back and ready to reconvene, and we were going to give  
21 Commissioner Duffy an opportunity to speak to -- you know,  
22 the State Trustees had gotten together and discussed the  
23 projects, and he's going to speak to sort of the State  
24 Trustees' review of the Work Plan as part of the next stage  
25 of the agenda, which is discussion and approval of the FY

1 2004 Work Plan.

2 MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just  
3 to reiterate, the State of Alaska Trustees have reviewed  
4 all of the projects proposed for the FY 04 Work Plan. In  
5 determining a set of recommendations for projects to be  
6 supported the State Trustees have carefully considered the  
7 terms of the civil settlement and Alaska law. In reviewing  
8 the proposed Work Plan, the State Trustees will use three  
9 criteria in coming to a perspective relative to the Work  
10 Plan. Those criteria were the project is directed towards  
11 the identification and quantification of any unknown or  
12 recently discovered impacts; number 2, the project is  
13 directed toward the long-term monitoring of ongoing direct  
14 impacts from the Exxon Valdez oil spill; and, number 3, the  
15 project directly supports State resource management  
16 decisions through applied research. Just a quick comment  
17 on that. I've heard a lot of comment about just saying  
18 that it was State resource management decisions through  
19 applied research. Keep in mind that was just the State's  
20 perspective. That particular provision could generally be  
21 resource management decisions through applied research for  
22 all agencies, not just State of Alaska.

23 The State really, at this point, as a  
24 Trustee we think we need to concentrate on an important  
25 part of what we're proposing, a synthesis of all the data.

1 We want to be sure the protocols and funding are in place  
2 for appropriate long-term monitoring for the presence and  
3 possible consequences of lingering oil. We are interested  
4 in the projects that enhance our ability to manage these  
5 resources in Prince William Sound. We tried to focus on  
6 completing multi-year work that is already well underway.  
7 We also want to maintain the sampling schedules for long-  
8 term projects, the repeat sampling on a cycle such as three  
9 or five years. The net result of our analysis of the  
10 proposed Work Plan is a proposed funding plan that meets  
11 our objectives. It is different and less expensive than  
12 the proposed Work Plan in front of us. However, every  
13 component of our proposal was peer reviewed and PAC  
14 reviewed through the well established EVOS process.

15 With that in mind, I would move to adopt  
16 the State's proposed list of projects, including the Adams  
17 community involvement project and the Finney watershed  
18 project. This proposal is a subset of the proposed Work  
19 Plan for consideration. I'm doing that in the form of a  
20 motion.

21 MS. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman, I would  
22 object.....

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Is there a.....

24 MS. BALLARD I'll second it so we can have  
25 the discussion.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Any discussion?

2 MS. PEARCE: I'd like to ask Dr. Mundy.....

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure.

4 MS. PEARCE: .....just to comment on the  
5 State's proposal.

6 MS. BALLARD Drew, I don't think anybody  
7 can hear you.

8 MS. PEARCE: Okay. I'm sorry. I'd like to  
9 ask Dr. Mundy to comment on the State's proposal. What do  
10 you see as -- if there are any losses?

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, Dr. Mundy, please  
12 go ahead. Go ahead.

13 DR. MUNDY: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
14 I have only had since Wednesday to look at this. However,  
15 as Commissioner Duffy said, every project that's on the  
16 State list has been through the peer review process. So  
17 the State is recommending a subset of what we recommended.  
18 My main concerns with doing only what was recommended in  
19 the State proposals is that I don't think that it's nearly  
20 enough, and I'm concerned that we would get down to a  
21 decision point, for example, later on under the court  
22 settlement and perhaps not have access to all of the  
23 information that we need to make a complete case. So I  
24 have, as I said, not sat down and looked specifically at  
25 each and every case. But, in general, what I did notice is



1 that we have a number of complementary areas that would  
2 indeed -- and the additional projects would support the  
3 State's criteria, as I understand them. And I think that  
4 in some cases, having had the benefit of the PAC, access to  
5 the PAC, the STAC and over 100 independent peer reviews of  
6 the individual projects, that we may have additional  
7 information available to us in our review processes, as I  
8 showed the spreadsheet this morning as an example -- we  
9 don't make that available to the public, we have that out  
10 there -- that might make it easier for the State Trustees  
11 to see how these three criteria have been applied in all of  
12 the projects that we're recommending to a greater or a  
13 lesser extent. I don't claim that every criteria applies  
14 to every project, but I think that there are quite a few  
15 projects that could be added to the State's list and that  
16 would be fully consistent with the criteria as applied by  
17 the State.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: This is just a question  
19 about one statement that you made. You said that we might  
20 get to a decision point in the court process where we would  
21 not be able to make a complete case, and I just wonder what  
22 you were referring to there. What decision point?

23 DR. MUNDY: Yes, Mr. Renkes. For example,  
24 we may be in the position of sending specific proposals --  
25 we may decide at the discretion, as I understand it, of the

1 Department of Law and the Department of Justice to send  
2 proposals to Exxon requesting that they pay for certain  
3 actions to remedy situations that were not foreseen at the  
4 time of the 1991.....

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So the reopener provision  
6 you're speaking of?

7 DR. MUNDY: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Which is the  
9 responsibility of the Federal and State governments  
10 separately and individually, but not really the  
11 responsibility of the Trustee Council?

12 DR. MUNDY: That's my understanding.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Just if I can, as the  
14 Chair, have an opportunity to comment also on the State's  
15 -- to me, how I characterize what we've come forward with  
16 here in my mind is a way of getting through the work here  
17 today in approving these projects. So we've done a careful  
18 review. We've tried to come together on some principles  
19 for projects that we believe that consensus can be achieved  
20 in funding and put a substantial list together. And maybe  
21 Commissioner Duffy and Commissioner Ballard can speak to  
22 sort of the subject matter organization of those  
23 categories, because I think the projects that are on the  
24 list kind of fit into four or so of the eight or so  
25 categories that you had while, outside those four

1 categories, there aren't. And so I think it's a -- you  
2 know, if you view this -- and I would encourage the other  
3 Trustees to view it as a step forward so we could take a  
4 group in a block, you know, and achieve consensus on them  
5 and then move to discuss some of the other items that are  
6 being put forward by the Executive Director for funding or  
7 deferral and take those up. And, as you say, maybe they  
8 meet the test or maybe they don't or maybe they require  
9 further discussion, but certainly it gets us toward our  
10 goal of getting through the Work Plan by identifying, you  
11 know, those things that in block we can achieve easy  
12 consensus on and then moving into the things that are  
13 harder to achieve consensus on where we maybe need further  
14 discussion. So, really, I believe that's the spirit of the  
15 State proposal, and it shouldn't be interpreted as  
16 something other than that. It's just a way of trying to  
17 get through our work here as a consensus decision body,  
18 which is a difficult thing to manage, and so we've tried to  
19 do as much homework ahead of time to reach that step. Dr.  
20 Balsiger.

21 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
22 Well, there's been a lot of homework done on this, of  
23 course, starting with the RFP -- well, starting before  
24 that. The GEM model was a child of a great deal of  
25 homework -- scientific input from the National Research

1 Council, from all of EVOS' public advisory groups and its  
2 statistical advisory group. Half of the academicians in  
3 Alaska worked on this, as well as many outside of Alaska,  
4 to start with the GEM program, which was reviewed two or  
5 three times by the Trustees and adopted and even reviewed  
6 by this particular group of Trustees at some depth, at  
7 least -- to some extent at least. Following that adoption  
8 of the GEM program, we put out the RFP, which also had a  
9 lot of homework behind it. It identified a whole series of  
10 criteria and requirements that we wanted to have under each  
11 little section of the plan. It identified what our top  
12 priorities were, and the public in good faith submitted its  
13 proposals expecting that this was a genuine RFP that we  
14 were hoping to accomplish the work under that we had laid  
15 out in the RFP. Once again, all of those projects that  
16 were submitted were subjected to a lot of homework. There  
17 were some 100 scientists that participated in the peer  
18 review of those projects. There were some deliberation by  
19 the PAG and by the STAC, a lot of work by Dr. Mundy as the  
20 Science Director and also by our Executive Director, which  
21 has arrived at a package of recommended projects that  
22 further what the Trustees said they wanted to do all the  
23 way through the GEM program, the RFP, et cetera. So I  
24 think that changing criteria now and identifying only three  
25 criteria by which we might approve projects has changed the

1 game a lot.

2 I think it's a tough role to adopt as a  
3 starting point these 20 or so projects the State has  
4 recommended and then add to it. I'm prepared to offer an  
5 alternate motion which would be to adopt the Work Plan as  
6 put forward by the Science Director and the Executive  
7 Director and, starting with that, amend that by removing  
8 projects that don't seem to fit the plan because these  
9 projects have been put together with quite a bit of  
10 thought. I reviewed those from the time that we had the  
11 last version of the Work Plan, and it makes some sense to  
12 me. And I'm not saying the State's proposal is  
13 nonsensical, but we've just had that over the weekend, and  
14 I think it's a better place to start. So I'm sorry if I've  
15 messed up the procedure here, but I wanted to offer an  
16 alternate motion and I'm afraid I've already spoken to it.  
17 So if I'm out of order, you can tell me so.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, you are a little  
19 out of order because there is a motion and it's been  
20 seconded and we're discussing that motion. You can move to  
21 amend the motion, and we could vote on it by consensus.  
22 But, absent that, then we need to stick on the motion we're  
23 on.

24 MR. BALSIGER: Well, I would think that  
25 Roberts Rules of Order would allow me to offer an alternate

1 motion at this time. But, again, you're chairing it, and  
2 I.....

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, I don't know. We  
4 can ask for a -- my understanding is that we have -- that  
5 once a motion is on the table, we have to move to table it.  
6 Otherwise, once it's been seconded it's on the table and we  
7 have to move to table it in order to consider an alternate  
8 motion. Now, you can move to, you know, amend the motion  
9 to.....

10 MR. BALSIGER: I don't think that.....

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....to change the  
12 procedure, but -- or a substitute, but.....

13 MR. BALSIGER: I'm sorry. I probably had  
14 the wrong terms, so I'm taking your advice. I would move  
15 to amend the motion to consider the Executive Director's  
16 Work Plan as opposed to the State's Work Plan. That would  
17 be my motion to amend Mr. Duffy's motion.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Well, I think we  
19 have to dispose -- we could take that up after we've  
20 disposed of the motion that's on the table.

21 MR. BALSIGER: I don't see how that would  
22 work, Mr. Chairman.

23 MS. BALLARD We've got a room full of  
24 lawyers. What do they think? No Roberts Rules lawyers out  
25 there?

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Once you have.....

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, I don't know that  
3 it does. You know, just in the discussion of your motion  
4 and the discussion of the underlying motion I don't know if  
5 it really does us any good to tie ourselves up into some  
6 sort of procedural knot or game. You know, I would just  
7 voice my opinion, is it doesn't really make a difference.  
8 You know, I think that the goal is here as a consensus body  
9 to reach consensus on funding these research projects that  
10 the Trustees have in front of it. And while a lot of work  
11 has been done, the staff has not recommended funding all of  
12 the projects that were submitted pursuant to the RFP, and  
13 certainly there's a role for the Trustees in evaluating the  
14 recommendations of the staff. And that's really what this  
15 meeting is about, I think, is to evaluate the  
16 recommendations of the staff. And if, you know, Trustees  
17 are going to express themselves about the criteria they're  
18 individually or even collectively applying in evaluating  
19 the recommendations of the staff, I don't think it changes  
20 the rules of the game midstream. I don't think that it  
21 violates the public process that's occurred before, and I  
22 don't think really that there was a new plan to evaluate.  
23 And so the matter -- you know, the amount of notice or time  
24 that there's been to evaluate a plan is sort of, I think,  
25 irrelevant to the process because no new projects have been

1 submitted. I mean, we've come in with a position to say  
2 let's clear the decks of, you know, almost all of the  
3 projects in four categories of the Work Plan and then let's  
4 talk about the other four categories and try to come to  
5 some agreement in those areas. So that's how I see what  
6 we're trying to do here. Maybe we can come to some sort of  
7 consensus about the process we should use to achieve it.  
8 We could go section by section of the Work Plan. But I  
9 think to move all of the Work Plan and then work our way  
10 back item by item is going to be a very difficult consensus  
11 building process. I think if we can begin to agree on the  
12 things that we can agree on section by section, or in  
13 multiple sections, we'll have a much better success as a  
14 group funding projects today. Those are my thoughts.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Duffy.

16 MR. DUFFY: Go ahead. Joe first, please.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Joe.

18 MR. MEADE: Thank you. My concern to move  
19 forward with a subset for me is probably more procedural.  
20 I have spent a couple of days being a new commissioner or a  
21 new Trustee to get myself knowledgeable of what the  
22 Executive Director has been recommending that we move  
23 forward, and here today, without having digital access to  
24 any information, this morning was the first that I learned  
25 that there was potentially a subset of information and a



1 different set of criteria. So I'm not at all prepared to  
2 be able to do any decision making today from a process that  
3 would introduce a subset of criteria or focus on just  
4 approving a subset of projects. What I would need to be  
5 able to do that would be to be able to ask the Executive  
6 Director and the Science Director the trade-offs. You  
7 know, if we looked at these subsets, how would these affect  
8 these other projects? As I have been led to understand it,  
9 this package has been brought forward to us through science  
10 peer review. It's been strongly supported by our PAC, by  
11 our STAC and that, through that process, they've weeded  
12 out, if you will, the projects that were not as pertinent  
13 and they've collected together those that have the most  
14 relevancy and some of them are interdependent upon others.  
15 And so the piece that I would struggle with being able to  
16 discern if we take out projects would be to be able to have  
17 some trade-off analysis to know what we are gaining or  
18 losing with the holistic or the larger outcome of the  
19 overall GEM. For me, without that analysis or without  
20 having the ability to read through a new proposal I kind of  
21 feel like I'm sitting in the dark.

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Let me ask Dr. Mundy just  
23 to follow up, Joe, on our comment. What would be lost if  
24 we discussed the projects in the categories that you  
25 discussed them in your introduction? For example, if we

1 took Alaska Coastal Current as one subject and discussed  
2 the research in that area and either approved it or didn't  
3 approve it and then went to community involvement, data  
4 management, lingering oil effects. I mean, your Work Plan  
5 is divided that way. Is the nearshore research and the  
6 lingering oil effect research interdependent with each  
7 other, or are these distinct categories that we could  
8 evaluate by themselves?

9 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I'm  
10 going to have to give you the kind of answer that a  
11 scientist gives that policy people just hate. Yes, these  
12 are distinct categories and they hang together and they  
13 have their own interdependencies within the group. There  
14 are certain interdependencies among these major categories.  
15 As you point out, the nearshore area is related to the  
16 lingering oil investigations. But, also, there are certain  
17 aspects of the ACC that are also important to the lingering  
18 oil investigations, which are more or less a focal point  
19 for our plan at this point in time. So that's my answer.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard, you  
21 haven't had a chance.

22 MS. BALLARD Well, I think Kevin was next,  
23 but.....

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, we had a tie, so I  
25 was.....

1 MS. BALLARD A tie? Oh.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....going to you.

3 MR. DUFFY: And I lose.

4 MS. BALLARD You lose. All right. The  
5 discussion we're having is part science, and it's part  
6 governance, and it's one of the challenges I guess we're  
7 going to have in our effort to gain consensus. We must  
8 come to every meeting prepared to hear one another,  
9 regardless of whether we had advance notice of what each of  
10 us were to say. We cannot be simply a rubber stamp, or we  
11 should dissolve, and the research effort should be  
12 separately organized and funded and have a life of its own.  
13 If we are going to fulfill our responsibilities -- or, at  
14 least, I feel as a State Trustee I must be able to sit here  
15 and use my judgment informed by my responsibilities at DEC  
16 and on behalf of the State without warning. I mean, we  
17 must be prepared to hear one another's discomfort and new  
18 suggestions. So I urge each of us to have that attitude.  
19 We did try to give some advance warning of our concerns,  
20 and I would re-emphasize that they are more about wishing  
21 to adhere closely to the job set to us by the settlement  
22 documents than about looking to the future, regardless of  
23 how promising future work and new knowledge may be. My  
24 participation as a State Trustee in forming the conclusion  
25 that we came to that we were not prepared to endorse all

1 the projects in Gail's proposal had nothing to do with the  
2 worthiness of the research and everything to do with my  
3 review of the situation we find ourselves in with a  
4 settlement that derived from some legal responsibilities  
5 that had specific requirements for injuries that were  
6 calculated, damages that were paid. The damages were  
7 intended to be used for restoration, and I had a  
8 responsibility to assure as one of the Trustees that that  
9 had been accomplished. I have tried -- and on the agenda  
10 later today is my request to Gail that we be given a  
11 presentation of the entire scope of the research community  
12 in the Alaskan -- not just in Alaska, but research that is  
13 funded in this area. We are not the only funding source.  
14 We are not the only science program. We are not the only  
15 actor in the let's gain important useful information for  
16 future decision making. We are the sole and only actor in  
17 the Exxon Valdez oil spill restoration project, and it's  
18 that that I want to focus our attention on. I am not  
19 prepared -- it's very clear from the three or four meetings  
20 we've had I'm not prepared to move forward until I feel  
21 better founded in finishing the job that I think we've been  
22 given.

23 MR. MEADE: Might I offer a response?

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure.

25 MR. MEADE: I want to say I wholly respect

1 and concur with your interest to keep focused the research  
2 work ahead of us, and I think in a bureaucracy it's easy to  
3 see scope creep. It's easy to see -- well, it's easy to  
4 see scope creep. I think that says it pretty well. What I  
5 would like to figure is a way that, in my uninformed  
6 position -- I don't have the background with EVOS, nor are  
7 a lot of the -- you know, many of these issues aren't as  
8 pertinent to my natural resource land management  
9 background. What I'd like to be able to gain awareness of  
10 as we make recommendations to defund certain proposals, I'd  
11 like to understand the trade-offs, and that would be the  
12 interaction I'd like to have. Rather than adopting a  
13 certain subset, if we had some ability with an objective  
14 staff being able to give us insights, I'd like to be able  
15 to understand those insights to what our trade-offs are so  
16 that I'm not making or helping to frame a decision that I  
17 wouldn't be able to offer an informed judgment from. So  
18 I'm in concurrence with the ideal of keeping it focused.  
19 I'd just like to have a process established where we could  
20 collaborate and gain objective input from a knowledgeable  
21 staff to guide our awareness of what our trade-offs are as  
22 we make those decisions so that we don't -- I don't want to  
23 make a foolish decision, not that any of the State's are  
24 foolish. I just want to make an informed recommendation or  
25 decision on any specific item.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, Dr. Mundy, are we  
2     able to do that today, to have that kind of insight as we  
3     look at each research project and the merits of funding it  
4     or not funding it?

5                   DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to  
6     do my best. I can't, of course, promise to answer every  
7     question that's going to be put to us. But, as I say, I  
8     believe the FY 2004 Work Plan as proposed is fully  
9     consistent with the three criteria that have been put out  
10    by the State Trustees, and I'm prepared to discuss the  
11    merits of each proposal based on those three criteria if  
12    that is the wish of the Council.

13                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Drew.

14                  MS. PEARCE: Actually, I think.....

15                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh.

16                  MR. DUFFY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

17                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh. Commissioner Duffy.

18                  MR. MEADE: It was a tie.

19                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sorry.

20                  MR. DUFFY: I should be in a position of  
21    suggesting a solution to move forward on this, and just in  
22    taking some notes thinking about what the State Trustees  
23    had come up with, it appears to me in terms of the  
24    categories for the RFP process -- on the watershed, on the  
25    synthesis, the nearshore and the lingering oil, just my

1 preliminary look at it there seems to be general  
2 concurrence. Maybe a little bit of disagreement around the  
3 edge. Where there seems to be nonconcurrence between what  
4 the State is looking at and what the Work Plan was that  
5 came forward to us is in the modeling arena, community  
6 involvement, data management and the Alaska Coastal  
7 Current. Now, I think as a Trustee Council if we went back  
8 through a process similar to Phil's presentation earlier  
9 today -- Dr. Mundy, excuse me -- where we started with each  
10 category and the proposed projects for funding, compared  
11 that to the ones that the State is recommending for  
12 funding, have some dialogue, we can reach consensus in that  
13 category and move to the next one. At the end,  
14 collectively, if it makes sense, we have concurrence and  
15 the Trustee Council moves forward. I think we can  
16 accomplish that, and I'm willing to move forward in that  
17 fashion.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any discussion about --  
19 I'm just trying to -- since we can't vote between motions,  
20 since we can only move by consensus, I'm just trying to  
21 think maybe we could come to a consensus on the process to  
22 follow. That's what I'm trying to achieve. Trustee  
23 Pearce.

24 MS. PEARCE: Well, I'm not sure I'm going  
25 to help that, but I'm still -- it seems like before we jump

1 to the list we need to talk a little bit about the new  
2 criteria, or the criteria that the State has applied as  
3 they went through the larger Work Plan and came up with a  
4 discrete list that they want to move forward with at this  
5 time. And I'm not sure -- I listened to Commissioner  
6 Ballard talk about the consent decree and the legal  
7 requirements in the monitoring and restoration -- or the  
8 restoration -- and I look at criteria one, and it seems to  
9 me more directed toward a future -- perhaps the reopener,  
10 but identification and quantification of unknown or  
11 recently discovered impacts. And if that has to apply to  
12 each and every one, I don't see that as covering our  
13 ongoing responsibility for the original settlement.  
14 Indeed, there is a reopener out there, and that's a whole  
15 kind of another question and whether or not we can identify  
16 in order to reach that. But the original settlement was  
17 not just directed toward identification of unknown or  
18 recently discovered impacts. And so I haven't gotten  
19 myself to being comfortable with the criteria that the  
20 State has applied in the first place. And, also, as has  
21 been pointed out, certainly my agencies -- and rightly so  
22 -- pointed out that there is definitely Federal resource  
23 management decisions that are made through research. I  
24 also would say that while I've spent a lot of time talking  
25 about science for the sake of science versus science for



1 the sake of being able to have informed decision making  
2 processes, I'm not sure that the original settlement also  
3 directed us to use the funds to help us make our -- talking  
4 DOI, alone -- make our management decisions. That wasn't  
5 really the scope, as I understand it, of the original  
6 settlement. So I'm still having trouble with the criteria.  
7 Kevin's idea sounds like it might get us somewhere, but  
8 I'll leave it at one other question. And that is, Kevin,  
9 when you -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Duffy, when you made  
10 your motion you talked about the fact that this is cheaper,  
11 and what is the intent of that? I agree it spends less  
12 money, but to what end?

13 MR. DUFFY: Yes, through the Chair. If I  
14 used the word cheaper, I mean less expensive or the total  
15 amount.....

16 MS. PEARCE: You may have said less  
17 expensive. I wrote down cheaper.

18 MR. DUFFY: The total amount of  
19 expenditures under the State's proposal is roughly about  
20 \$3.1 as opposed to the proposal that was in front of us of  
21 about six point something -- 6.3. So that's the  
22 difference. I think that reduced expenditure is the net  
23 result of the more narrow focus we've taken on a set of  
24 categories. Nothing more, nothing less. Of course, we in  
25 the State system are in a position of significant scrutiny

1 of all of our expenditures; but that, for me, didn't play  
2 much into this decision. This decision was more of a  
3 narrow focus as I described among the categories and a net  
4 result of a reduced funding package.

5 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Balsiger.

7 MR. BALSIGER: You know, we have a  
8 restoration plan that goes beyond, perhaps, the original  
9 idea of looking at where the oil was and which resources  
10 were affected by the oil, but that restoration plan was  
11 developed with a lot of legal guidance. So I don't have  
12 any ability and I don't have any belief that -- well, let  
13 me put it the other way. I believe that our GEM model is  
14 completely consistent with the requirements that we have,  
15 and I don't have a phrase in mind but I could probably find  
16 it here -- completely consistent with the terms of the  
17 civil settlement and Alaska law, because the GEM model and  
18 the restoration plan wasn't developed absent people who  
19 should have been able to advise us on that. So I don't  
20 have a problem if the Trustee Council wants to change the  
21 restoration plan, wants to narrow the scope of the work  
22 that it's doing to do, wants to identify new criteria. But  
23 then, if we're going to do that, we should do it that way.  
24 We should change the restoration plan. We should say we're  
25 changing our focus, not because what we're trying to do now

1 is illegal or outside the bounds of the settlement, but  
2 because it's something different we want to do. Then we  
3 should put out a different RFP with different criteria,  
4 explain to the people what we're trying to do instead of,  
5 at this point, after having gone through several years of  
6 this culminating in this first Work Plan under the GEM  
7 model to suddenly change in our mind in a manner that, to  
8 me, is not consistent with the restoration plan or the GEM  
9 model or the work that we've done over the past three or  
10 four years describing to the public what we're trying to do  
11 and why this whole program makes sense. It seems to be a  
12 non sequitur to abandon such a large part of this program  
13 at this point in time. And, Mr. Chairman, I don't have a  
14 problem if you want to make progress by looking at this  
15 section by section, if you judge that's the way to get  
16 through this easier, presuming to do that we would have  
17 both of these motions off the floor, my attempted motion  
18 that never came into status and Mr. Duffy's.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah. We'll hear from  
20 Trustee Meade, and then I'll speak to that.

21 MR. MEADE: Just, I guess, to kind of pause  
22 in our discussion, a question of perhaps some legal advice.  
23 A person with a public affairs background that I am, I  
24 would suggest maybe add some public affairs wisdom to it.  
25 But more, it's a question, since we don't necessarily have

1 a relationship issue here, you know, from a governmental  
2 standpoint, maybe it's more just making sure we're legally  
3 okay. But the question that I just beat around the bush to  
4 get to is if we have built up public expectation, we've  
5 concluded an RFP, we've sought a research agenda, we've  
6 engaged a variety of individuals to submit proposals, as we  
7 heard this morning from at least our first caller, and  
8 there's been individuals that have put their expectations  
9 towards our requests and have, perhaps, turned away other  
10 work, are we going to legally and/or from a public affairs  
11 standpoint substantially damage ourselves if we change  
12 course at this point in the process? And I ask that more  
13 with the question if narrowing the scope or keeping  
14 ourselves more focused is appropriate, wouldn't this RFP  
15 process that I currently think we're just completing or  
16 starting through for the next cycle be the place to really  
17 influence that so that we don't damage our relationship  
18 with potential -- vendors is a wrong term, but potential  
19 researchers, potential RFP responders, and we also don't  
20 open up a legal question to settlement, if there even would  
21 be one there? That, I don't know, from a contractual or a  
22 purchasing standpoint. But I would think it would behoove  
23 us to have some sense on both the legal side, which we  
24 probably have the legal right to not hire -- I guess that  
25 was always retained. But we have put out a lot of public

1 expectation over the last couple of years shaping into an  
2 agenda here, an RFP. Certainly, businesses have put  
3 themselves on hold. I sure wouldn't want to be one of  
4 those businesses that put myself on hold with expectations  
5 that I was going to have the ability to provide a service  
6 simply to see a change in focus from what was originally  
7 expressed through our RFP. I would think that focus should  
8 be adjusted as we put a new RFP together and move it  
9 forward, to do it in a forthright way.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I'd just comment on one  
11 thing I heard Commissioner Duffy say in his preamble -- was  
12 that one of the criteria that was applied in trying to find  
13 the projects that we could achieve consensus on quickly  
14 were those projects that were -- where work had been done  
15 where there was a reliance on continuing funding. So I  
16 think that that's an excellent point, and I think that  
17 meeting that reliance that people have on continuing  
18 funding is important. Where there's new research, of  
19 course there's less of an expectation or a reliance on  
20 that. And then, the other question, I suppose, is did the  
21 RFP make any guarantees that all research submitted would  
22 be funded, and I know that that's not the case and that,  
23 you know, all of the proposals are subject to review  
24 obviously by the Trustees and approval of funding. So I  
25 think, you know, there are probably some expectations that

1     there would be some research done in all of the categories  
2     that were presented.  Let's ask Dr. Mundy, since I haven't  
3     seen the RFP.  Is the RFP organized in the same way as the  
4     Work Plan?

5                     DR. MUNDY:  Yeah, Mr. Chairman.  Yes.  
6     There are three documents here that are internally  
7     consistent in terms of their organization and their  
8     content.  The Science Plan, which is a document that's been  
9     through public review, basically lays out the questions  
10    that we're asking and the big picture in terms of what we  
11    want to do and, also, directs itself towards priorities in  
12    terms of what needs to be done first in terms of getting  
13    the information that we've identified.  After the Science  
14    Plan comes the RFP or the invitation for proposals, as we  
15    call it, and that is a direct translation of the priorities  
16    expressed in the Science Plan, and if you were to go to the  
17    Science Plan you would see that much of the text in each of  
18    these sections matches the text in the Science Plan.  And  
19    the Work Plan itself, again, draws text directly from the  
20    RFP and from the Science Plan in explaining how the  
21    projects actually match what was invited.  So the whole  
22    thing is logically consistent so that if we were, for  
23    example, in getting ready for the FY -- shortly, we would  
24    expect our normal cycle to be getting ready for the FY 05  
25    invitation.  That would be built from the Science Plan

1 after public comment. In other words, the Science Plan is  
2 out, so the place to change in the system that we've used  
3 heretofore -- the place to change objectives and to change  
4 criteria for selection of projects is at the level of the  
5 Science Plan, and then it's directly taken right through  
6 into the request for proposals and the Work Plan. So it  
7 maps one to one.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh. Well, I would  
9 make a proposal -- a motion, I suppose, that -- since we  
10 have two motions pending, but just a proposal to sort of  
11 summarize the -- I think there's probably more agreement on  
12 the specifics, my own perception, than there is on the  
13 general. And so, I would propose to the other Trustees  
14 that we do take this in the way that it was presented to us  
15 in the Work Plan and discuss each section and the research  
16 that's being proposed to be either funded or deferred and  
17 make some decisions about what to fund as a way of trying  
18 to -- and then, you know, if you want to subject that at  
19 the end of the process to, you know, a final vote to report  
20 out the package of things that we have accepted or not  
21 accepted, I mean I think that would be reasonable since we  
22 have to act by consensus. But at least that way we could,  
23 you know, see how far we could get in developing a  
24 consensus about all the elements here that have been  
25 presented to us in the Work Plan. Dr. Balsiger.

1 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, I'll withdraw  
2 my non-seconded and illegal motion, if that starts the  
3 process.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Did you withdraw yours too,  
5 Kevin?

6 MR. DUFFY: No.

7 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

8 MS. PEARCE: He can't, because there's an  
9 objection on the table. I'll withdraw my objection.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Do you want to withdraw  
11 your motion, Kevin, or restate a new motion?

12 MR. DUFFY: With the objection being  
13 withdrawn, I'll withdraw my motion.

14 MS. BALLARD I'll withdraw my second.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

16 MS. BALLARD Good job, Greg.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Then we'll make a new  
18 motion that we begin to discuss and vote on the research in  
19 each section of the FY 2004 Work Plan and, you know, do  
20 that in the order that it's presented and work through the  
21 Work Plan. And then, at the close of that effort, we will  
22 then take a final head count on whether we can achieve  
23 consensus today in funding the work that we've agreed upon  
24 as a package. Any objection?

25 MS. PEARCE: I think we've just moved from



1 Roberts to Masons.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, this is a non-body  
3 anyway.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: I would make one comment.  
5 As you see -- just for your own edification, as you're  
6 dealing with the deferred projects, et cetera, we do have a  
7 considerable amount of money in elapsed funds that you will  
8 be asked to address at a later time, and that considerable  
9 amount is about \$600,000.

10 MS. BALLARD Greg, one.....

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Pearce.....

12 MS. PEARCE: Can I ask a.....

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....first. Yeah.

14 MS. PEARCE: .....a question about that?  
15 And will we address that in terms of a specific  
16 recommendation for specific projects or just to vote into  
17 a.....

18 MS. PHILLIPS: We have a generalized motion  
19 prepared for you to deal with, but you can do whatever you  
20 want.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard.

22 MS. BALLARD I noted that Phil began with  
23 the watershed recommendations and then went back and went  
24 through alphabetically. Was that right? Could we proceed  
25 in that same manner?

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure.

2 MS. BALLARD Just follow the same order  
3 that he did?

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any objections?

5 (No audible response)

6 MS. BALLARD It makes sense to me to start  
7 there.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. So we'll start  
9 with the discussion of the watershed section, which appears  
10 on -- what page is the chart for that

11 DR. MUNDY: Thirty-four, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thirty-four. Would it be  
13 the -- any discussion from the Trustee Council? Going  
14 through each section, would you like to look at each  
15 section and make a motion with respect to the section and  
16 then discuss it, or would you like to make a motion with  
17 respect to each research project as they're listed?

18 MS. BALLARD Well, as a general statement  
19 I'll say that at least in reviewing this among the State  
20 agencies, this entire section was a very attractive  
21 section, and most of what we proposed for recommendation  
22 was also included in here and.....

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Would you like to make a  
24 motion related to the section itself?

25 MS. BALLARD I'd like to ask a couple of

1 questions.....

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

3 MS. BALLARD .....about Knudsen, which is  
4 the very large project which the State Trustees -- are you  
5 wanting to say something? I probably ought to wait while  
6 you.....

7 MR. DUFFY: Go ahead.

8 MS. BALLARD If we could, at least, for my  
9 purposes in trying to move forward on this section if Phil  
10 could tell us a little bit about -- my impression was that  
11 Knudsen could start any particular time. I did not have  
12 the impression that this was a continuing project. Is that  
13 correct?

14 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

16 DR. MUNDY: Yes. In fact, I don't think we  
17 have -- let me just quickly check what I'm saying here.  
18 Other than Mazumder, we don't have any continuing proposals  
19 in this section. This is a new initiative. We developed  
20 the nearshore last time, and it was our intention to  
21 develop the watershed as fully as possible this time. So  
22 all of these proposals, with the exception of Mazumder --  
23 and, in essence, Mazumder was doing a project for us last  
24 year, but the content of this is quite different from what  
25 he was doing for us last year. So, in essence, all of

1 these projects are new projects.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Duffy.

3 MR. DUFFY: Just if this helps the  
4 discussion, and under the State's perspective, we have  
5 supported the Finney project, the Honnold project and the  
6 Walker project and did not suggest funding the Knudsen  
7 project.

8 MR. MEADE: Which project on there, if I  
9 might ask -- and if we could just have conversation.....

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure.

11 MR. MEADE: .....rather than motions going  
12 through these, I think that might help us dialogue better  
13 than if we.....

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right.

15 MR. MEADE: .....have motions and then have  
16 to figure out the right Roberts rules for the right motion  
17 as we decide if we can talk.

18 MS. BALLARD I agree, yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Since we can only vote by  
20 consensus anyway.

21 MR. MEADE: Yeah. Which one is the Kenai  
22 one? I think it was on the deferred. I don't have  
23 the.....

24 DR. MUNDY: That's Mazumder.

25 MR. MEADE: Mazumder. Now, which is the

1 one that you had mentioned the State was.....

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Knudsen.

3 MR. MEADE: Knudsen, okay. I had interest  
4 in the Kenai one. So.....

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Do you want to -- Dr.  
6 Mundy, could you just give us another very quick synopsis  
7 of Knudsen?

8 DR. MUNDY: Sure. I'll refer to page 80 of  
9 the draft Work Plan, and this proposal, in my mind, was the  
10 clearest -- offered the clearest strategy. One of the  
11 things that we asked the people to do secondarily in the  
12 watershed area was tell us A, B, C, D. Tell us the steps  
13 that you're going to take in order to get us to a marine  
14 derived nutrient monitoring program that means something in  
15 the watershed that you're addressing. So the proposal  
16 offers a strategy for developing a monitoring program for  
17 watersheds that would form the basis for a comprehensive  
18 understanding of water quality and biological production in  
19 relation to natural and human induced variability.  
20 Sampling strategy effectively leverages existing funding  
21 from the Oil Spill Recovery Institute and North Pacific  
22 Research Board to minimize costs. Data derived on isotopic  
23 signatures of carbon, nitrogen and sulfur will be  
24 invaluable in designing monitoring throughout the GEM area.  
25 Important new information would be produced on effects of

1 watersheds on productivity of nearshore environments, the  
2 feasibility of using sulfur as an indicator of marine  
3 related effects, and the relation of marine derived  
4 nutrients to freshwater residence time in juvenile salmon.

5           So the Knudsen proposal has a number of  
6 aspects to it that are not reproduced in other proposals in  
7 the watershed area. One of these is its emphasis on  
8 nearshore environments -- that is, looking down in the  
9 lower river and on the estuary. It's based in eastern  
10 Prince William Sound near the Copper River Delta, and so it  
11 has the ability to look at certain aspects that are not  
12 proposed in the other proposals. I believe it is also  
13 looking a number of species, including juvenile halibut,  
14 which is relatively unique as part of their sampling  
15 design. One of the issues that we face in trying to figure  
16 out how to measure marine derived nutrients in animals in  
17 watersheds is how long does an animal have to hang around  
18 before it's going to get a marine derived nutrient signal?  
19 Chum salmon and pink salmon are very important to Prince  
20 William Sound, but they're also notoriously short-lived in  
21 terms of their freshwater residence. They're in, and  
22 they're out. But, on the other hand, it could be that  
23 they're feeding on -- that they do feed. We know that some  
24 of the chum salmon do feed. So they're going to be looking  
25 at the relation of MDN to freshwater residence time, which

1 was also something of interest. I believe that in addition  
2 to the OSRI and NPRB that they brought in, I think that  
3 also the USGS is throwing in some additional funding on top  
4 of this.

5 MR. MEADE: If I might, a follow-up? On a  
6 policy maker's scale of one to 10, 10 being quite  
7 important, how integral is this component to the goals of  
8 the GEM program?

9 DR. MUNDY: To getting GEM to where it's  
10 ultimately supposed to be, I mean this one is an eight or a  
11 nine. It's right in there. It's right what we asked them  
12 to do, and they stepped up to the plate and brought  
13 significant money to the table in addition to giving us a  
14 plan that tells us how they're going to proceed and what  
15 we're supposed to have at every step along the way to get  
16 us to a marine derived nutrient monitoring program.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I think Trustee Balsiger  
18 was next.

19 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
20 I'm not quite sure I understood how we're dealing with the  
21 deferred funding. For example, the State's proposal  
22 wouldn't include Heintz, I don't believe, but maybe we're  
23 not worried because we're going to have \$600,000 of  
24 deferred funding that might cover that later on? I'm  
25 having trouble figuring how we put those pieces together.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: There is approximately  
2 \$600,000 of unspent, lapsed funds from 2003 that could be  
3 used for deferred projects, if that's what the wish of the  
4 Trustee Council is.

5 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Dr. Mundy.

7 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, just a minor  
8 correction. I just want to point out that the Heintz  
9 project is a fund contingent and, therefore, in that  
10 category. It's been included under the \$5 million cap. So  
11 it's not part of the deferred.....

12 MS. PHILLIPS: The lapsed.

13 DR. MUNDY: Yeah, the lapsed.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: What is the funding  
15 contingent on?

16 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, the funding is  
17 contingent on Mr. Heintz providing the.....

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh, that's right.

19 DR. MUNDY: .....reports that he owes the  
20 Trustee Council.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right. Trustee Pearce.

22 MS. PEARCE: Back to the Knudsen -- if I'm  
23 pronouncing that correctly.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh, Knudsen, uh-huh.

25 MS. PEARCE: .....project, you said that it



1 will leverage funds that are coming from OSRI and the North  
2 Pacific Research Board and, you think, additional USGS  
3 funding. Do you remember -- are we talking tens of  
4 thousands, hundreds of thousands from those other agencies  
5 to match the 150?

6 DR. MUNDY: I think you're talking tens of  
7 thousands of dollars. Now, the USGS contribution is a one-  
8 time contribution related to escapement counting, which is  
9 part of the salmon escapement counting, but the OSRI and  
10 the North Pacific Research Board components, I think, are  
11 in the tens of thousands of dollars. I'd have to check the  
12 matching, but you're talking about substantial cash. This  
13 isn't just in kind contributions.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

15 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman. Relative to  
16 my earlier question, the Heintz proposal is, I believe,  
17 sort of related and integral with the Walker proposal, but  
18 I know the Heintz is fund contingent based on producing  
19 some other reports. And so I'm not quite sure whether that  
20 48,000 for the Heintz would be available under the lapsed  
21 funding or whatever, but I have an interest in the Heintz  
22 one, whenever we get to that level.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And you're saying that  
24 you believe if you fund Walker it would be helpful to fund  
25 Heintz? Is that what you're saying?

1 MR. BALSIGER: That's my belief, but  
2 perhaps Dr. Mundy could tell me if that's sensible.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

4 DR. MUNDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
5 Heintz was recommended because it is a marine derived  
6 nutrient application. It is a relatively unusual marine  
7 derived nutrient application that, except for the  
8 management application, would probably not have been  
9 successful. So, again, putting these things together --  
10 that is, by going in and taking Walker's samples and  
11 working with Walker's samples to use a technique that will  
12 give us information on marine derived nutrients and the  
13 allocation of those to growth and production structures in  
14 fish, but also give us some handle on survival, since  
15 growth is closely related to survival in these species,  
16 that brought up the possibility of a management  
17 application. Now, the management applications in the GEM  
18 program are not the top priority. It is the evaluation of  
19 the ongoing injuries to injured species and understanding  
20 those in an environmental context. Those are the top  
21 priority. On the other hand, we've had very strong signals  
22 from the community and from the agencies that they want  
23 these management applications. So as long as we can get  
24 them as we move along, without impairing the other parts of  
25 the mission, we do. So Heintz is a stand-alone project,

1 probably would not have been recommended for now, although  
2 it's something interesting that we probably would like to  
3 do eventually. But the fact that it does have a management  
4 application and it is building on the Walker project -- it  
5 is integral to the sampling portion of the Walker program  
6 -- we felt that putting these together as a package was a  
7 good chance to get a management application out of it.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Pearce.

9 MS. PEARCE: Commissioner Duffy, what was  
10 the reasoning behind not funding Knudsen? I'm just trying  
11 to.....

12 MR. DUFFY: Yeah. I'm just thinking back  
13 on our discussions. We were struggling with the  
14 applicability of this to the perspective we brought to the  
15 table -- the criteria we were talking about. It just  
16 didn't seem directly relevant. I have talked with Dr.  
17 Mundy about this project, and he sees some real value from  
18 it from a GEM perspective in going forward on this project.  
19 From my more narrow perspective, being from a management  
20 agency, I just didn't see the -- I couldn't connect the  
21 dots that the value of this research even short-term and  
22 maybe long-term -- I'm not sure -- to how managed species  
23 would be, you know, improved through this. So that's why I  
24 didn't support it. I recommended to the State Trustees not  
25 supporting it, and they basically agreed.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Is there further  
2 discussion about the research in this section? Do you want  
3 to make a proposal for -- shall we go through project by  
4 project -- take Finney first?

5                   MR. MEADE: Well, did I just hear from Mr.  
6 Duffy that the State is in support of all but the one? Is  
7 that where your recommendation is, at this point, Kevin?

8                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Of the four funding  
9 proposals.....

10                  MR. MEADE: Yeah, of the four.

11                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Of the four, yeah. All  
12 of the three -- Finney, Honnold and Walker -- but there's  
13 concern about Knudsen.

14                  MR. MEADE: Right.

15                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: So three of the four.  
16 And then there's the fund contingent, Heintz, that is a  
17 question mark, I think.

18                  MR. MEADE: And isn't there also  
19 contingents on the Kenai one that's associated there,  
20 securing.....

21                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: That's rated defer.

22                  MR. MEADE: Deferred, okay. Thank you.

23                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh.

24                  MR. DUFFY: Based on Dr. Mundy's comments  
25 on the Heintz and its applicability to management I would,

1 you know, as a State Trustee would support that and put  
2 that on the list. So our list at this point under  
3 watershed would be for Finney, Honnold, Walker and Heintz.

4 MR. MEADE: I would look to, you know, the  
5 insights from both my Federal partners. I can support the  
6 State's perspective. I don't have any specific knowledge  
7 that would cause me to have a concern one way or the other  
8 with the items, other than just hearing the insight from  
9 Dr. Mundy that it is right up there as a number eight in  
10 hitting the GEM agenda. But I realize if we're wanting to  
11 narrow the scope here to the extent we can, Jim and Drew I  
12 would look to you to give any additional insight from an  
13 agency perspective, although that is right up the Copper  
14 River Delta. I can see where it could have potentially  
15 some implications and interest, but not anything so direct  
16 that I could offer any wisdom.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Pearce.

18 MS. PEARCE: Well, I guess my perspective  
19 would be it meets -- according to Dr. Mundy, it meets the  
20 GEM criteria to a tee or right on the mark or whatever the  
21 proper term is for that, and I'm still struggling with my  
22 lack of understanding of why our criteria should be whether  
23 or not it's going to be able to help us manage in the  
24 short-term the resource, if it will provide us with  
25 information that may end up being very useful in the

1 management, particularly of salmon, particularly on the  
2 Copper River, and it meets the criteria of the GEM program.  
3 It would seem to me we that it should be included.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Duffy.

5 MS. PEARCE: It's a huge fishery.

6 MR. DUFFY: Just in response to that, in  
7 terms of the management applicability you'll hear from me a  
8 lot, and that will kind of be a broken record. That's not  
9 the only thing I'm looking at; but, on the other hand, in  
10 terms of the Copper River Delta and the current salmon  
11 species that are managed in the delta I'm not sure that we  
12 need a whole lot more data to manage more effectively.  
13 That fishery currently is constructed. But I understand  
14 the importance, perhaps, from the GEM perspective, but  
15 maybe this is one that we can put an asterisk by and come  
16 back to, based on any decisions we make on carryover of  
17 additional FY 03 funding and move on to the next category.

18 MR. MEADE: I was actually going to see if  
19 that might be a way to move forward if we have found broad  
20 agreement -- if we held this one to the side. At least if  
21 we did nothing else by the end of today, we could reach  
22 some critical decisions on the vast majority and maybe need  
23 to do additional research and validation on just but a  
24 handful.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: It seems to me that the

1 criteria give us some options, because we can move from --  
2 you know, we have fund, fund contingent, defer. So, if we  
3 want to, we could move Knudsen from fund to defer and then  
4 address it on that basis. Dr. Balsiger.

5 MR. BALSIGER: I was hoping you would allow  
6 me to have like a five-minute break so I could talk to some  
7 people about some thoughts that I have.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Your entitled. We can  
9 have a break.

10 MR. BALSIGER: I'll really make it five  
11 minutes.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure. Take a break.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: One thing that we're going  
14 to need, too, as you're going through all of this is we  
15 need to know whether or not to put the defer -- whether or  
16 not you guys want to hold the deferred projects on a  
17 separate list so that we can come back to the deferred  
18 projects, or if you just want to not deal with them. So,  
19 even though it's on defer on this list.....

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: What do you want to do?

21 MS. PHILLIPS: .....I'd like to put them on  
22 a separate list.....

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, then come back to  
24 them.

25 MS. PHILLIPS: .....and then come back to

1       them.

2                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Yeah.  That makes sense.

3                   MS. PHILLIPS:  Okay.

4                   (Off record - 2:58 P.M.)

5                   (On record - 3:06 P.M.)

6                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Okay, I'd like to get  
7 going again.  If we can get Dr. Mundy back.

8                   MR. BALSIGER:  Mr. Chairman, pursuant to  
9 the break for which I asked.....

10                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Okay.

11                  MR. BALSIGER:  .....and which you granted  
12 me, for the record, if you would allow me, I would like to  
13 ask Craig O'Conner, who is general counsel for NOAA --  
14 because of some statements that I may have sort of  
15 inadvertently muddled the record with -- I'd like to ask  
16 Mr. O'Conner if he believes that the projects that have  
17 been submitted and proposed by the various researchers,  
18 whether or not they're on the State's list -- recommended  
19 list, are consistent with the terms of the settlement act  
20 -- the civil settlement?

21                  MR. O'CONNER:  The.....

22                  REPORTER:  Mr. O'Conner, if I can get you  
23 to come up where Mr. -- Dr. Mundy.....

24                  MS. PHILLIPS:  Or just move your chair up.

25                  REPORTER:  .....or move the chair up,



1 please. Thank you.

2 MR. O'CONNER: But I don't want to be  
3 looked at for that long. My concern that I rai -- Mr.  
4 Chairman, if you don't mind.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh, yes please.

6 MR. O'CONNER: My concern that I raised  
7 with Jim had -- in large measure had to do with the state  
8 of the record based upon Commissioner Duffy's comments and  
9 then Jim's response. I guess by way of answering your  
10 questions, Jim, I would have to ask the State, at this  
11 point, is it the conclusion of the State that the projects  
12 that they have -- they're opposed to funding or they have  
13 not recommended funding for, in their opinion, inconsistent  
14 with the terms of the settlement agreement particularly? I  
15 have my own independent opinion after having looked at the  
16 projects and I would disagree with that conclusion. But  
17 the record as it sits at this point would seem to indicate  
18 that the State has done a legal review of the projects as  
19 well as a programmatic review and come to the conclusion  
20 that those they didn't recommend funding for were  
21 inconsistent particularly with the terms of the settlement  
22 agreement. Or perhaps even the restoration plan and some  
23 elusion to State law, although I would assume that's your  
24 own oil pollution act or similar legislation.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, I can answer that

1 the State has not done a legal review on a project by  
2 project basis. And I think that the comment -- you know,  
3 I'll let Kevin Duffy speak to the comments that he made  
4 that were presented not in the way of establishing new  
5 criteria for evaluating the projects as much as they were  
6 just an opportunity to express the logic behind which the  
7 State Trustees individually and collectively evaluated and  
8 prioritized the funding requests that were put forward in  
9 the Work Plan. Kevin, do you want to speak to that?

10 MR. DUFFY: Yeah, just if I could. I'm a  
11 bit surprised by this interpretation. I didn't mean to, if  
12 it was implied, that I was saying that the projects for  
13 discussion, that we're moving through, but the original  
14 State list of projects was not meant to imply anything  
15 relative to the validity or inconsistency of the other  
16 projects relative to the settlement agreement.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Good. Thank you.

18 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 MR. DUFFY: If I could, I'd like to follow-  
20 up just a bit, not on a legal perspective but just this  
21 idea that the State is applying new criteria, I think  
22 that's really a misnomer. We just had a perspective that  
23 we wanted to bring to the table. As part of initiating the  
24 dialogue, I wanted to share that perspective with my  
25 Federal Trustees. You need to have a perspective in the

1 things that you looked at in order to lay a set of proposed  
2 projects on the table. That was all I was trying to do, I  
3 was not trying to violate the RFP process or do anything  
4 inconsistent with the process. It is -- RFP process. It  
5 is still my belief that once we work through these eight  
6 categories and achieve consensus on the list of project, we  
7 will have operated in good faith and consistent with the  
8 terms of the RFP and the process we've gone through as a  
9 Trustee council. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, well we were  
11 addressing the -- I'm sorry, I looked down. Did you have  
12 your hand raised, Ms. Ballard?

13 MS. BALLARD: I.....

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I couldn't tell, I looked  
15 down but.....

16 MS. BALLARD: I did and you were going on.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....it's like.....

18 MS. BALLARD: I will simply add to this  
19 discussion we just had that it's clear from the history of  
20 both EVOS and all the other NRDA actions in the country  
21 that there's a great deal of room for definition of  
22 restoration. And the State was not judging the adequacy of  
23 some proposals but rather favoring for our view the  
24 immediacy of others.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, thank you. So we

1 were discussing the watershed proposals when we broke and  
2 we were reaching, I think, relative agreement on Finney,  
3 Honnold, Walker and I think Heintz.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Heintz.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Although I only heard  
6 Commissioner Duffy and Dr. Balsiger speak to Heintz. But  
7 they're the two most knowledgeable of the.....

8 MS. BALLARD: I'm okay with Heintz.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....all the Trustees in  
10 that area, so.....

11 MS. BALLARD: Well, I thought Phil -- Dr.  
12 Mundy gave an excellent explanation of the status of Heintz  
13 and why it was in the fund contingent category, so.....

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So I would -- from that  
15 conversation I gather that the Trustees are moving toward  
16 consensus on moving Heintz from fund contingent to fund?

17 MR. MEADE: And based on your suggestion,  
18 deferring decision or deferring funding on the.....

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: On Knudsen.

20 MR. MEADE: On Knudsen. And that way we  
21 can move to another category, respectful of the clock.

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: If we could do that, if  
23 we could move Heintz from fund contingent to fund and move  
24 Knudsen from fund to defer. And then during the break, the  
25 Executive Director and I had a conversation about the defer

1 category and how we treat that. And we thought that the  
2 defer would be a separate list that we would keep that we  
3 could come back to, to consider funding. Is that right?

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, just going  
5 back to Heintz, Heintz is fund contingent, not having  
6 anything related -- to do with the project or anything but  
7 simply the fact that we're waiting for a report, for him to  
8 come in. So we would classify that as a fund project.....

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

10 MS. PHILLIPS: .....as soon as that report  
11 is in, that will become a fund.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Just trying to get the  
13 work completed.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

16 MS. PHILLIPS: And then I will.....

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, that's fair.

18 MS. PHILLIPS: .....maintain.....

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: We don't want to get in  
20 the way of that.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: .....a list of the deferred  
22 for us to go back to it later.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, I think that would  
24 be good. So on that basis -- and then Mazumder would also  
25 be on the defer category?

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Mazumder is on the deferred  
2 list and hold to go back to list is Knudsen. So two  
3 separate lists but both meaning the same thing.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, with that  
5 discussion of watershed proposals, is there any objection  
6 to approving the watershed proposal category on that basis?

7 MR. DUFFY: No objection here.

8 MR. MEADE: What if we just continue to  
9 move through the list, knowing what we've made, and that  
10 way we can look back -- reflect back on where we, you know,  
11 collectively come out at.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right. Good. So now do  
13 we go back to do it alphabetically, is that the idea?

14 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, it's my  
15 understanding of Commissioner Ballard's request that we now  
16 move to the Alaska coastal current. For most of you,  
17 that's on page 21 of the draft Work Plan, is where you'll  
18 find that table.

19 MS. BALLARD: I just wanted to go in the  
20 same order you had gone in.

21 DR. MUNDY: That's.....

22 MS. BALLARD: Because it seemed you had a  
23 logic so I thought it was good enough for me to follow your  
24 logic.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, so page 21 in our

1 new draft, Alaska coastal current proposals recommended for  
2 funding and deferral. Who wants to start discussion of  
3 these projects?

4 MR. MEADE: Just to get me on home page, if  
5 I could, if I could ask Dr. Mundy, if I recollect, when  
6 were here about a month ago you talked about the relevancy  
7 of these projects here associated to currents and effects  
8 on -- I think you even used some examples of the salmon  
9 fisheries and effects by new knowledge as to aspects of  
10 this potential research that was affecting certainly our  
11 runs here but even making shifts towards -- like the  
12 Columbia basin and the Pacific northwest. Am I in the  
13 right thinking? Is that this group of research projects?

14 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes please, Dr. Mundy.

16 DR. MUNDY: Yes, that is in part the intent  
17 of the -- of this section. I also would point out that in  
18 relation to the State's criteria that number 2, the project  
19 is directed toward the long term monitoring of ongoing  
20 direct impacts from the Exxon Valdez oil spill. Now I  
21 understand from discussions with Commissioner Duffy that  
22 the term direct may have a different meaning however we  
23 have long held that we had to have auxiliary information,  
24 we had to have environmental information to place the  
25 ongoing direct impacts of the oil spill in context. And

1 we've given some examples of that earlier today. It's  
2 very, very hard to evaluate individual trends in animals  
3 such as sea otters and Harlequin ducks without background  
4 environmental information. Because the -- we've often had  
5 the claim that there were no oil impacts but simply  
6 environmental or climate impacts on the animals. And that  
7 the changes we were seeing were not respon -- you know, the  
8 oil was not responsible for that.

9                   So -- and also I would point out that in  
10 this category we have endeavored to build in at least one  
11 highly relevant resource management application in applied  
12 research. So this has the context of looking at  
13 environmental change. We can share this information with  
14 people all up and down the West Coast and they'll find it  
15 relevant. But it also has immediate application to  
16 evaluating lingering oil effects and also has built in  
17 fisheries management applications. And I would be happy to  
18 go through and point out specific examples of those at the  
19 request of the counsel.

20                   MR. MEADE: If I could.....

21                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Go ahead.

22                   MR. MEADE: .....further -- if I could ask  
23 you to guide my eyes to the project that had, for me, a  
24 good deal of relevancy for a land based management agency  
25 like ours, and that was the one that did effect -- it was,



1 as I recollect, you highlighted some relevant findings and  
2 research that would further our knowledge about, I think,  
3 it was factors that are affecting certain food sources that  
4 then did affect substantial spikes or shifts in salmon  
5 runs. For example, in the Sound say down to the Columbia  
6 basin. Which project would that be?

7 DR. MUNDY: Right, that would be the Batten  
8 project. And this is the only -- at the present time, this  
9 is the only monitoring project in the Gulf of Alaska that's  
10 in a position to detect what the oceanographers have called  
11 a regime shift. And the regime -- the change in the  
12 climate, I think today's weather is probably a pretty good  
13 example -- the change in the climate has had a fair impact  
14 on salmon runs but also we believe on Stellar sea lions and  
15 other bird and mammal populations of interest. And really  
16 the CPR was originally developed as a fish finding  
17 technology back in the 1920's, dragging an instrument  
18 through the water to look for plankton so that they could  
19 spot -- because they knew if they could find the plankton,  
20 they could find the fish. But it's since that time been  
21 applied to look at changes in climate and, as I say, is the  
22 only project presently by any organization that's got the  
23 ability to give us this background signal.

24 So, for example, if somebody came up and  
25 said, okay look, this change that you're seeing in the

1 Harlequin ducks is due to -- simply due to the effects of  
2 the regime shift that started in 1977, we have the grounds  
3 now to say, sorry but that one is over. 1998, 1999, we  
4 have evidence that that's gone back in the other direction  
5 so you'll have to find another rationale, another excuse.

6 MR. MEADE: Thank you. Thank you for  
7 indulging. I -- since I don't have the data in front.....

8 DR. MUNDY: Not at all, I think that's.....

9 MR. MEADE: .....in the same fashion. But  
10 that study particularly was of great interest to me. And I  
11 don't know if there are others that affiliate or associate  
12 to that potential component being successful but I did --  
13 and I don't know where it fits in the State's  
14 recommendations but.....

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Duffy, do  
16 you want to speak to -- or, I'm sorry, Dr. Balsiger, do you  
17 have something you want to say?

18 MR. BALSIGER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I  
19 thought -- my notes would indicate that the State hadn't  
20 proposed any of these projects so I -- but I'm still pre --  
21 if you'd rather him present it, that's fine. But I was  
22 going to propose that we fund Batten, which is the proposal  
23 that we just discussed that Mr. Meade was interested;  
24 Cokelet, which is the system that Dr. Mundy talked about  
25 where we're putting the instrumentation on the Alaska State

1 Ferry; O'Connen [sic], the monitoring program; Stabenow,  
2 this is the second year of -- in the final year of a  
3 program of a program that we funding last year;  
4 Weingartner, who we heard about that on public testimony  
5 and the information points out that this is a time series  
6 that's gone on for 33 years and Willette, monitoring the  
7 dynamics. This is the second year of a program. As you  
8 can see from the list, it is not the last year but it's  
9 phasing down. And that would be my proposed list on this  
10 page.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Mr. Duffy.

12 MR. DUFFY: I have question, I think -- a  
13 few questions I think for Dr. Mundy. The Willette project,  
14 that was one that I really struggled with and in the end,  
15 in talking to the State Trustees, I did not include it,  
16 hoping to have this kind of dialog. The -- if we commit to  
17 the -- continue to commit to the Willette project, is that  
18 one that will have some finality at some point after FY-06,  
19 based on the declining numbers I have in front of me or is  
20 this one of these projects, once you commit to it, it would  
21 continue theoretically forever?

22 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy, go ahead.

24 DR. MUNDY: This is in the happy category  
25 of one of those projects that will continue forever but the

1 financial obligations will be very small. The -- this is  
2 set up -- this project, the Willette project is based on a  
3 transect that's fished by a fishing vessel at Anchor Point  
4 and due west of Anchor Point in Cook Inlet and has been  
5 fished there since 1979. We have noted that that area is  
6 subject to very heavy tidal influence. The oceanography is  
7 quite, quite complex. Quite -- most people who have worked  
8 in Cook Inlet know the rips, which are tidal fronts which  
9 define very, very discreet oceanographic regions within  
10 Cook Inlet that have a lot to do with the movement of the  
11 fish.

12           The test fishing program was originally set  
13 up there to advise the managers, particularly with respect  
14 to the Kenai River sockeye salmon, which was an injured  
15 species under the oil spill. But the variability from the  
16 program is quite high and the managers use this with a  
17 grain of salt or maybe more than a grain of salt but  
18 nonetheless, they feel that it's still valuable  
19 information. But they really would like to know why it's  
20 so reliable in some years and in other years it's not very  
21 reliable at all. So -- and the principle purpose of it is  
22 to allow them, for the purposes of fishing regulations, to  
23 know when the sockeye salmon are going to make beach-full,  
24 coming in from over a thousand square miles of water out  
25 there where the fishing fleet operates. Because at that

1 point in time, the ability of the managers to control the  
2 sockeye salmon escape by using the drift gill net fleet is  
3 practically gone.

4                   So the -- for the purposes of the GEM  
5 program, we saw the ability to define the extent of the  
6 intrusion of the Alaska coastal current into lower Cook  
7 Inlet as a very important piece of information which  
8 relates to the recruitment of shrimp and crab populations,  
9 among other important pieces of information. But the  
10 variability in the ACC, Alaska coastal current as a whole,  
11 we believe is a major factor in controlling bird, fish and  
12 mammal populations in the area. So by putting  
13 oceanographic instrumentation on the Anchor Point test  
14 fishing vessel and the -- most of what you see here in  
15 2004/2005 are capitalization costs. But there are also  
16 some additional costs associated with the fact that we now  
17 are operating oceanographic instruments such as a acoustic  
18 doppler current profiler from the vessel. So the charter  
19 costs have increased. So there are some increased charter  
20 costs here.

21                   We felt that this was a very good  
22 opportunity to put together a physical oceanographer with a  
23 fish group and to optimistically put some physical  
24 oceanography into salmon fishing regulations. As a -- you  
25 know, as a side benefit. So as I say, we work hard to try

1 to get management applications, short term management  
2 applications, and build those onto the project whenever we  
3 can. So again, this is a project that helps us define the  
4 extent of the incursion of the Alaska coastal current into  
5 lower Cook Inlet. It helps us with -- by defining the data  
6 that were being -- that are used in the sockeye salmon  
7 regulations or the reliability of those data and hopefully  
8 they'll improve.

9 And it's something that's going to be  
10 relatively low cost once we have these instruments  
11 installed. They should be there for quite some time. And  
12 once the people start using this data, the environmental  
13 data, we think that other people will step forward and help  
14 with the funding. So that's where I am  
15 on that.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you, Dr. Mundy.

17 MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Dr. Mundy, that was  
18 very helpful. Is there any chance that that would help me  
19 and us collectively in our allocation discussions in Cook  
20 Inlet?

21 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, there no help for  
22 Commissioner Duffy on -- in that regard.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I told him that too.

24 MR. DUFFY: I've got another one on -- just  
25 real briefly, the Coker project and the discussions that

1 have been going on with the Department of Transportation,  
2 Marine Highways. The -- and we heard today in either your  
3 discussion or in testimony, I forgot which, that this one  
4 is time critical. That we need to pull the trigger on this  
5 one if we want to move forward on this analysis. The  
6 question I have is, the project, I would assume, would have  
7 initial start up costs that would be very expensive. But  
8 through time those operating expenses would remain steady  
9 but capital expenses would go down. And so I was  
10 questioning this one from just the dollar amount associated  
11 with the three fiscal years in front of us. Can you shed  
12 any light on that for me, Phil -- Dr. Mundy? Thank you.

13 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman. Yes, the -- this  
14 project is very experimental with respect to the gear  
15 that's going to be put in. They're using standard methods  
16 to measure solidity and temperature however we expect to be  
17 able to be able to install a real time instrument that will  
18 measure nitrate on the vessel. Now this doesn't sound too  
19 exciting but we've never had the ability to measure nitrate  
20 other than by chemical means. If you're going to measure  
21 nitrate in sea water, what you're going to do is take  
22 sample and you're going to put some reagents in it and  
23 you're going to make some tests. But people have to handle  
24 it. We're now coming to the stage where we believe we  
25 have an ultraviolet color metric test that does -- that

1 goes real time. This will really revolutionize the way we  
2 look at the changes in the transport of nutrients up onto  
3 the shelf which we believe are involved in controlling the  
4 abundances of birds, fish and mammals in the northern Gulf  
5 of Alaska.

6 So the -- and I would also point out that  
7 the branch of NOAA that mis -- Dr. Cokelet belongs to is  
8 putting quite a bit of its own gear into this operation as  
9 well. So what you see here is really only part of the cost  
10 because the whole North Pacific has its eyes on this  
11 project. There are lots of people who are very, very  
12 interested in making sure that this works. So I'm sure  
13 that if any -- if there are contingencies and so forth that  
14 a lot of people will be stepping forward.

15 So the reason that this is kind of waffling  
16 around as far as the cost and not declining just in the way  
17 that the Willette project is declining as we do the cost of  
18 capitalizations because we will be trying new things during  
19 the course of this -- of the three years of this project.  
20 Because this is a learning exercise. People have been  
21 talking about doing this for 25 years. It seems like such  
22 a straightforward thing to do and such a cost effective  
23 thing to do, you wonder that people wouldn't have done it  
24 in the past. But it's not as easy as it looks. There are  
25 -- as I mentioned, just the fact that it's a passenger



1 vessel and if you put something on a passenger vessel that  
2 hasn't been certified, you lose your classification as a  
3 passenger vessel.

4 And so, we are very pleased with the fact  
5 that we do have the MOA, which is on the table here, which  
6 is an action item, ready for signature. This took quite a  
7 bit of work with the engineering people at the Alaska  
8 Marine Highway system before they would agree to let us  
9 come onto their boat and start messing with the plumbing.  
10 So we're -- I'll stop there.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, thank you Dr. Mundy

12 MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Dr. Mundy.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard, do  
14 you want to make a comment?

15 MS. BALLARD: Yeah, Dr. Mundy, I wonder if  
16 you could tell me, if I looked at a GPS plot of where they  
17 had gone, what the scope, in terms of covering of the  
18 ocean, of the Okkonen versus the Cokelet one is?

19 DR. MUNDY: Okay, Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

21 DR. MUNDY: Yes, the Cokelet project is --  
22 operates along the line that goes from Seward down the  
23 outer Kenai Peninsula up into Homer, back down to the east  
24 side of Kodiak and then over to Chignik. So you're  
25 covering the -- basically the waters in the northern Gulf

1 of Alaska that are most biologically active. Okkonen's  
2 project has been on the tanker vessel from which the CPR  
3 project was working. And so Cokelet's project goes from  
4 Valdez out into the Gulf of Alaska and then down the coast  
5 to Long Beach. We're not, of course, paying for collecting  
6 data off the coast of California but on the other hand,  
7 that's the beauty of these things. It doesn't cost  
8 anymore, once it's installed, it's up and it's operating to  
9 give the people down in California the data.

10 So we're -- so the Okkonen project  
11 operates out in the Gulf of Alaska. It's one of the few  
12 windows that we have on the central Gulf of Alaska. And  
13 the Cokelet project operates in coastal waters in the  
14 northern Gulf of Alaska.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any more questions,  
16 discussion? Trustee Pearce.

17 MS. PEARCE: Dr. Balsiger, could you go  
18 back through your list please?

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Here, I've got it right  
20 here.

21 MS. PEARCE: Oh do you? Okay.

22 MR. BALSIGER: The top half of page 21 on  
23 the proposal, on the funded ones, I suggested funding all  
24 of them save Bechtol.

25 MR. MEADE: Save Bechtol?

1 MR. BALSIGER: Except for Bechtol.  
2 MR MEADE: Oh, is Bechtol the one that.....  
3 MS. PHILLIPS: No, that was Batten.  
4 MR. MEADE: Oh, Batten. Excuse me, thank  
5 you. I concur.  
6 MS. BALLARD: I'm not ready for that big of  
7 list yet. I'm a little nervous about the Cokelet one.  
8 This whole section, of course, is one that I'm the most  
9 concerned about. I'm the most concern that we're stepping  
10 beyond where I want my focus of attention to be in wishing  
11 to seek a compromise. I'm just not quite with you yet,  
12 Jim.  
13 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman. I didn't see  
14 you come back in so I thought I was waving at an empty  
15 chair.  
16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: No, I'm here.  
17 MR. BALSIGER: Of those six projects, two  
18 of them are new, the Cokelet one and the Okkonen or Oc --  
19 oh, I'm sorry, the Cokelet and the.....  
20 MS. BALLARD: Yeah, Okkonen is ongoing.  
21 MR. BALSIGER: I guess they're all ongoing,  
22 save the Cokelet one. Some of them decline in price has  
23 been discussed and some of them continuing. I don't -- I  
24 guess we could consider whether these ongoing ones that are  
25 monitoring ones if we're going to reject the GEM -- part of

1 the GEM model that suggests monitoring as an appropriate  
2 use of these then perhaps we need to give that signal. But  
3 some of these people that expected that we would be looking  
4 at these probably may not have put a lot of effort into  
5 applying to the North Pacific Research Board or some place  
6 like that. Because it seems that these -- to them that  
7 these monitoring projects were appropriate for this  
8 council.

9                   So I hate to shut them out this year  
10 without giving an opportunity to pick up these time series  
11 other places, if that's what the Trustee Council is going  
12 to eventually do, is to change the restoration plan, change  
13 the thoughts that we have for the GEM model. I'm not  
14 proposing we do that because I'm still a supporter of both  
15 the restoration plan, the way it is in the GEM model. But  
16 if the will of the Trustee Council no longer lies there, I  
17 think we change that and then indicate that in a future RFP  
18 rather than not allowing these kinds of projects to go  
19 through at this time.

20                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Is there another proposal  
21 for this section?

22                   MS. BALLARD: I guess my response to Jim is  
23 this is the dilemma of the government structure that we're  
24 stuck with. That we either exercise no judgment as new  
25 players at the table or delay that. I mean, I understand

1     what you just said, I also understand how I feel about it.  
2     And I'm not wishing to pass judgment on the GEM project,  
3     I'm wishing to focus my energies on, as I've said, on the  
4     more immediate issues that I feel all of the resource  
5     agencies are confronted with. I believe that an aspect of  
6     restoration is an element of public assurance, an element  
7     of public credibility since a significant aspect of the  
8     injury and therefore the funding of the damages had to do  
9     with the public's belief about the condition in Prince  
10    William Sound.

11                   So I really am struggling with this. I  
12    don't have -- at this moment I'm stuck on this category  
13    because this category is the most difficult for me to  
14    square with my own belief that we have still a very heavy  
15    responsibility right now, ongoing, to be sure that the uses  
16    and the conditions that, to the degree they have been  
17    restored, are restored, are protected, preserved and  
18    managed in the way that they were lost to the American  
19    people whose consideration through the contingent funding  
20    is really the source of the money to begin with. I'm just  
21    having a real problem with it.

22                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Trustee Meade.

23                   MR. MEADE: I just wanted to share that I  
24    completely -- I feel I'm in concurrence with where Ms.  
25    Ballard is at on this. I just wonder if the right time to

1 emphasize or to focus that would be at the next RFP rather  
2 than at a point where individuals that are carrying out  
3 those monitoring activities, you know, have foregone other  
4 options to be able to find funding sources for them to  
5 continue that anticipated work. So I wonder again if the  
6 RFP, as we move forward, is a place where we can really put  
7 our signature on how we shape this in some of these areas  
8 anyhow.

9 MS. BALLARD: If I can just add my one  
10 comment. These are all projects which, if we start, we're  
11 really committed. You know, I understand the comprising  
12 nature of Joe's comments but, you know, if we take the  
13 Bartlett and -- inner hull out and put the equipment on  
14 board, that's a long term commitment. That's not a one  
15 year commitment.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

17 DR. MUNDY: Yes, if -- Mr. Chairman, if I  
18 might respond to Dr. Balsiger's comments and perhaps I can  
19 offer Commissioner Ballard some perspective. This was the  
20 hardest part of the GEM program to put together. This  
21 was, from the beginning, we had a lot of controversy about  
22 this. And so we have a very long record of discussion of  
23 these particular projects. So I don't -- it's not  
24 surprising to me that you are having the problem that  
25 you're having with these projects.

1                   And there was a substantial amount of  
2 debate in the scientific community. We came down to these  
3 conclusions and are recommending these projects as --  
4 probably as integral to the GEM program. I would simply  
5 say that these are what sets GEM apart from any other  
6 agency program to manage fish and wildlife resources. And  
7 the rationale here is that we have, in addition to our sea  
8 otters and our harlequin ducks where we're putting a lot of  
9 our lingering oil research money, we also have other  
10 injured species. We have several species of commorants  
11 that are listed as not recovered. We have species such as  
12 dolly varden and cutthroat trout which are listed as status  
13 unknown.

14                   So we have a lot of unfinished business  
15 from the restoration program in terms of injured species.  
16 And the consensus that we arrived at in the scientific  
17 community is that we can't sort these things out without  
18 some long term environmental signals.. Without some long  
19 term environmental information. Also, the Trustee Council,  
20 in setting out the GEM program, in authorizing the GEM  
21 program, explicitly told us to go and shoot the gaps. They  
22 told us to take the holes in the agency mission. And what  
23 is it that natural resource management agencies like Alaska  
24 Department of Fish and Game and Fish and Wildlife Service  
25 do not have? And that is, long term environmental

1 background information. What was it that we didn't have  
2 that we needed at the beginning of the oil spill? We had  
3 counts of fish, we had some counts of birds and mammals --  
4 we didn't have any long term environmental background data.  
5 As Dr. Royer pointed out to you this morning, in fact there  
6 are only two long term oceanographic stations in the entire  
7 North Pacific. I feel fortunate that we've got one of them  
8 but that's just not enough. We -- in order to -- if we're  
9 going to sort out the difference between natural causes and  
10 human effects -- human effects such as fishing and the oil  
11 spill and other things like that, shoreline development --  
12 we're going to need long term environmental signals. And I  
13 think that in the long term, policy makers -- and spend  
14 most of my career providing science to policy makers --  
15 policy makers are going to use this money to sa -- use this  
16 data to save the taxpayers money. Because we keep getting  
17 into these environmental train wrecks, like the stellar sea  
18 lion debacle and we -- chances are that if we'd had some  
19 better information going into that, particularly long term  
20 baseline data, we could have avoided some of that conflict  
21 and we could avoided a lot of the expense that accrued to  
22 the industry as a result. So that's the thing.

23                   The other thing about these ACC proposals  
24 that I would point out is that Weingartner -- you know,  
25 this Weingartner project, that is the -- that's the GAK-1.



1 That's the long term environmental monitoring program. The  
2 longest -- one of the oldest monitoring programs in the  
3 North Pacific.

4 The Batten project, the CPR, again, this is  
5 the only thing that anybody has that's out there to look at  
6 regime change. This is the only data that we've got that  
7 comes out of this part of the Gulf of Alaska. So the --  
8 these projects have been carefully chosen. These have been  
9 projects such as Batten's project and Cokelet's project,  
10 have vetted not only by our own peer reviewers but there  
11 are scientists all over the Pacific who are interested and  
12 excited in these programs. These are also the same people  
13 that we call on for volunteer services when we do our peer  
14 reviews so I'm glad that they're excited. At least they  
15 know who we are, so.....

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Is there -- do you want  
17 to put all of these projects onto our list to come back to  
18 and move on to the next section or do you want to continue  
19 to discuss this section? Or what would be the will of the  
20 collective Trustees? Or do you want to have a different  
21 proposal other than the one Dr. Balsiger has proposed?

22 MS. BALLARD: I can go with Willette and  
23 Batten for the reasons that Phil just said. I mean, I can  
24 at least go that far. I'm not -- at this moment I'm not  
25 comfortable going beyond that but I can put those two on

1 the table. If we can get six agreements on those two.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Was it Willette or  
3 Weingartner that was the long term.....

4 MS. BALLARD: Oh, I'm sorry. I meant -- I  
5 went -- the 33 years. I've got my arrow wrong.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I thought you meant that.

7 MS. BALLARD: Yeah, you're right, I'm  
8 sorry. The trifocals didn't help me out there.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So Batten and  
10 Weingartner?

11 MS. BALLARD: Yeah, sorry.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Are there other -- Dr.  
13 Mundy, are the -- what are the -- I was trying to  
14 understand between your presentation and Dr. Balsiger said  
15 about the long term -- I mean, you know, the ongoing nature  
16 of these projects. And are these projects that were pre --  
17 if there are projects here that have an ongoing monitoring  
18 nature, were they previously funded by EVOS?

19 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, the Batten  
20 project was tried in concept by the NPMR funding source  
21 which is said to be the North Pacific Research Board. I  
22 believe that that was an independent appropriation but  
23 nonetheless there is a route from Seattle to Hokido, across  
24 -- a trans-Pacific route of Batten that was funded by the  
25 North Pacific Research Board. As far as I know, since its

1 inception, the transect that runs through Alaskan waters,  
2 the Batten transect, the CPR transect, has been funded by  
3 us.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

5 DR. MUNDY: The Weingartner -- the -- we  
6 are the only group that's funded the mooring at GAK-1.  
7 These ocean stations are latitude and longitude, they are  
8 locations on a map. And in general, the reason that we  
9 have such a nice long transect there -- time series for  
10 GAK-1 is that it's been a tradition to stop and take the  
11 station oceanographically on the way out of Seward. So  
12 that's where you had a lot of data. By putting the mooring  
13 in, we were able to get long time series data at depth,  
14 which is the problem. We can get surface data often from  
15 satellites if there aren't clouds but we can't get that  
16 data at depth. We were able to get a long -- a nice time  
17 series of data at depth so that was our addition here.

18 I'd also point out on the Cokelet project  
19 here, after all the stuff we went through with the  
20 engineers at the Alaska Marine Highway system to get them  
21 to agree to let us on board their vessel and the work that  
22 we've done with the master of this vessel and the crew to  
23 bump them up about the prospects we're doing this, I don't  
24 think I would want to be back next year saying, hey, we  
25 didn't do it last year but we're going to ask you do it

1 again. I don't think that's a -- I wouldn't advise that as  
2 a course of action.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

4 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
5 I'm not sure if -- I probably misunderstood your question  
6 to Dr. Mundy.

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I'm just trying  
8 understand the amount of reliance, I guess.....

9 MR. BALSIGER: Right but I think that the  
10 Stabenow project here is the second year, which was the  
11 first year, which was funded by the Trustee Council last  
12 year.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right.

14 MR. BALSIGER: And I think that the Okkonen  
15 project.....

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okkonen.

17 MR. BALSIGER: .....it was a pilot project  
18 put in place by the EVOS Trustees last year.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right.

20 MR. BALSIGER: So if your question was, are  
21 these continuing, they are. I don't know if that means  
22 they're totally reliant on this. And if I may, while I  
23 have the floor, I know that Commissioner Ballard -- and I  
24 agree with you -- that we have responsibility to review  
25 these and not be a rubber stamp for some process that was

1 put in motion. But a part of responsibility of the old  
2 Trustee council was the adoption of the GEM model.

3 So it isn't as if these projects came out  
4 of whole cloth just showed up here. They showed up here  
5 because we said these are the things we want to do, show us  
6 the best way to get these particular things done. And so,  
7 I don't feel like I'm abrogating the public trust by  
8 failing to reduce these by 70 percent or 40 percent or  
9 whatever goal there might be. I think that these are  
10 already reduced from the proposals that came in on target  
11 and are the best ones, all recommended by the best  
12 scientists we could get our hands on, including Dr. Mundy.

13  
14 So I don't think that we're -- that by --  
15 if we, for example, chose 95 percent of these, it's not a  
16 rubber stamp. It's a process that was started a long time  
17 ago. It was a fine sieve that we put together that they  
18 had to go through to get here already. So, well, thank  
19 you.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Do we want to agree to  
21 those that we can agree to and then put these -- the others  
22 on a list to come back to and move to the next category?  
23 Then maybe at the end we can come back to the list, does  
24 that make sense?

25 MS. BALLARD: I guess, for now.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: So it sounded to me like  
2 we could agree on Batten and Weingartner. Is there any  
3 more discussion on the -- after the information that Dr.  
4 Mundy provided on Cokelet, the Alaska Marine Highway  
5 project?

6                   MR. MEADE: That appealed to me but I can  
7 only say from a partnership standpoint it appealed to me.  
8 Here we have the State and the State's marine highway  
9 department fostering a partnership and data collection  
10 that's going to be of high quality to the State, to EVOS  
11 and other needs. So in that the relationships have been  
12 forged, the MOU sits on the desk, it just is a good  
13 partnership relationship project to continue to move  
14 forward on. At least that's -- when I heard of this  
15 project about a month back, it sure appealed to me and it  
16 -- I've done partnerships where you have to go through this  
17 long mating dance to get approvals to do these unique  
18 approaches and all that ground has been forged. My  
19 goodness, I think it's a natural for a win-win outcome.  
20 Where we've got some committed interests with marine  
21 highway and I think it's going to yield up some benefits as  
22 well as the partnership relationship. So for me, I guess I  
23 would ask why not? It's going to get us some good and  
24 important focus data. We've got the partnership  
25 established and expectations built. As long as we can get

1 a commitment to get the equipment tooled in time for the  
2 dry dock, it makes good sense.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Mr. Duffy.

4 MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
5 Speaking for myself as a Trustee and listening to Phil's  
6 explanation of this project and thinking long and hard  
7 about it, I as a State Trustee, given where we're at in  
8 terms of our coordination with the Marine Highway system  
9 and I do see some value in this project in the long term.  
10 Kind of information that it's going to provide, I would --  
11 I as a State Trustee would support the Cokelet project. I  
12 would recommend putting that on the approved list.

13 MS. BALLARD: I won't stand in the way of  
14 that.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, we got consensus on  
16 another one. So that's good, so we now have Batten,  
17 Cokelet and Weingartner that we would put in the fund  
18 category. And Bechtol, Okkonen, Stabenow and Willette  
19 that we put on the -- our deferral list to come back to.  
20 And I got a feeling that's -- we should maybe move on to  
21 the next section and come back. Is that -- is there a  
22 consensus to move on to the next section?

23 (No audible response)

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

25 MR. BALSIGER: Okay.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: The next section is  
2 community involvement. Any discussion here?

3                   MR. MEADE: I might offer some here.....

4                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Meade.

5                   MR. MEADE: .....because I did speak up  
6 earlier. I want to suggest or State on behalf of my role  
7 as a Trustee, our agency's involvement around the Prince  
8 William Sound and on down to the Kenai, our connection with  
9 our villages and communities is vitally important. I don't  
10 know if I was very satisfied with what I read in the  
11 proposals as submitted but I would feel it would be a large  
12 injustice to take the very, most impacted segment of  
13 Alaskans, and that's our Native villages in and around  
14 areas affected by the oil spill, and not have them as an  
15 important ingredient in what the research needs ahead are  
16 to be.

17                   Again, I can't necessarily say, Dr. Mundy,  
18 that I saw anything packaged in the community component  
19 here that I would necessarily stand so firm and defend but  
20 I would certainly advocate that we -- make sure we've got  
21 an active village and impacted community component to this.  
22 I offer that, not being able to give any specificity.  
23 Perhaps could ask Ken Holbrook to assist me if he saw some  
24 in there that were essential from our agency's perspective.  
25 But I don't want to see us not have some strong component



1 of connection in there with those that have been most  
2 impacted by the oil spill.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I just might add, if I  
4 can, I also have a strong feeling about this area and I  
5 feel we do have a responsibility to involve these  
6 communities and people, particularly the traditional  
7 ecological knowledge that they have and their subsistence  
8 culture and need needs to be part of the equation, I think,  
9 going forward. And what makes me uncomfortable about the  
10 proposal here -- and this could be my own fault for not  
11 digging deep enough, so I admit that up front -- but from  
12 what I've been able to have the time to read here is that  
13 I'm uncomfortable about what I don't know about the  
14 proposals that have been rejected and why. As opposed to  
15 just having what I see, which to me seems to be inadequate  
16 given the public testimony that we got this morning. At  
17 least we haven't communicated to those communities and  
18 those people who have other proposals. It doesn't sound  
19 like to me -- why they're not part of this group and other  
20 people are. So I was left with a very uncomfortable  
21 feeling about this section and I don't even know if it's  
22 possible, given the process. But what would make me more  
23 comfortable would be to take this community involvement  
24 piece of this plan and to go back and rethink it in terms  
25 of -- or take a -- have the Trustees get more information

1 about the proposals that have been rejected and take -- and  
2 have a broader maybe discussion than we could have today,  
3 just about this section. And maybe do it in the near  
4 future.

5                   So I don't know what I'm really proposing  
6 with where we are here and I think that I'd like to have  
7 more information about how we're engaging these communities  
8 and valuing the impact of the research and the relationship  
9 of the research to the subsistence need that exists there.  
10 That's my thought.

11                   Trustee Pearce.

12                   MS. PEARCE: I agree with what you've said.  
13 In some ways it appears that in deferring funding for  
14 subsistence and stewardship or for the youth area watch we  
15 are aligning ourselves more with kind of the scientific  
16 research side of GEM and forgetting about the people who  
17 are most affected, the indigenous people. And I think the  
18 traditional ecological knowledge is very important. But I  
19 attended the Tatitlek WisdomKeepers' meeting and they were  
20 very useful, I think, both for the scientists who attended,  
21 certainly for the Trustees that were there, staff who was  
22 there and I would hope for the people of Tatitlek, and I  
23 think they were. It brought a community together, the  
24 elders and the children, and allowed some interaction  
25 that, right, wrong or indifferent, hasn't necessarily been

1     happening in those areas.

2                     And they made suggestions of specific  
3     research that they would like to see the Trustee Council  
4     but it's kind of real time, what is happening to the kelp.  
5     Specific things that they see because they're there.  
6     Questions that they have that we aren't answering the  
7     broader GEM program. And I'm wondering if -- well, I --  
8     your idea is to kind of set these aside and get more  
9     information. And I certainly don't have a problem with  
10    getting more information but I'm wondering if there's a  
11    community piece of our entire responsibility that we should  
12    just kind of reach into GEM and pick up and move over here,  
13    outside of that more scientific discussion. I don't know  
14    that I need -- frankly, I don't know that it's very  
15    relevant to what I see as the positive outcome of a  
16    WisdomKeepers' meeting to have the STAC decide whether or  
17    not they think a fit in a scientific in a GEM model.

18                    I think we have a responsibility to spend  
19    more time and frankly more money in working with the local  
20    communities. That during the entire time that I've been a  
21    Trustee, I've thought we weren't doing enough in that  
22    respect. I understand that there -- well we've  
23    commissioned some sort of a project that going to give us  
24    ideas. We're not sure -- I should know the answer and I  
25    don't. I don't know who's doing it. It said it was

1 supposed to be with us the end of September. Is that  
2 something we have?

3 MS. BALLARD: It has been turned in so it's  
4 something that we're working on right now.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: What's -- I'm sorry, I'm  
6 not aware of it. What's that?

7 MS. PHILLIPS: It's a recommendation for  
8 the community involvement program for the Trustees. It was  
9 an actual project.

10 MS. PEARCE: Trying to fit community  
11 involvement into the GEM.....

12 MR. BALSIGER: It's already funded.

13 MS. PEARCE: .....matrix as opposed to  
14 anything separate.

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

16 MS. PEARCE: Okay. Well, having not seen  
17 that, so I.....

18 MS. PHILLIPS: No.

19 MS. PEARCE: .....obviously speak to it  
20 but.....

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Shouldn't we take  
22 these.....

23 MS. PEARCE: .....I still feel like there's  
24 a piece of what -- that we're missing from community  
25 involvement, particularly with the local tribal entities

1     which we of course have a trust relationship with that  
2     probably is that round -- square peg trying to fit into a  
3     round hole or vice-versa in GEM but that is very important  
4     to what I see as a long-term responsibility that perhaps  
5     we're not getting to but I'd like to get to. And if that  
6     means pulling these -- you know, the youth area watch seems  
7     like an excellent program to get the young people involved.  
8     Okay, it doesn't fit in GEM but maybe we could figure out  
9     how to make it fit somehow.

10                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Let me ask Gail, how do  
11     you -- how does the study that you just completed, you're  
12     just discussing, how does that fit with moving forward on  
13     the projects that are proposed here?

14                   MS. PHILLIPS: Well, we just very recently  
15     received the document. So Phil and I are in the process of  
16     going through that right now. That would be certainly  
17     something -- I don't know, Phil, if there was any -- one of  
18     these programs that we wouldn't be able to wait and  
19     address both the results of that project and these at the  
20     same time a little later, if you wanted to do that.

21                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard.

22                   MS. BALLARD: I don't understand the  
23     relationship between that project and the community  
24     involvement component of the fiscal '04 plan. I'm sorry, I  
25     don't see how that works.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

2 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, the question is,  
3 is what is the relationship between the report that was  
4 done by Marilyn Sigmund, it's the Sigmund report. It  
5 included other people, including Patty Brown-Schwalenberg,  
6 who testified before you this morning, was one of the  
7 people on that report. The relation of that is that we  
8 were -- we had the NRC review of the program, okay. And  
9 they made recommendations on how to move forward with what  
10 -- you know, with what we're calling GEM. And one of the  
11 things that they criticized the Trustee Council and the  
12 restoration program for was the nature of its relationship  
13 in terms of funding projects with the tribes, which they  
14 characterized, I think, probably the word's tokenism. So  
15 what we have, even though the expenditures in the past in  
16 that program were substantial, there was a lot of money  
17 spent in that regard. So we have tried to -- I mean, I  
18 fully recognize the problem that, you know, Council member  
19 Pearce is addressing here, and that is, how do you get TEK,  
20 how do you get Traditional Ecological Knowledge into the  
21 program. How do you serve the interests as identified by  
22 the Council and mesh those with the interests of the people  
23 who were heavily impacted the oil spill area.

24 Now one of the issues here is how you  
25 define communities because is community a synonym for

1 tribal. Or is -- or are you going to deal with the -- I  
2 spend a very large part of my career working with tribal  
3 governments and writing fishing regulations and other  
4 things for tribes. So the question is, is how are you --  
5 are you going to deal with the tribes in their own right or  
6 are you going to treat them as other communities. I  
7 certainly know that in working in Puget Sound, the Columbia  
8 River basin, the tribes there do not view themselves as  
9 simply another user group or simply another user community.  
10 They see that they have a different relationship with the  
11 organization.

12 So there are all kinds of policy issues  
13 here that I -- that as a science director I can't begin to  
14 cut through, although I can listen for you and identify  
15 them for you. We have a problem with quote, unquote,  
16 community involvement in terms of the definition of what  
17 community means and in terms of how we're going to do it.  
18 The idea of having this broad based report that had a lot  
19 of different contractors involved and certainly did have a  
20 tribal perspective in it was that the Executive Director  
21 could then take this, use it as a starting point and work  
22 with the Trustee Council to develop a coherent community  
23 involvement package that would recognize the needs of the  
24 tribes as well as other communities in the oil spill  
25 affected area.

1                   So that's the relationship, Commissioner  
2 Ballard, of this report to the FY-04 strategy.

3                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: But I personally just  
4 very much support that process for addressing a community  
5 involvement piece. It sounds like a good process that's  
6 been underway. It's had some stakeholder involvement in  
7 the report that you have. And I'd look forward to the  
8 interaction with you and with Gail Phillips on, you know,  
9 that report and how as Trustees we can address the  
10 community involvement. But concerns me is that, you know,  
11 Trustee Pearce's, you know, recommendation about the value  
12 of say the WisdomKeeper workshops but then seeing the  
13 funding for that is not continued in the program. So that  
14 sends a message that is inconsistent, I think, you know,  
15 you -- so but that's something that we could discuss within  
16 the context of the overall community involvement effort.  
17 So I'd like to see if we couldn't reach a consensus on  
18 moving this piece into that process and addressing it in  
19 the near future.

20                   MS. PEARCE: In a separate.....

21                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Meade first and  
22 then Dr. Balsiger.

23                   MR. MEADE: I'm right where you're at, Mr.  
24 Chairman. I would just want to be sure we sent a bold  
25 statement of support in this action so that it could not be



1 misread by our villages and communities in the oil spill  
2 influenced and impacted areas. To me, our notion here in  
3 tabling this would be to recognize its heightened  
4 importance and that we're not getting at the very  
5 fundamental components that we'd like to see us getting at.  
6 And so we're going to give it more energy, more rigor, and  
7 look to how we can better position ourselves to be more  
8 responsive to those individuals in communities and  
9 villages. If that's the notion, I can completely support  
10 what you're suggesting.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That would be my notion.  
12 Dr. Balsiger.

13 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
14 guess my own -- I like the idea but my one consideration  
15 would be whether a good program such as this youth area  
16 watch in Kodiak suffers because we won't be able to get  
17 back together again until March. And what that does to the  
18 wrong -- I just made that date up. Whenever we -- we  
19 probably can't get back together right away and I'm  
20 wondering what damage is done to their program if there's a  
21 lapse in funding and that that would be my consideration.  
22 And I don't know if we have that information.

23 MR. MEADE: There were two that appealed to  
24 me, the one in Kodiak as well as the support to the schools  
25 here in.....

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Chugach.

2 MR. MEADE: .....Chugach. So maybe those  
3 could be a couple if we could find a couple that are  
4 relevant within the school year and time frames and then  
5 try to be expeditious in getting the other in the broader  
6 context perhaps.

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Mr. Duffy.

8 MR. DUFFY: I concur with a number of the  
9 number of the comments that have been stated here but I  
10 want to ask Dr. Mundy, because we do have at least one  
11 project that is a continuing project, that's the Adams  
12 fishery management project. It had one year of funding,  
13 this is a request for a second year of funding. And what  
14 impacts might that have if we chose to go this route  
15 relative to that project where he would be basically in  
16 limbo for a month or two period, when -- probably two  
17 months realistically. Because I certainly wouldn't want to  
18 send that signal based on our discussions about the project  
19 today.

20 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, Dr. Mundy.

22 DR. MUNDY: Yes, he would be in limbo, as  
23 are the other continuing projects. I mean, they don't have  
24 funding at this time. Also, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'd  
25 like to point out that the Cooper here is -- perhaps this

1 was not the right to put it but it was submitted under  
2 community involvement. This is part of the watershed  
3 package. This is the one that brought the -- we called for  
4 in our watershed RFP community involvement in using  
5 community based sampling to achieve our purposes. So this  
6 one is in addition to the -- this one is unlike the others  
7 in here. This one is actually using people in the  
8 community to go out and collect data. And this is the  
9 community based sampling project.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Pearce.

11 MS. PEARCE: I have a question about the  
12 State's recommendation. Obviously there's something about  
13 the community involvement that -- because none of them were  
14 on your list for funding for the two youth watch, the  
15 Schneider and DeLorenzo -- set those aside and set aside at  
16 the moment the -- Patty's project. For Adams, Baird and  
17 Cooper, what's the, I guess in looking at which ones to  
18 fund and which ones not to fund, what was the reasoning  
19 behind not having those?

20 MS. BALLARD: I can speak a little bit  
21 about some of them, not all of them, particularly Cooper.  
22 If I understand Cooper correctly, a citizen monitoring --  
23 we don't have any objection to citizen monitoring, it's a  
24 question really of wanting a structure that assures that  
25 that monitoring is fed properly into -- it started with

1 some sort of baseline but it fits -- it's -- the data  
2 that's collected fits into a broader plan. We've had a  
3 number of similar challenges with State funds where we had  
4 excellent projects that were isolated from one another.  
5 They didn't hang together in a way, the targeted -- the  
6 resources that perhaps most needed monitoring, nor did they  
7 hang together with an overall monitoring strategy so that  
8 information you got here and information you got here tied  
9 together in a way that would make it predictive of  
10 situations which were similar someplace else. So that's  
11 the -- that would be why I wasn't in favor of Cooper.

12 Adams, I confess, is an oversight. I think  
13 that the comments that both he made and then that Dr. Mundy  
14 made, I would feel very much in favor of the Adams project.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Go ahead.

16 MS. PEARCE: I'd like to just throw out a  
17 suggestion that we take the two youth watch projects, the  
18 Schneider project and the DeLorenzo project and go ahead  
19 and move those forward. And take the Brown-Schwalenberg  
20 and set it aside just until we have an opportunity to go  
21 through the new proposal or model report, whatever, and  
22 then see if we don't come up with something that fits that  
23 project better. And doesn't necessarily need to be even --  
24 in my mind, I still don't mind if it doesn't fit the exact  
25 matrix of GEM. And also, it might even be more expensive

1 once we've read what the report says.

2 MS. BALLARD: Drue, point of clarification,  
3 do you mean this Brown-Schwalenberg project or the other  
4 one? I think you all are looking at the WisdomKeeper and  
5 isn't the WisdomKeeper in the one that isn't even on this  
6 list?

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right, that's correct.

8 MS. BALLARD: Yeah.

9 MS. PEARCE: Oh, I'm sorry.

10 MS. BALLARD: I wonder if that isn't the  
11 one you two mean?

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah.....

13 MS. PEARCE: Probably.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....and what I was  
15 thinking is, is that if we enter into -- if we look at the  
16 report and then have a broader discussion about community  
17 involvement then we might be able to include a discussion  
18 of the WisdomKeeper program and other things that didn't  
19 make it onto this list that we haven't been able to see.

20 MS. BALLARD: I would be more comfortable  
21 with a community involvement focus that didn't have to meet  
22 the rigors of the -- didn't have to meet the rigors that  
23 have been applied through the GEM proposal but address the  
24 more conventional involvement that allowed the standards  
25 for involvement to be locally set and traditionally

1 oriented and not peer reviewable. I'd feel a lot more  
2 comfortable under those circumstances. But I still think  
3 we ought to look at Adams. I think that that's.....

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So how about a proposal  
5 that we change the DeLorenzo, which is the Chugach area  
6 project, from defer to fund and we fund the Schneider  
7 Kodiak youth area watch program. And we fund Adams and  
8 then we put Baird and Cooper and Brown-Schwalenberger [sic]  
9 on the -- well, Baird and Cooper on a deferred list, the  
10 set aside list that we're creating for the end and then --  
11 and the Schwalenberger [sic] project already is on a defer  
12 status.

13 So that we'd agree now and then move on to  
14 the next section, that we want to do -- we want to fund  
15 Schneider, the Kodiak youth area watch, the DeLorenzo youth  
16 area watch and Adams. And then put the rest of the  
17 proposals to the defer list with a commitment that Trustee  
18 Meade had articulated so well. That we feel like we're in  
19 -- we may be inadequate in this area, it may be the rigor  
20 of the GEM process has helped create that situation. We  
21 want to look at community involvement within the context of  
22 the report that's just been submitted and we want to do  
23 that in the near term.

24 MS. PHILLIPS: And hold the defer -- those  
25 deferred projects until we can get together and meet

1 on.....

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That's right.

3 MS. PHILLIPS: .....as a whole.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That's right.

5 MS. PHILLIPS: All right.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Except at the end, we may  
7 want to -- taking Trustee Ballard's comments into account  
8 and Dr. Mundy's, the Cooper project, maybe we -- should be  
9 viewed in light of the watershed area on the deferred list.

10 MR. MEADE: And it would be, I think,  
11 helpful, if I may, Gail, if we could perhaps, you know, not  
12 wait until we next meet but actually begin to do some  
13 homework that maybe we could ask the -- your staff here to  
14 help us.....

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Sure.

16 MR. MEADE: .....explore so we could begin  
17 to take a look at what are the options that may be with  
18 more of a ethnographic or a social science -- social  
19 ecology slant that we might have gone at, you know, to be  
20 able to gain more in that context of traditional ecological  
21 knowledge versus in having it so driven by perhaps the  
22 structure GEM put it into. And that way when we do meet  
23 again, perhaps we will have had a pre-reading package that  
24 we could look through. Perhaps even if it's not  
25 inappropriate we could engage some elders and tribal or

1 village input or participation in shaping that.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: We have -- the annual work  
3 meeting will be in January and many of the members would be  
4 coming to that, maybe we could.....

5 MR. MEADE: Have a concurrent session or  
6 a.....

7 MS. PHILLIPS: .....arrange the meeting  
8 during that time.

9 MR. MEADE: That would be wonderful. That  
10 could really help drive us somewhere with us rather than  
11 leaving it languishing.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

13 MS. BALLARD: May I clarify with Gail the --  
14 I want to be sure I understand what this -- the other  
15 project is. We -- the draft plan was circulated, was it  
16 not, in the late summer?

17 MS. PHILLIPS: The draft was, I believe.  
18 It went out.....

19 DR. MUNDY: The draft Work Plan?

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Not the Work Plan, the  
21 community involvement one.

22 MS. BALLARD: Was it not circulated in the  
23 late summer?

24 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

25 MS. BALLARD: Was there not -- why do I



1 feel a sense of familiarity with this?

2 MS. PHILLIPS: I think that it was, before  
3 I came on board.

4 DR. MUNDY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I --  
5 Commissioner Ballard, I'm sorry, I don't know -- I do not  
6 believe it was. I mean, we -- oh, let me think. We had  
7 some -- we had a meeting of the public advisory committee  
8 with the contractors, okay, to -- and the staff here at the  
9 Trustee Council in August to talk about finishing up the  
10 report and what was -- you know, what they were going to  
11 cover in the report specifically and so forth. But there  
12 was not draft circulated. In fact, the draft that we have  
13 on hand now has not been circulated except the peer  
14 reviewers. So that draft has not been out of this shop,  
15 I'm certain of that.

16 MS. BALLARD: I'm sorry, I'm just trying to  
17 understand exactly what this product is. And I guess we'll  
18 wait and we'll something distributed to us.

19 DR. MUNDY: Well, you -- I'm sorry, Mr.  
20 Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Go ahead.

22 DR. MUNDY: If I may. Commissioner  
23 Ballard, you may get a sense of what it is because we can  
24 give you the contract. We can give you the funded -- what  
25 was funded -- the project description that was funded so

1 that you can see what they're supposed to produce.

2 MS. BALLARD: That would be helpful. Okay,  
3 that would be helpful.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

5 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
6 Just to clarify, Ms. Phillips, did you suggest that we  
7 would have Trustee meeting concurrent with the January  
8 symposium at which we'd make decisions on these?

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, you could -- we could  
10 do that or you could have a workshop during the -- during  
11 the annual meeting, we could have a workshop with the  
12 elders and the people involved if you want. Or we could do  
13 it by teleconference. I mean there's a lot of different  
14 options.

15 MR. BALSIGER: But specifically relative to  
16 deciding which ones to fund, if we're deferring them, that  
17 would be the time frame we'd make that decision, you're  
18 suggesting?

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Right. Right.

20 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: But I'll send you all the  
22 material ahead of time.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And I'd prefer to have a  
24 workshop where there was some information gathering and  
25 some dialogue and then digest it and then.....

1 MS. PHILLIPS: And then.....

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....maybe quickly come  
3 back at a teleconference or something and make a decision.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: .....okay -- and to make the  
5 decision, sure.

6 MR. MEADE: I think that workshop idea  
7 where we could have opportunity to interface with elders  
8 and interests from the community level would be invaluable.

9 MS. PHILLIPS: And the workshop dates are  
10 the 14th through the -- 12th through the 16th.

11 MS. PEARCE: Of January?

12 MS. PHILLIPS: January.

13 MS. PEARCE: Is that a time frame that we  
14 can bring some elders in?

15 MR. KOMPKOFF: Russian Christmas in the  
16 villages is on January 7th, 8th and 9th and New Year's is  
17 about a week after that.

18 MS. PEARCE: Uh-huh.

19 MR. KOMPKOFF: If we are to bring elders  
20 in, then I think about the 14th.

21 MS. PEARCE: Okay.

22 MS. PHILLIPS: What did you have during the  
23 7th, 8th and 9th?

24 MR. KOMPKOFF: That's Russian Orthodox --  
25 Russian Christmas.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, yeah.

2 MR. KOMPKOFF: (Indiscernible - away from  
3 microphone and communications on phone system)

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

5 MS. PEARCE: New Year's and what? I'm  
6 sorry, I can't hear you.

7 MR. KOMPKOFF: New Year's is the 14th, I  
8 think. And then generally from.....

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, we can schedule it --  
10 we can work with you guys to schedule it when it work out.

11 MS. BROWN-SCHWALENBERG: (Indiscernible -  
12 away from microphone) middle of December a round of  
13 regional meetings, maybe that would make for  
14 (indiscernible)

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Patty, if you could get me  
16 those dates, please. Thanks.

17 MR. MEADE: And if I could coordinate with  
18 you, Gail, I would really like to -- I've got some  
19 conflicts scattered through January, I'd really like to  
20 find a date where I could actively participate.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: Sure, sure. Great.

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, shall we move on to  
23 the lingering oil? Should I restate where I think we were  
24 on community involvement. We were at Adams, Schneider and  
25 DeLorenzo. And then.....

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Hold the rest for the.....  
2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Hold the rest, okay.  
3 MS. PHILLIPS: Uh-huh.  
4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Lingerin oil.  
5 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, data management.  
6 MS. PEARCE: You skipped one.  
7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh, I'm sorry.  
8 MS. BALLARD: We've gotten -- we're at  
9 lingerin oil. I think I can make this easy. I propose we  
10 fund all of these.  
11 MR. BALSIGER: Yeah, we skipped one because  
12 of a mis -- there's a typo there.  
13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Is there something in  
14 between?  
15 MS. BALLARD: I know that but I had already  
16 turned.....  
17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh, I'm sorry.  
18 MS. BALLARD: .....my page so I was just  
19 going to dispose of lingerin oil before I went back to  
20 data management otherwise identified as community  
21 involvement round two.  
22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.....  
23 MS. PHILLIPS: Misidentified.  
24 MS. BALLARD: Yeah.  
25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, let's just -- since

1 Commissioner Ballard has made a proposal, lingering oil.  
2 We accept the Work Plan recommendation.

3 MS. BALLARD: Yeah. That was where we  
4 were.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any discussion?

6 MS. PEARCE: Well, what does that do to the  
7 sea otters and the.....

8 MS. BALLARD: I can't hear you, Drue, I'm  
9 sorry.

10 MS. PEARCE: I'm sorry, would you restate  
11 what you were.....

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, on page 27 is.....

13 MS. PEARCE: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....the Work Plan  
15 recommendation and.....

16 MS. PEARCE: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....we'd accept it as it  
18 is.

19 MS. PEARCE: With the deferrals?

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah. The -- I'm sorry.

21 MS. BALLARD: No, no, I'm sorry. I don't  
22 know -- I don't have an opinion about the deferrals, I was  
23 just going through the fund contingents and then we talk  
24 about the deferrals.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Fund and fund contingent.

1 Dr. Balsiger, you had a comment.

2 MR. BALSIGER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was --  
3 I believe that the -- we're sort of confused a little bit  
4 because last Friday we had a meeting in Seattle where we  
5 went over some of the background on the fund contingent and  
6 the deferred ones following -- hearing that we were going  
7 to decide whether they should be included in the fund part.  
8 But I think Dr. Mundy told us this morning that we're  
9 slightly ahead of that but we can't delay making those  
10 decisions. So I'd suggest that we include both fund  
11 contingents and the Bodkin sea otter one as well. But I'm  
12 not sure if that's what Commissioner Ballard was  
13 indicating.

14 MS. BALLARD: I just hadn't cast my eye  
15 down on the deferreds, Jim, so if I understand you then, it  
16 would be Fall, Irons, Nelson, Rosenberg, Short and Bodkin?  
17 Is that what you just said?

18 MR. BALSIGER: Well, I -- Mr. Chairman, Ms.  
19 Ballard, I'm actually just trying to capture what I thought  
20 was -- without interjecting my own attitude here, I thought  
21 that because of the meeting we had on Friday that we would  
22 agree to fund Short and Weise, which are fund contingent  
23 and defer Bodkin, which is defer.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes.

25 MR. BALSIGER: But I may have missed

1 something. I can't recall what the Irvine issue was now.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

3 DR. MUNDY: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I would  
4 suggest that you consider moving the -- changing the  
5 deferred projects to fund contingent. When I earlier spoke  
6 to you about how we handled deferred projects in the past,  
7 I was speaking of a method that worked when we approve the  
8 Work Plan on August the 3rd, which is when we would  
9 normally approve. And we're now three months past that.  
10 So basically we need to give the signal to these folks that  
11 they're -- we're working on getting them their money and  
12 that they can expect to get it.

13 So I would just simply recommend -- the  
14 Irvine project is a -- the only project that we have that's  
15 outside Prince William Sound. We did have some  
16 presentation, even though Dr. Irvine was not there, we did  
17 have some presentation on oil outside of Prince William  
18 Sound. And it was indicated that yes, there is still --  
19 there is oil outside of Prince William Sound and it's most  
20 likely to be under these boulder armored beaches. So I  
21 would recommend that if you change these three defers to  
22 fund contingent and accepted the package that we could take  
23 of the Trustee Council's wishes on that.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any comments about that?

25 MS. BALLARD: I'm happy where Jim was,



1     which did not include Irvine.

2                     CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Any further discussion of  
3     Irvine?

4                     MR. BALSIGER:  Mr. Chairman, I didn't  
5     intentionally delete that, I was just trying to bring us up  
6     to date.....

7                     CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Right.

8                     MR. BALSIGER:  .....with the discussions we  
9     had.  And I do recall now that even though Irvine wasn't in  
10    Seattle, that there was the information on outside of  
11    Prince William Sound on the boulder and armored beaches  
12    which is part of the problem.  So I think I would recommend  
13    we include that as well.  That would be the whole package  
14    then.

15                    MS. BALLARD:  I'm getting people nodding at  
16    me.  While.....

17                    MR. DUFFY:  Mr. Chairman.

18                    CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Commissioner Duffy.

19                    MS. BALLARD:  I yield.

20                    MR. DUFFY:  I was hung up on exactly the  
21    same issue that the proposer wasn't at the meeting on  
22    Friday.  I anticipated that then, we still had some  
23    discussion relative to the issues.  And from my perspective  
24    I at this point would support including Irvine under the  
25    fund contingent.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, so then the  
2 proposal is for lingering oil to fund the three funded  
3 projects and to leave in the fund contingent category  
4 Rosenberg and Short. And then to change Rice, Irvine and  
5 Bodkin to fund contingent from defer. Commissioner Duffy.

6                   MR. DUFFY: Well summarized, Mr. Chairman.  
7 Just a quick question to Phil. You have this list of  
8 projects that have been funded in the past and people are  
9 late on their reports. Are there any issues here related  
10 to that list that need to be resolved?

11                  DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, we are working  
12 with the authors here. The reason that -- I believe that  
13 Rosenberg is fund contingent problem has been resolved.  
14 I'm not aware that Dr. Short's fund contingent issue has  
15 been resolved but we're working on it. We -- and there is  
16 -- part of the issue with Dr. Irvine's boulder armored  
17 beaches was a problem with a needed publication. There's a  
18 missing publication here. So I guess that's really all I  
19 can respond with.

20                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, I think  
21 understanding on the fund contingent is they're funded  
22 contingent on you being satisfied that whatever condition  
23 needs to be met, gets met.

24                  MR. DUFFY: Is that your understanding.  
25 Great, thank you. Thank you for that clarification.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, good. So we've --  
2 I think we've got a -- we've got consensus on the lingering  
3 oil section and let's back track. Inadvertently skipped  
4 over data management. And I'm just going to recognize that  
5 we're a half hour over our estimated time of departure. Do  
6 we want to continue? Do we -- for another half an hour and  
7 see if we can't get through all the categories more  
8 quickly?

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes.

11 MS. PHILLIPS: If I could just interject,  
12 you're here, if we can get as much done today as possible,  
13 that's better for everybody. So, you know, what -- the old  
14 adage of a bird in the hand. We could go -- continue with  
15 -- through with this, that would be great.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

17 MR. BALSIGER: I was going to suggest that  
18 we work as hard as we can to get through the Work Plan at  
19 least.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah.

21 MR. MEADE: I was going to suggest if we  
22 can't get to the rest of the business slated for the day,  
23 perhaps Gail can give us a sense if any of those items can  
24 hold but I think we should get through the Work Plan.

25 MS. PHILLIPS: And we could do it by

1       teleconference if necessary.

2                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Okay, well, it's okay  
3       with you, Commissioner Duffy?

4                   MR. DUFFY:   Absolutely, I think we should  
5       keep going.

6                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Okay, well, I don't want  
7       to make a long conversation about this.   Oh, I'm sorry,  
8       Trustee Pearce.

9                   MS. PEARCE:   I came all this way from  
10      Washington, I'm going to stay until we're done.

11                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Okay, good.   Let's go.

12                  MR. MEADE:   And I got to go to Washington  
13      in the morning and I got to have a suit to go with.

14                  MS. BALLARD:   Did you just make a decision  
15      about how long we're going to sit here?

16                  MR. MEADE:   8:30.

17                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Yes.

18                  MR. MEADE:   We're going to be done by 8:30.

19                  MS. BALLARD:   No, no, we got to catch a  
20      plane.

21                  MR. DUFFY:   Not all of us.

22                  MS. BALLARD:   Some of us.

23                  MR. DUFFY:   Press through the agenda, let's  
24      keep going.

25                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Now we just said that

1 we're going to try to finish this in the next half hour.

2 MS. BALLARD: Oh, well we'll catch the  
3 plane then.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So you'll catch your  
5 plane. Data management. We skipped data management by  
6 accident and we're back to it. Is there a discussion about  
7 data management? Commissioner Ballard?

8 MS. BALLARD: I have a question for Dr.  
9 Mundy. This is an area in which I struggle to understand  
10 what is available already. But we at DEC participate in a  
11 project called CIIMMS, which I believe was funded by -- in  
12 part by EVOS at one time in the past. And DNR participates  
13 in also. And Ron behind you can tell you what it stands  
14 for if anybody wants to know. But is there a reason that  
15 I'm missing why we don't simply work through that project,  
16 which is a meta-data project, as I understand CIIMMS.

17 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

19 DR. MUNDY: Yes, Commissioner Ballard, we  
20 are working through CIIMMS as the scope of CIIMMS is not  
21 sufficient, as I understand it, for our purposes. We do  
22 indicate in the narrative here of the document that we are  
23 working with CIIMMS to the extent that it's possible. The  
24 other thing is, is that CIIMMS was initiated and put  
25 together prior to the time that we were thinking about GEM

1 in its current context. And the concepts of data  
2 management that have come to us in terms of using  
3 distributed information systems, web-based systems and so  
4 forth, are a good bit different than the investment we made  
5 in CIIMMS. And yes, the Trustee Council did put in, I  
6 believe it was about -- and Carol Fries is here, she can  
7 help me -- but I believe it was about two million dollars  
8 into the up front developmental cost. So we spent a lot of  
9 money on CIIMMS and it is a useful system insofar as it  
10 goes. We're looking for a -- for systems here that are a  
11 little more broader in scope and a little more flexible in  
12 terms of web-based distributed systems.

13 MS. BALLARD: If I could follow on that.  
14 It seems to me unfortunate to them, introduce yet another  
15 system to be running parallel rather than to fix SIM -- let  
16 me finish. The State agencies at least and any other  
17 participants in CIIMMS will continue to collect  
18 information. And some of that information if entered and  
19 if the data quality objectives met the parameters for  
20 whatever database design we had, we would be adding to it,  
21 not otherwise. I mean, it just seems to me a shame to  
22 pursue a whole new system when we have this one in place.  
23 And not to dedicate our efforts to fixing CIIMMS so it  
24 satisfies the GEM objectives.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

1 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chair, the -- I am not an  
2 information technology professional. Okay, let me make  
3 that clear. Long ago and far away I might have been but  
4 I'm not now today. The advice that I have is that we --  
5 this is not a parallel system to CIIMMS. This is not a  
6 duplication of effort. This is an effort -- both of these  
7 efforts here do things that CIIMMS cannot do, that CIIMMS  
8 was not designed to do. And we are fully cognizant of  
9 CIIMMS and -- but limiting our ability to handle data and  
10 particularly data visualization, for example, the OBIS  
11 project here has an implementation of the only 4D  
12 visualization tool that's available outside of the  
13 military. And by 4D, I mean it has all the dimensions of  
14 location and depth and time. So bringing OBIS along, you  
15 would have a 4D visualization capability on your data.  
16 CIIMMS, to my understanding, has no visualization  
17 capability at all. That is, the ability to plot your data  
18 out there on a map and get an idea of what the distribution  
19 of the data is and what the density is.

20 So CIIMMS was -- CIIMMS is a part of our  
21 strategy and CIIMMS is something that we're using but I  
22 don't see that this is parallel or duplicative in any way  
23 with regard to CIIMMS.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Meade.

25 MR. MEADE: I just wanted to -- I think one

1 of the principles that Ms. Ballard is underscoring is, you  
2 know, the data I entered once and utilized for multiple  
3 purposes is an excellent principle. With that though I  
4 don't want -- again, I probably am where I was in the  
5 discussion with the communities and villages for totally  
6 different reasons. There's no passion behind data like  
7 there is for our communities of context. But what I will  
8 say, coming from an agency who essentially just a few years  
9 ago, if we were in the form of a bankruptcy, would have  
10 been bankrupt. We are getting our data systems and data  
11 sets together and it has been a struggle and it's taken a  
12 monumental investment.

13                   And as we take a look at the work of EVOS  
14 and the work that we're chartering here with GEM, I think  
15 it's important that we do give it good digital leadership  
16 or good leadership for our daily needs. For me, data is  
17 important to access. For the work I've listened to that  
18 the science group has done, much of that has been  
19 accomplished through web interface and through digital  
20 objectives. So we -- I'm gaining a sense in the short time  
21 I've been interacting and listening to Gail's staff that  
22 there's a pretty important access to highly effective data  
23 systems. Now I too, with a much stronger confession than  
24 Dr. Mundy, I'm not a data expert but I do know that they're  
25 critical to our ability to perform the work we do. If some



1 of that can be accomplished through CIIMMS or SAM or SUE,  
2 it should. I have no knowledge there to say but I will say  
3 we should have a very robust data system so that we can  
4 continue the collaboration that I understand it's able to  
5 be enabled through an effective use of data in technology.

6  
7 So I certainly wouldn't want to see us back  
8 off of the importance of having quality data but I also  
9 would agree with Ms. Ballard in the context that we ought  
10 to be not reinventing, we ought to be enhancing so that  
11 whatever the objective is, if other systems in the state  
12 rely on this, that it's all enhanced. That's it, you know,  
13 brought along, so.....

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy, do you have a  
15 comment about that?

16 DR. MUNDY: No.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any other comments?

18 MS. BALLARD: No, I'm -- I mean, I guess  
19 we're all frustrated.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, it's difficult  
21 because we're not convinced -- well, I'm not convinced but  
22 then again, I don't know. So I suppose.....

23 MS. BALLARD: Well, we have struggled to  
24 get this CIIMMS tool with, I think, considerable funding  
25 from EVOS and we've got two large Federal or State agencies

1 that are collecting data and imputing it and it just -- I'm  
2 just very frustrated that we would then not have that data  
3 be useful to the degree it could be in some longer term  
4 data collection effort. I've said what I had to say.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Compatibility issues  
6 maybe or.....

7 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, again, I would  
8 say that it, you know, here -- the GEM objective was to  
9 create a comprehensive web accessible geo-reference  
10 database of the marine related physical and biological  
11 databases of the Northern Gulf of Alaska. Building on  
12 standards and systems already in place, such as the State  
13 of Alaska's Cooperatively Implemented Management System and  
14 the STORET database. There is no duplication of effort  
15 here. There will be utilization of CIIMMS data. We have  
16 -- that is part of our -- chapter nine in the GEM program  
17 document. I mean we -- I don't know how I can say it  
18 plainer than that. We're moving -- you know, we're moving  
19 forward here. We're going to work with existing systems.  
20 And look at the level of expenditures. I pointed out, I  
21 believe, that we -- EVOS invested two million dollars in  
22 the CIIMMS system. However the CIIMMS system is specific  
23 to a location and a particular set of uses and utilities.  
24 We're asking you here to invest -- in this case there are  
25 no out year costs. It's less than \$200,000 because I don't

1 include the habitat website in this effort. And out of it,  
2 we'll get a tremendous capability to not only find  
3 information but also to visualize it. So I think that the  
4 -- that there are newer technol -- I do know for a fact  
5 that there are newer technologies available now than when  
6 we put CIIMMS together. We put an awful lot of money in  
7 the programming -- in CIIMMS. And I think that those  
8 efforts are easier now because of the types of software  
9 that are available for web-based distributed systems.

10 Again, I'm not criticizing CIIMMS, I'm just  
11 saying that CIIMMS was built on the technology that was  
12 available at the time it was built. And as we move  
13 forward, we have to take advantage of the good that we can  
14 find in the systems that now exist and put together the  
15 best system that we can possibly find. So the cost that --  
16 given the history also -- given the checkered history of  
17 the Trustee Council's data management type activities, I  
18 think that this is a very modest request for some very  
19 large returns in data management, which is fully consistent  
20 with existing efforts such as CIIMMS.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

22 MR. BALSIGER: So effort would -- is really  
23 just a -- for example, you'd be able to apply GIS tools to  
24 the data that's already in the CIIMMS database. GIS  
25 algorithyms and all that stuff being practically brand new

1 on the web. So it's just a way of accessing what might be  
2 in CIIMMS or what might be in Race Base or what might be in  
3 the Observer data system should we ever make that -- get  
4 over the confidentiality items. So it's just a top layer  
5 or something like that.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes.

7 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I  
8 propose we support all of them.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard.

10 MS. BALLARD: Can I ask Phil why he was  
11 excluding in his summary the Saupe work or Soupe [sic],  
12 however she pronounces it?

13 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please go ahead.

15 DR. MUNDY: It's not that Saupe's project  
16 is not a worthy project, it was just in the context of  
17 CIIMMS and STORET and other existing databases that I was  
18 speaking. The Saupe's project is a -- is specifically  
19 oriented towards setting up a habitat website that will  
20 help us coordinate observations on particular types of  
21 shoreline management data. It came out of -- we have a lot  
22 of different groups that are using this -- using these data  
23 and this seemed like a very cost effective approach to  
24 allowing everybody to play on a level playing field in  
25 terms of getting their hands on the data -- the shoreline

1 data and that sort of thing. So this is not a -- this is  
2 not a database project per say but rather a website  
3 coordination type project.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Duffy.

5 MR. DUFFY: Just a quick question on that,  
6 Dr. Mundy. In the end, where will this be accessible at?  
7 This website? I'm assuming the agencies would all have  
8 access to this habitat web-based stuff. I've looked at  
9 some that's quite intriguing but I'm just wondering where  
10 is it accessible at, is my question, in the end? And --  
11 yeah.

12 DR. MUNDY: On the website that's  
13 maintained by the Cook Inlet Regional Citizen's Advisory  
14 Council.

15 MR. DUFFY: Thank you.

16 MS. PEARCE: That's for which project?

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: The Saupe habitat  
18 website.

19 MR. DUFFY: Saupe.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Saupe. Trustee Pearce.

21 MS. PEARCE: For the Kiefer and Macklin  
22 projects, who are the end users there? Who would we expect  
23 to want to use this information. Not me, because I can't  
24 even turn a computer on.

25 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please.

2 DR. MUNDY: The end users in the Macklin,  
3 for example, would be the staff here. Would be contractors  
4 who are looking for data to use and applications for  
5 projects. They could be any agency or university group of  
6 public based group that is looking to start a research  
7 project and they want to know what's going on out there and  
8 they want to find where the data are. In the case of  
9 Kiefer's project, I think he would have all of those same  
10 people, such as Trustee council staff and researchers and  
11 that.

12 Plus I think you'd have a substantial  
13 component from the public and also what I would call line  
14 professionals at natural resource management agencies.  
15 Because if the Kiefer project works out as planned, we'll  
16 be able to hook up just about any database that you can  
17 think of to this visualization software. And what -- which  
18 databases we actually hook up to it through the OBIS system  
19 and the easy software that's provided by Kiefer will depend  
20 on what the demand for this is. I'm quite anxious to get a  
21 hold of this because this is the software that I've seen  
22 used to make some great maps of data distribution of plants  
23 and animals in relation to currents and so forth. So it's  
24 a -- it's going to be a very visually attractive kind of  
25 package. So I would expect that once the general public

1 became aware of this type of thing that you would find  
2 people would be -- more and more members of the public  
3 would be looking to this.

4 MS. PEARCE: If I can continue.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please.

6 MS. PEARCE: So does this get us closer to  
7 integrating what all the different groups are doing? Like  
8 Mr. Parker was talking about earlier today when North  
9 Pacific Research Board and we within GEM and the Arctic  
10 Research Commission all have access and easier, more  
11 coordinated access to stuff?

12 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes.

14 DR. MUNDY: The shortest answer I've been  
15 able to give so far, yes.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, well Dr. Balsiger  
17 has proposed that we accept Kiefer and Macklin or was it  
18 all three, I can't remember.

19 MR. BALSIGER: I said all three, Mr.  
20 Chairman.....

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: All three.

22 MR. BALSIGER: .....because I thought Saupe  
23 was relatively inexpensive for the description.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Any discussions on that  
25 proposal? Can we reach consensus on that or.....

1 MR. MEADE: I sure agree. Again, I don't  
2 feel we can under invest in having a robust ability to deal  
3 with data and technology. I think it will only service us  
4 as we move into the 21st century as we move ahead. So I  
5 think these are going to be very reasoned investments in  
6 being able to continue what I already am pretty -- very  
7 impressed by the use of technology here at EVOS. I'll say  
8 I've come to see the things that they've done with their  
9 science group and others through web-based initiatives.

10 I'm very impressed and I think we should  
11 continue to try to keep in front of the power curve rather  
12 than slip behind. And it sounds to me as though Dr. Mundy  
13 has highlighted that we will fully be incorporating  
14 existing systems and bringing them with and enhancing as we  
15 go. So.....

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And it's my  
17 understanding, Dr. Mundy, that this -- all the data that's  
18 been generated through all the research that EVOS has  
19 funded over time, that obviously this -- we got the  
20 synthesis effort going on, you know, the book and -- but  
21 all the data would be included in this system. Is that  
22 correct?

23 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, no. Part of the  
24 problem that we're addressing here is -- I mean, for  
25 example, the Sound ecosystem assessment program, a 25



1 million dollar ecosystem assessment program ended in 1999  
2 and I as science director still can't get access to most of  
3 that data. And, as I said, that's because we were not  
4 proactive in the data management area in those days. We  
5 hadn't set up rules and -- for our contractors, we hadn't  
6 set up the rules of the game. So we will be getting a hold  
7 of our past data, our older data, as we can. But there's --  
8 because of the way that the contracts were set up, there's  
9 substantial issues about ownership of that data.

10 But we are -- we're taking steps now when  
11 we let contracts, to make it clear we have a data  
12 management plan for each one of those and the -- we make it  
13 clear that the ownership of the data is here and we control  
14 it. That's one of the changes we've made but no, past data  
15 is something that we will be incorporating as we have time  
16 and money.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard.

18 MS. BALLARD: I want to be sure I  
19 understood -- stand something you just said, Phil. That  
20 there are some collections of data that we paid for that we  
21 don't have rights to use in a database?

22 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, I can't -- I try  
23 not to practice law without a -- you know, without being  
24 admitted to the bar. I don't know about rights,  
25 Commissioner Ballard, but there are -- well, there's on 25

1 million dollar data set that I can't get my hands on.

2 MS. BALLARD: A 25 million dollar data set?

3 DR. MUNDY: Yes.

4 MS. BALLARD: Wow.

5 DR. MUNDY: And I don't intend, on my  
6 watch, to see that -- I don't intend to see something like  
7 that happen on my watch.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So whether it's inside or  
9 outside GEM or the GEM model or whether we, in future  
10 RFP's, you know, limit the scope or guard against scope  
11 creeping, we -- this data piece really relates to the way  
12 EVOS is doing its business and all the data that we  
13 collect, whatever we're doing. And to the extent that we  
14 can have available past data sets will be included in this.  
15 It will be coordinated with CIIMMS and the data that we  
16 collect in the future will be part of this new technology  
17 that -- is that correct?

18 DR. MUNDY: Yes, that's correct. I don't  
19 want to give you the impression that these two projects are  
20 the whole picture because we have our data manage -- data  
21 systems managers working on a lot of different fronts to  
22 see that this happens with other sources of funds, such as  
23 those that have already been approved on September the 3rd.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh, okay.

25 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, if I could.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Mr. Duffy.

2 MR. DUFFY: I'm guessing that the Trustee  
3 Council members have consensus on this set of projects. I  
4 have listened to a couple of Trustee Council members and  
5 there's at least a couple that know a whole lot more about  
6 this arena than I do. I'll be the first to admit that.  
7 But Phil has described the importance of this information  
8 to the Trustee Council process, we move forward. So I  
9 think we're ready to sign off on this one and move forward  
10 unless I hear differently. Just a suggestion.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, I'll take  
12 consensus. Any objections?

13 MS. BALLARD: I'm on modeling.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Somebody must think I'm  
15 finished. My phone keeps -- okay. We're on modeling. So  
16 for the record, we accepted all three data management  
17 proposals as recommended by the Work Plan. Modeling and  
18 mod -- document is on page 28, the chart. We've got two  
19 recommendations to fund, McNutt and Schumacher. Any  
20 discussion of these two? Yes?

21 MS. BALLARD: Is this not the instance in  
22 which, Dr. Mundy, you said these folks would coordinate  
23 with each other better if we paid them?

24 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, may I respond?

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Dr. Mundy.

1 DR. MUNDY: The comment that I made was is  
2 that I've noted that communication among modelers is much  
3 more efficient and effective when we are paying them.

4 MS. BALLARD: In all seriousness, since  
5 this seems to be a NOAA centered effort, Jim, is this  
6 happening anyhow?

7 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, I think it's  
8 happening at a low level but I think if you identify a  
9 project specifically designed to bring them together, it's  
10 likely to speed it up a great deal.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Can I ask, Dr. Mundy, why  
12 it is that the funding is constant over the three year  
13 period? Is there any tailing off of the investment here?  
14 Is this a ongoing payment to keep the modelers happy?

15 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, this is just  
16 simply -- this is pretty much funding for McNutt and  
17 Schumacher (Two Crow) and some staff, some -- we're  
18 providing some of the money for the workshops; they're  
19 providing some of the money for the workshops. But  
20 basically this is a process to build a community that will  
21 put together our model for us. I mean, I do agree with Dr.  
22 Balsiger that this communication is occurring on a lower  
23 level but if I go to -- if I walk into the NOAA shop or  
24 Pacific Marine Environmental laboratory and I try to grab  
25 one of their programmers and I say, hey, I need to you to

1 fix this up so that it works for me in the Northern Gulf of  
2 Alaska, that's not going to work. Somebody like Eddie  
3 Bernard is going to throw me out for coming in and messing  
4 with their people.

5 So what we're trying to do here is put  
6 together -- is have them -- put together a group that will  
7 focus existing models on our needs. Okay, so that's the  
8 key difference here, is that the -- and we're hoping that  
9 by the end of 2000 -- by the end of this effort in 2006, we  
10 will have identified a modeling specific to particular  
11 applications in the nearshore, in the watersheds and so  
12 forth and this thing will go under its own power and we  
13 won't need to do something like this. So this is sort of a  
14 project to get the modeling going and two very capable  
15 people.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, so are what we  
17 getting here is we're really getting two people? We're  
18 getting a percentage of their time?

19 DR. MUNDY: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So for \$80,000 a year,  
21 how much of McNutt's time are we getting?

22 DR. MUNDY: Well, the whole \$80,000 is not  
23 devoted to McNutt's time. I don't have the.....

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So some of this is paying  
25 -- like you said, paying for meetings or other expenses?

1 DR. MUNDY: Meetings and.....

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Just time and expenses.

3 DR. MUNDY: .....also assistance, I mean,  
4 in -- such as research assistance or some people like that.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And is it a fixed fee or  
6 is this an estimate of time and materials?

7 DR. MUNDY: This is fixed fee. They  
8 provide deliverables for a price.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. I'm sorry, Dr.  
10 Balsiger.

11 MR. BALSIGER: Yes, to Commissioner  
12 Ballard, these aren't really NOAA projects. I often don't  
13 understand how the lead gets assigned. I see that McNutt  
14 says it's ADF&G lead and Schumacher NOAA lead but they're  
15 -- neither of them are NOAA people or ADF&G people.

16 MS. BALLARD: I accept that. These don't  
17 appeal to me. I'm sorry.

18 MR. DUFFY: Real quickly.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Duffy.

20 MR. DUFFY: Dr. Mundy, could you explain  
21 that to us. The thing that Dr. Balsiger just described.  
22 It has us marked as a lead agency for the -- from -- for  
23 the -- on the McNutt GEM infrastructure product and then it  
24 has NOAA identified as the other lead agency but I don't  
25 think that we're the lead agencies. Or how does that work?

1 DR. MUNDY: These were just simply  
2 designations of how the money is disbursed. As you know,  
3 the Trustee Council does not disburse its own funds, these  
4 are disburse through government agencies, not necessarily  
5 Trustee Council agencies but through government agencies.  
6 And we assign University of Alaska contracts to ADF&G. We  
7 assign other categories to NOAA and that's by tradition, by  
8 arrangement and by convenience.

9 MR. DUFFY: Thank you.

10 MS. PEARCE: I was just asked to continue  
11 in his absence. Do we have a proposal? I didn't hear one.

12 MR. DUFFY: Well the State -- at least the  
13 State's ideas coming into the meeting were not to fund  
14 either of these I believe.

15 MR. BALSIGER: Madame Chairman.

16 MS. PEARCE: Dr. Balsiger. Dr. Balsiger.

17 MR. BALSIGER: On the next set of  
18 proposals, I intend to add \$350,000 to what the State  
19 supported. So I prefer to do those before I had to decide  
20 what to do on this one. In other words, I don't want to  
21 use all of the bullets that I may or may not have any of  
22 right now.

23 MS. BALLARD: Do you want to go to  
24 nearshore and come back to this?

25 MR. BALSIGER: Yes.

1 MS. BALLARD: I'll do that.

2 MR. BALSIGER: Okay.

3 MS. PEARCE: We're moving on to nearshore  
4 without making a decision.

5 MR. BALSIGER: Sounds like a card game.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Geez, I leave for one  
7 minute and we.....

8 MS. PEARCE: When you come back you're  
9 hearing about bullets.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: We've lost a.....

11 MS. BALLARD: He's got my ear now, I want  
12 to hear what he has to say.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....section. Okay,  
14 we're moving on to nearshore and we're putting all of data  
15 management on the return list.

16 MS. PEARCE: No, modeling.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Modeling, I'm sorry. I'm  
18 still -- okay, nearshore.

19 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, on  
20 the nearshore, I believe that the State has proposed that  
21 we fund Bishop and Thorne. I note that Bodkin is only  
22 \$10,000. It's for a closeout year of a project that we've  
23 been funding. So I clearly think that ought to added inn.  
24 Konar is the natural geography in the shore areas. This is  
25 the second year of the project. It ties into the census of



1 marine life which ties into a whole series of other ongoing  
2 projects. And I think that we ought to fund that.

3 Ruesink is the second year of a project  
4 that the Trustees have funded. It involves a community  
5 sampling, I believe, and that would be my very brief  
6 introduction and probably Dr. Mundy would have more details  
7 on all of them. Or I could dig out more notes if it was  
8 useful to you either way.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Ruesink was second year,  
10 Bodkin is a closeout and, I'm sorry, what did you say about  
11 Konar?

12 MR. BALSIGER: Konar is also a second year  
13 and I believe part of it is working on the census of marine  
14 life which is a project that's tied into international  
15 census of marine life things funded by a whole variety of  
16 places. And I might be making that last part up, I'd have  
17 to ask Dr. Mundy to confirm.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy, do you want to  
19 add anything on Konar?

20 DR. MUNDY: Yeah, Konar -- in the case of  
21 Konar, we have adopted a census of marine life sampling  
22 protocol that allows us to compare Konar's data to other  
23 projects all around the Pacific Rim. So for example, if  
24 you want to see an ENSO signal, if you want to see if you  
25 can -- how far you can see an ENSO signal or whether you

1 can see it in the -- which is a weather signal in the  
2 nearshore, you can use these data sets. The idea is you  
3 can use these data sets to look at them. That was simply a  
4 bonus that was made possible because we noticed that they  
5 had this protocol. It really isn't costing us anything, in  
6 fact it saved us money because we were able to adopt the  
7 sampling protocol and didn't have to develop it. So -- but  
8 it is a continuing project.

9 Konar has a very substantial community  
10 involvement part and they, for example, Katherine Icon was  
11 involved in the WisdomKeeper meeting in Port Graham just  
12 recently. And so there -- we have projects such as Konar's  
13 that have substantial community involvement components.  
14 Where as I've said, the PI's themselves have done an  
15 admirable job of reaching out to the communities and  
16 working with the communities. So everything that Dr.  
17 Balsiger said about this was correct.

18 MS. BALLARD: Greg.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Commissioner  
20 Ballard.

21 MS. BALLARD: Dr. Mundy, what non-Alaskan  
22 university Ruesink affiliated with?

23 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, Jennifer Ruesink  
24 is at the University of Washington.

25 MS. BALLARD: Pure curiosity.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: So as a proposal we've  
2 got Bishop and Thorne, Bodkin, Konar and Ruesink to fund.  
3 Any discussion, any objection?

4                   MS. BALLARD: It's okay with me.

5                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Let's take that as a  
6 consensus and move on to.....

7                   MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, would you say  
8 that -- I think I heard what you said but just to be  
9 certain that I made.....

10                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Bishop and Thorne, Konar,  
11 Ruesink and Bodkin.

12                  MR. BALSIGER: Thank you very much.

13                  MS. BALLARD: It's the whole fund list,  
14 read in a different order just to see if you're still  
15 awake.

16                  MR. BALSIGER: Well, apparently I wasn't  
17 quite.

18                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: That was the way you said  
19 -- that was the order you presented it in. Because you  
20 said we had agreed to Bishop and Thorne and then.....

21                  MR. BALSIGER: Yes, no you're exactly  
22 right. Thank you very much.

23                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Synthesis proposals.  
24 Spies is fund contingent for the reasons that you stated in  
25 your introductory remarks.

1 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that  
2 Dr. Spies has satisfied his contingencies at this point in  
3 time however our decision was to simply present the plan as  
4 originally submitted to the Trustee Council. Because these  
5 are the same financial decisions. I mean, fund and fund  
6 contingent are the same.....

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right.

8 DR. MUNDY: .....fiscally for the Trustee  
9 Council. Well, I believe that Dr. Spies has removed his  
10 contingencies at this time.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, Commissioner  
12 Ballard.

13 MS. BALLARD: Without regard to this  
14 proposal, which I believe we must go ahead with, I'd like  
15 to see whatever we have in writing with him about this book  
16 so that I can understand better the terms under which the  
17 book is being published.

18 MS. PHILLIPS: I'll get that to you.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, because I have a  
20 feeling about this, that the -- I'd like to see the book,  
21 for example, if it could be published, published in Alaska  
22 as opposed to outside Alaska. And I'm just expressing my  
23 own view here. And I'd like to see it published clearly  
24 under the auspices of the EVOS Trustee Council as opposed  
25 to under the auspices of something else that doesn't change

1 the author. So those are just some feelings that I have  
2 about something that the EVOS Trustee Council has paid for.  
3 But I don't know what the flexibility is in the  
4 relationship is to accomplish that.

5 MS. BALLARD: We've heard a lot in the year  
6 that at least I've been involved in this about the pride  
7 that you, Phil, and I assume the others associated with  
8 developing these annual plans take in the unique tailored,  
9 EVOS oriented integrity of them. And it just seems to me  
10 that a synthesis of the results of that that isn't clearly  
11 identified in an ownership -- and I don't mean legal  
12 ownership -- but clearly identified with that, it just  
13 doesn't work for me.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, well that's a  
15 little discussion. Trustee Meade.

16 MR. MEADE: Well I'll just echo, I think,  
17 the expressions of -- both you and Ms. Ballard have already  
18 stated, I don't know the facts. I guess what I would like  
19 to do is get some more facts. I'm concerned to see us  
20 obligated into another year. I don't know what the total  
21 is, if it's reflective of this year's costs. It's three  
22 quarter's of a million dollars towards a synthesis project  
23 that it seems like we'll have no ownership of.

24 So I -- without any fact, I feel exactly as  
25 you summarized, that EVOS ought to have an ability to have

1 a role in how it's published, where it's published and to  
2 what focus it is done for. Unless we can get other  
3 relevant facts that help us be more aware of, you know, any  
4 other factual content to this. But the other piece that I  
5 think is important is to have some sense that this is going  
6 to draw to closure, that it won't be coming back again next  
7 year for another stipend, for another extended period of  
8 time.

9 And I think I heard Dr. Mundy suggest that  
10 that indeed is the case this year. But I would hope that  
11 that would be an expectation if it is funded this year.  
12 I'm concerned about funding it I guess. I won't obstruct  
13 that, I mean, perhaps we have no other choice but it sure  
14 seems like we're kind of in a -- I guess in a sense  
15 extortion -- well, maybe I shouldn't say that.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Dr. Mundy.

17 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, may I respond?

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sure.

19 MR. MEADE: And he's probably a very  
20 credible guy, I apologize.

21 DR. MUNDY: My -- you know, actually you  
22 can, if these are your concerns and you so wish, you can  
23 keep the fund contingent and tell us to make it so. I  
24 mean, that's -- so it's not a matter of.....

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, maybe we should --

1 I would make a recommendation that we keep the contingency  
2 on the funding and we ana -- we look at the contract with  
3 respect to the publication rights and that we satisfy  
4 ourselves, not with another meeting but in, you know, in  
5 communicating with the Trustees that we've got sufficient  
6 control over the process after it's completed.

7 DR. MUNDY: Also, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh.

9 DR. MUNDY: My colleague from the Forrest  
10 Service, Ken Holbrook, has provided me with a prop here,  
11 and I'm holding up a copy of the proceedings of the Exxon  
12 Valdez Oil Spill symposium. American Fisheries Society  
13 symposium number 18. Okay, so this is copyrighted material  
14 and the copyright is owned by the American Fisheries  
15 Society. But this was one of the landmark publications  
16 from the oil spill where we made a big effort to get the  
17 things that had been done and the damage assessment, in the  
18 NRDA phase particularly, brought together in a coherent  
19 fashion and published. The control that the Trustee  
20 Council had over this was, for example, the editorial board  
21 on here, I believe, was Bob Spies and Jeep Rice, Doug Wolfe  
22 and Bruce Wright, all people who worked closely with the  
23 Trustee Council or with contractors of the Trustee Council.  
24 And then of course the peer review process itself. So this  
25 is an example of a document that somewhat akin to what Bob

1 Spies is trying to put together. He has anot -- this has a  
2 whole bunch of different authors in here. Sometimes  
3 multiple authors on the same paper. And, as Bob Spies  
4 says, as right now.

5 Also I'm sure that -- for the Trustees, we  
6 can get you access to the website where the -- anytime that  
7 you want to look at the document, we have a password on the  
8 website that you can look at if you want.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Meade.

10 MR. MEADE: If I may too, I apologize for  
11 my disrespectful remark. I don't actually know the doctor.  
12 And just a business principle suggests to me that we should  
13 be prudent in being sure that we're getting an investment  
14 that the American taxpayer is owed here and that we want to  
15 monitor it and we want to be sure that it's not an ongoing  
16 commitment unless we are briefed to the extent that we feel  
17 we should recommit to an ongoing commitment here.

18 I think that yarding up the data and  
19 knowledge and getting it published is all very good. The  
20 last thing I'd want to do is have any remark on the record  
21 of any disrespect towards any professional that's been  
22 working on compiling the product. My interest is just to  
23 be sure we keep our eye on the ball, that we don't allow  
24 scope creeping, that we keep the outcome focused so that we  
25 don't have an ongoing expense.



1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Mr. Duffy.

2 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, I can support the  
3 Eckert project and the Spies project fund contingent,  
4 subject to what we talked about.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, Eckert and Spies.  
6 Is there any objection to moving forward with Eckert and  
7 Spies as they're listed in the synthesis proposals  
8 recommended for funding. Dr. Balsiger, Eckert and Spies as  
9 they're listed in the synthesis proposals recommended for  
10 funding?

11 MR. BALSIGER: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, without objection  
13 we'll accept that with our comments about -- in wanting to  
14 be satisfied that we have sufficient control over an input  
15 into the publication of what's going to be, you know, more  
16 so maybe even than the symposium that you have there, I  
17 think a very, very important document. And then we've  
18 already completed the watershed proposals. So we've  
19 actually worked our way through the document.

20 MR. MEADE: Should we go back to modeling  
21 though. It seemed like we.....

22 MS. BALLARD: Modeling. We have to go back  
23 to modeling.

24 MR. MEADE: .....didn't give any decisions  
25 there.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Back to modeling. Oh,  
2 okay, I forgot that you had all decided to skip.

3 MR. MEADE: Well, somebody wanted to shoot  
4 his bullet before we.....

5 MR. BALSIGER: Well, I shot it and everyone  
6 landed so I feel like it probably won't fire again.

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, back to modeling.

8 MS. BALLARD: So now your gun is empty,  
9 Jim.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: On page 28 of the new  
11 Work Plan, McNutt and Schumacher -- Two Crow, I mean.

12 MR. MEADE: And did I gain from the  
13 discussion or -- may I?

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes.

15 MR. MEADE: Did I gain from the discussion  
16 earlier, perhaps between Jim and Dr. Mundy that these funds  
17 would simply enhance modeling work perhaps that would  
18 otherwise be under way but not at near the accomplishment  
19 rate?

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, Dr. Balsiger.

21 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Meade, my  
22 take would be that there's lots of projects through the  
23 years that have led to modeling various thing but these  
24 modelers have never all got together to see how my model in  
25 Kodiak works with somebody else's model in Cook Inlet. To

1     how it ties together with the model in Prince William Sound  
2     and make sure that they're all modeling the same  
3     parameters. So if some -- at some point all the models  
4     could talk to each other, something like that. I don't  
5     think that that last stage where all the models are made to  
6     work together has been accomplished.

7                     And I think if we funded something to the  
8     tune of \$100,000, it's likely, if that was the project, to  
9     make the models talk together, to make the -- put together  
10    the infrastructure for those models, it's much more likely  
11    to happen than it is that the person who is modeling Kodiak  
12    takes it on him self to make his model work with everybody  
13    else's. I kind of struggled with that explanation but I  
14    think there are models being developed, they are useful  
15    models, but I don't think that the overall model or the  
16    framework to tie them all together exists or is likely to  
17    be advanced very quickly in the absence of a project like  
18    this.

19                    MR. MEADE: And how important is that  
20    advancement?

21                    MR. BALSIGER: Perhaps Dr. Mundy could talk  
22    to it.

23                    CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

24                    DR. MUNDY: Okay, Mr. Chairman, if I may,  
25    let me back up a little bit and talk about how we came to

1 this proposal. We have in the GEM program document a  
2 chapter on modeling. And in that chapter we lay out the  
3 role of modeling in the GEM program. We need a GEM model  
4 in order to warehouse our results and to look at the  
5 relationship among our results. And we articulate fairly  
6 carefully in chapter eight of the GEM program document  
7 exactly how this is supposed to work.

8               We were also advised by the National  
9 Research Council that one of the best things we could do  
10 for the purpose of making all this stuff fit together and  
11 coordinating across habitat types and making sure that we  
12 didn't just get lost in a regional focus or a geographic  
13 focus and miss the big picture, that we have what they  
14 called a coupled biophysical fisheries model, or something  
15 like that. We decided that fisheries was probably too  
16 narrow and that there were people who were interested in  
17 birds and mammals that weren't considered part of  
18 fisheries. Although it's hard to imagine anything nowadays  
19 that doesn't get wrapped up in a fisheries decision.

20               So the idea is -- okay, so now you're  
21 confronted as a science director with the prospect, okay,  
22 how do I get one of these. How do I get one of these  
23 coupled biophysical models that are going to help us direct  
24 the program. Because, you know, somewhere along the line  
25 we're going to have to pull stuff together and show how

1 things work together. I mentioned earlier that we expect  
2 modeling to also provide some advice to managers and  
3 particularly to fisheries regulators.

4 So in looking over the field out there,  
5 there are a couple of possibilities. We could reach out  
6 and point to some group of modelers and say, okay, you're  
7 our modeling people and away we go. However, what we  
8 wanted to do was to coordinate and integrate and get costs  
9 down as much as possible. We want to assure ourselves that  
10 we were doing this in the most cost effective fashion.

11 Plus we felt that the -- there are lots of  
12 modeling communities that never get together. You can --  
13 it's likely that the physical modelers who work off of  
14 Kodiak are going to talk to the fisheries modelers who work  
15 off of Kodiak. But it's practically zero that the modelers  
16 who work in the Kenai River watershed with hydrology and  
17 fish are ever going to talk to the fisheries modelers off  
18 of Kodiak, even though they probably have a great deal to  
19 say to each other when you bring them together.

20 So the -- so our idea, again, as part of  
21 our strategy that's explained in chapter one of the GEM  
22 program document of leveraging our money and bringing  
23 people together, we decided that the best thing that we  
24 could do was to craft the invitation so that we ask people  
25 to show us how to build this community of modelers so that

1 we could get the most bang for our buck and come out the  
2 other end with a GEM biophysical model. And that's what we  
3 -- that's what this is crafted to do.

4           So it's -- this is not a modeling exercise  
5 by any stretch of the imagination. In fact, we got a  
6 number of modeling proposals that were supposedly  
7 responsive to this that were rejected out of hand because  
8 we said we're not ready to spend our money on a model. But  
9 we -- what we are trying to spend our money on here is  
10 building a community. Building a modeling community that's  
11 going to help us move the GEM program forward and help us  
12 get some applications out the other end in the process that  
13 will benefit natural resource management agencies.

14           So that's my speech.

15           CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, I've got to say, if  
16 I can have a comment in between, that the -- this strikes  
17 me -- the only adjective that comes to mind is soft. I  
18 mean it seems to me like a pretty soft and an expense that  
19 is difficult to measure. I mean, I read the paragraph, the  
20 workshops necessary to begin the consensus building  
21 process. I mean, that's -- you know, that could be just  
22 about anything. And in the scientific and other types of  
23 communities. Now I don't know what the other types of  
24 community -- we have the scientific community. I assume  
25 the modeling community is part of the scientific community.

1 So I don't know what other types of communities but I'd be  
2 concerned, you know, about -- and I'm sure there are more --  
3 obviously more detailed description of what these  
4 workshops actually would be once you respond to other types  
5 of communities.

6 But then to provide guidance to the staff  
7 on how to craft future invitations for proposals in support  
8 of the modeling efforts. So, you know, like you say, it's  
9 a very preliminary thing but we're paying people to do what  
10 the staff ought to be able to do in some way. I mean, you  
11 know, they -- these people maybe know the people in the  
12 modeling community better than the staff know the people in  
13 the modeling community. But what -- if we're bringing  
14 people together to talk about issues and collaborate and  
15 the staff is going to get educated about how to write  
16 future invitations for proposals, I mean, it seems like  
17 what -- you know, we're buying meeting facilitators here  
18 and, you know, and expensive education for the staff. But  
19 I don't mean to sound as cynical as I do but it just seemed  
20 to me to be somewhat soft when I looked at it.

21 Dr. Mundy, do you want to respond to my  
22 cynicism?

23 DR. MUNDY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Well, we  
24 added other communities in response to concerns from the  
25 group that's doing the community involvement process. For

1 example, tribes, fishing communities, others may have  
2 significant questions that the modeling communi -- that the  
3 GEM model per say specifically should address.

4 As far as the staffing issue goes, again,  
5 these people are, you know, modelers. I mean, they're  
6 mathematicians, they're people who write computer code,  
7 they're physical scientists. They're not like the  
8 capabilities that we have on the staff. You have.....

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: McNutt and Two Crow.....

10 DR. MUNDY: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....are modelers. What  
12 makes them good at running a workshop?

13 DR. MUNDY: Well, Lynn McNutt, I think a  
14 lot of people know Lynn from our January meeting. She's  
15 just -- what makes her good at doing this is just being  
16 Lynn McNutt. She's a great -- she's a great person. She's  
17 very personable, she's very good at organizing. She's very  
18 good at speaking. Everybody has seen her in action here at  
19 the.....

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

21 DR. MUNDY: .....meeting. Two Crow, in  
22 addition to being a physical oceanographer, is  
23 knowledgeable in Native Americans and is -- and I would  
24 expect him to definitely work hard with the community  
25 involvement aspects of, you know, of this. For example, he



1 was part of the WisdomKeeper meeting that we had at  
2 Tatitlek and we had hoped that he would work on some  
3 proposals out of that. We haven't seen any so far. But  
4 in any event, the -- these people are here to provide a  
5 service. And as I've said, it's not modeling but it's  
6 definitely not a service that can be provided by the staff.

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Good explanation.  
8 Trustee Pearce.

9 MS. PEARCE: I guess -- well, I don't  
10 guess, it's still sounds soft to me in that I still don't  
11 understand what the outcome is expected to be. Are we  
12 asking people to tell us how to design a model or are we  
13 asking them to tell us how to get all the models that  
14 already exist in the spill area to talk to each other. Or  
15 are we asking people to tell us how to, once we have a  
16 model, how to get the community input to ask us what  
17 questions we'd like to run through the model and tell them  
18 what's happening with the kelp off Tatitlek Point.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy.

20 DR. MUNDY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm reading  
21 from page 104 from the abstract of Schumacher which should  
22 be pretty close to McNutt's. And it says our goals is to  
23 provide consensus recommendation on one, creation of an  
24 integrated ecosystem model for the Northern GOA -- okay so,  
25 basically what they owe us is a deliverable -- is how do we

1 create and integrated ecosystem model for the Northern GOA?

2

3 One possible outcome of this is they may  
4 say, you can't do that right now. It's too expensive, it's  
5 beyond your capabilities and we can't find you any partners  
6 out there who are willing to fit the bill so you can  
7 forget it. That's one possible outcome on number one.

8 Number two is understanding spatial and temporal scales for  
9 implementing an ecosystem monitoring program. And this is  
10 one that Dr. Balsiger has already spoken to. When you have  
11 the perspective of the physicist, which is a really big  
12 picture in the perspective of the biological modelers,  
13 which is usually a much smaller time frame. I'm trying to  
14 get the spatial and temporal scales to match up so you can  
15 just integrate them all and compare them as a tough job.  
16 So trying to get people aware of what other people are  
17 doing in getting the move in. But specifically having  
18 spatial and temporal scales that we can put in our data  
19 management plans for projects that we're putting out there  
20 when people are collecting plans and in our RFP's. These  
21 are specific specifications, criteria that we would put in  
22 RFP's.

23 Number 3, implementing the GEM  
24 infrastructure and recruiting -- and they mean you're the  
25 modeling infrastructure, including identification of

1 strategies for cooperation, coordination, integration, cost  
2 efficiency. For example, we don't need to set up our own  
3 standards on geo-spatial data because there is a Federal  
4 committee on geo-spatial data that spends lots of money  
5 every year having meetings and setting up standards. And  
6 we incorporate AFGCD criteria. They are a part of our  
7 infrastructure but they're definitely not on our payroll.  
8 But being aware of them and having the ability to tap  
9 them is very important. What else do we need to know?  
10 There are other standards, there are other things that we  
11 need to know about in order to put -- implement our  
12 modeling program, we need to know what these are. And  
13 they're not necessarily things that we're going to pay for  
14 but we have to identify what these are. We have to put our  
15 finger on them and say what they are.

16 So these were three, in my mind, I don't  
17 see this as soft at all. I see this is providing us with  
18 three deliverables that we need to move the GEM program  
19 forward and to live up to what we said we were going to do  
20 in the GEM program document and to follow the advice of the  
21 National Research Council.

22 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Duffy.

23 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Dr.  
24 Mundy, for that explanation. That was thorough but I am  
25 not convinced, I think I'm siding with a couple of other at

1 least Trustee Council members. That \$300,000 doll over  
2 three fiscal years. Could this kind of a morphis project.  
3 I'm not convinced we should go forward with these -- at  
4 this time.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Mundy, if we didn't  
6 go forward with this, what would the alternative from the  
7 other agencies that are engaged in this kind of modeling.  
8 What kind of encouragement could we give them to, you know,  
9 one of the discussions we have had is the legal requirement  
10 that we not supplant, you know, the work of other agencies  
11 and sometimes agencies get involved in this collaborative  
12 exercise and pull things together, sometimes they don't.

13 But it seems to me something like this  
14 would be something that NOAA would be very, very interested  
15 in doing. I mean having an ecosystem model for the Gulf of  
16 Alaska is just very important in all, you know, data points  
17 that you'd need and the modeling expertise you'd need  
18 probably resides largely within NOAA. I mean, you know,  
19 with some collaboration with the State and other Federal  
20 agencies, they could probably easily spearhead this kind of  
21 thing as opposed to the Trustee Council. Is that possible?

22 MR. BALSIGER: Could we have the \$300,000?

23 DR. MUNDY: Indeed Mr. Chairman, what would  
24 my fall back strategy here. I guess as long as we're going  
25 to do a GEM program, we're going to have a model of --

1 we're going to have a GEM model. Can't see going forward  
2 with the GEM program without a GEM model. I take the  
3 Trustee Council's advice to heart and you're telling me  
4 this is not it. Okay, so we would find an alternative  
5 strategy.

6                   Probably the first thing we would do is  
7 have a -- is get a workshop together so that we could get  
8 criteria together for whatever it is we're going to ask for  
9 in the FY-05 invitation for a model. Okay, so I  
10 understand your advice to be that this is -- building a  
11 community is not what you want to do but what you want to --  
12 I hope I'm hearing that you would support a model. So if --  
13 so then basically what we would do is issue a call for a  
14 model.

15                   And I approach that with some trepidation  
16 but -- because I had planned on having a lot of advice and  
17 a lot of time before I had to issue that RFP. And I don't  
18 think I'm going to have -- I'm going to know everything  
19 that I'm going to need to know to put that RFP out there.  
20 But on the other hand what that means is that we'll find  
21 some group of people who know how to do this and we'll have  
22 to trust them to, you know, to deal with these issues.

23                   The other thing that wouldn't do is we're  
24 not going to have -- it's not going to be -- we can do it  
25 but it's not going to be as easy to get the public involved

1 and to get the different communities involved in this  
2 effort as it would be with these two particular people.  
3 These people are particularly good at networking with  
4 people and with working with people and putting science  
5 into, you know, layman's language.

6 So we'll try to locate it, who knows, maybe  
7 one of these people would be interested in bidding on the  
8 FY-05. Also, we're -- at this point in time, we're one  
9 year behind. So.....

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Is there a way for the  
11 Trustee Council staff and the Trustee Council members to  
12 serve as a focal point for, you know, bringing these types  
13 of modelers together to get the kind of advice you need to  
14 go forward?

15 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, as I've said, we  
16 could probably put a workshop together but we're -- our  
17 staff is very small right now and we have lots of other  
18 things to do. We're -- we have to turn around immediately  
19 and try to get the FY-05 invitation together based on the  
20 outcome of this meeting. We have a -- before that can  
21 happen, we have a science plan that needs to go out for  
22 review. So by the time -- so I guess my short answer on  
23 that is no. I mean, we just don't have the staff.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Because I see a model --  
25 there is a different -- in my own views, I see a model in a

1 different category than the synthesis project or data  
2 management. I mean, those are things that, you know, we're  
3 paying for data, we're creating this. We have a  
4 responsibility to organize it and make it accessible to the  
5 public. But when you get into a predictive model that can  
6 be used for other applications in the future, applications  
7 that are going to be, you know, more relevant to the  
8 resource management agencies involved in using that model,  
9 I don't know, to me it's in a slightly different category.

10

11                   It's my own view and maybe more the  
12 responsibility of pulling that together would lie with the  
13 agencies. And, you know, I wasn't really -- you know,  
14 having worked for NOAA -- you'd be surprised at one stage  
15 in my career and the -- you know, knowing all of the  
16 modeling that does get done, you know, both climate and  
17 oceans inside NOAA, it would seem to be something that they  
18 might even naturally take on when the priorities allowed --  
19 funding priorities allow them to get to this stage of the --  
20 to this part of the world to solve some of these problems.

21

22                   I don't know, Dr. Balsiger, maybe you --  
23 you obviously -- it's your responsibility, here you'd know  
24 -- is there a way to get this done in an intelligent way  
25 and a timely way that it doesn't have to be supported by

1 the Trustee Council so that we can be out doing more of the  
2 data collection and restoration activities with the fund?

3 MR. BALSIGER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have  
4 several responses which I probably shouldn't give. One is,  
5 often times when NOAA makes a modeling, we don't involve  
6 the stake holders and everyone else. But the model doesn't  
7 go over real well. So we'd have to -- and we'd have to  
8 incorporate some broad outreach if we did it ourselves.  
9 And frankly, if we had money, we'd probably hire someone  
10 like Schumacher and Lynn McNutt to see it -- to help us  
11 with it.

12 Perhaps not as bad as the State agencies  
13 right now but we're suffering funding decreases as well,  
14 different mandates to -- a lot of our research money goes  
15 outside now instead of being done in-house. So we're -- I  
16 wouldn't want to say that NOAA wouldn't have the people  
17 that would be capable of doing this. I don't know that  
18 they're likely to be brought to bear on this topic in the  
19 near future. But I've have to explore that through the  
20 other NOAA people -- agencies before I could say for sure  
21 because I haven't specifically asked that question of NOS  
22 and OAR and the other groups we have.

23 But I don't think that there's consensus  
24 here to go forward with these now. So I guess I'd propose  
25 that we regroup on this and either as Trustees have a



1 discussion amongst ourselves at some point as to whether  
2 we'd want to go forward with this kind of thing so that we  
3 could shape up the RFP to get specifically what we want or  
4 find a different way, such as Phil has suggested, to go  
5 forward in the future. But I don't see much point in  
6 belaboring any more today.

7 MS. BALLARD: I agree.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard, do  
9 you have a comment?

10 MS. BALLARD: I was just going to propose  
11 that the scope be tightened for the next go round if we  
12 don't have concurrence to that.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, so shall we review  
14 the bidding?

15 MS. PHILLIPS: We should and we -- Mr.  
16 Chairman, we do have to go back to the list. We have to go  
17 back to watershed and make a decision on Knudsen and Alaska  
18 coastal comm -- and make a decision on four there. So if  
19 we could go back to watershed first.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: In watershed, we decided  
21 to fund Finney, Honnold, Walker and Heintz?

22 MS. PHILLIPS: And the one in question here  
23 was Knudsen.

24 MS. PEARCE: Are we ready to take a vote?

25 MS. PHILLIPS: No, that was to go back and

1 discuss.

2 MS. PEARCE: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, the -- just in  
4 terms of what we've done, it seems that -- I don't know how  
5 is our discussion going to -- we should -- I'm open to  
6 discussing it if the Trustees want to discuss it. I don't  
7 know how to lead the discussion. I don't know how that  
8 it's going to be different than we -- the discussion we've  
9 already had but go ahead, Commissioner Ballard.

10 MS. BALLARD: While the Trustees try to  
11 figure out how to proceed, let me ask a question about the  
12 numbers. And it may be again because I'm using the old  
13 Work Plan, I see numbers that seem to be \$20,000  
14 difference. Which is the correct number?

15 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes.

17 DR. MUNDY: The \$20,000 higher.

18 MS. BALLARD: So the 173,000 in the first  
19 year is the correct number?

20 DR. MUNDY: Correct.

21 MS. BALLARD: Okay.

22 MR. BALSIGER: And 157 in the second year.

23 DR. MUNDY: Correct.

24 MS. BALLARD: And as to how to proceed, I  
25 guess we proceed sort of the way we have. If somebody has

1 a proposal to make, we'll see if we can all agree to it.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Looks to me like we  
3 funded every research in every category except modeling.  
4 And -- which we were going to defer for maybe a different  
5 collaborative and less expensive approach. And we've --  
6 Gail, do you know how many projects we've deferred that  
7 otherwise were proposed for funding?

8 MS. PHILLIPS: I believe there were 14.  
9 Let's see.....

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That were.....

11 MR. BALSIGER: Not that we deferred right  
12 here today.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: Fourteen -- oh, you mean --  
14 from the list.....

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That were recommended for  
16 funding but that we put on the hold list.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: No, I can figure it out.  
18 Six or seven. Yeah, I could figure it out, it's about six  
19 or seven.

20 MS. PEARCE: At least seven. Plus a few  
21 more that I haven't been keeping -- at least nine because  
22 we just deferred those two.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And in the coastal  
24 current area, we funded Batten, Cokelet and Weingartner.

25 MS. BALLARD: I show we had four in that

1 category and this one as ones we were revisiting.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: That's correct.

3 MS. BALLARD: If I kept score correctly.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: That is correct.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And what was the other  
6 one we funded in ACC?

7 MS. PHILLIPS: In ACC you funded Batten,  
8 Cokelet and Weingartner.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, correct.

10 MS. PHILLIPS: The other four are up for  
11 discussion as is Knudsen and watersheds.

12 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So there's four there.  
13 Community involvement we funded.....

14 MS. PHILLIPS: That's okay, we have a plan.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: We funded three and we  
16 have a plan.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Uh-huh.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Data management we  
19 decided to fund all three.

20 MS. BALLARD: Correct.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So nothing was deferred  
22 there. Lingerin oil, we funded the Work Plan  
23 recommendation plus we took three off the deferred  
24 list.....

25 MS. BALLARD: Correct.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:   .....and funded them. Do  
2 you want to jump in here? Do you want to go.....

3                   MS. PEARCE: I was going to just talk about  
4 Knudsen for a minute.

5                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, let's just get an  
6 overview of the numbers. So in nearshore we funded Bishop,  
7 Thorne, Konar, Ruesink and Bodkin.

8                   MS. BALLARD: Correct.

9                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: So which is all of the --  
10 we took all the funding proposals. In synthesis we did  
11 Eckert and Spies.

12                  MS. BALLARD: Correct.

13                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: So we took all.....

14                  MS. PEARCE: Did you do Bodkin in  
15 nearshore? You did Bodkin in lingering oil. Did you do  
16 both of them?

17                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, in lingering oil we  
18 did Bodkin, Rice and Irvine.

19                  MS. PEARCE: Bodkin.....

20                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Bodkin, Rice and Irvine.  
21 We've got three deferred.

22                  MS. PEARCE: I didn't hear Bodkin  
23 initially.

24                  MS. PHILLIPS: On nearshore it's in.

25                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Bodkin is in.

2 MS. PEARCE: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And then watershed, we  
4 did Finney, Honnold, Walker and Heintz. So we deferred  
5 five projects out of the entire list and we added three  
6 that were deferred to five. So I think the total impact of  
7 all the research that was to be funded here, leaving the  
8 modeling aside and community involvement, which we funded  
9 some but we haven't planned for, is that it looks like  
10 we're -- we pushed two research projects off. I'm just  
11 doing this for my own sense. So that gives us some  
12 background and why don't we talk about Knudsen.

13 MS. PEARCE: It's my understanding from  
14 staff, who are no longer here, that this project, while it  
15 shows DOI as the lead and USGS, that the money primarily  
16 passes through to OSRI. But as.....

17 MS. BALLARD: To what? I'm sorry, Drue.

18 MS. PEARCE: To OSRI. To the Oil Spill  
19 Recovery Institute. It passes to Kline.

20 DR. MUNDY: In the form of Kline's salary,  
21 yes.

22 MS. PEARCE: Yeah. And Dr. Mundy talked  
23 about it being an eight on the scale of 10 in terms of  
24 meaning the RFP and the scope that we put out for the  
25 project. If we want to do this research and begin the

1 basis for future years and possibly for opportunities for --  
2 even though it's Prince William Sound, even Copper River  
3 Basin focused at the moment, they're trying to develop a  
4 tool that can be used in other areas, not just in that  
5 area.

6 But the bigger thing is that the sample  
7 that is being done and the samples that would be used for  
8 the project have been actually collected this year, as I  
9 understood what they were telling me. And that it -- we  
10 won't be able to do the project, at least not have that  
11 sampling if we defer it. We would not longer have a  
12 project. Is that your understanding?

13 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, Dr. Mundy.

15 DR. MUNDY: Is there someone else here,  
16 Drue, who could speak to this? Because you've kind of lost  
17 me.

18 MR. HAGEN: Excuse me, Pete Hagen here with  
19 NOAA. Yeah, that proposal -- I'm speaking for DOI because  
20 they left. But that proposal does tie into with NPRB  
21 proposal that's taking place on the nearshore of Copper  
22 River. And it's also -- it's obtaining samples from other  
23 projects that are funded by other entities, the NPRB and  
24 Fish and Game.....

25 DR. MUNDY: OSRI.

1 MR. HAGEN: OSRI, I guess as well. So it's  
2 -- and those projects are funded, they're underway, so  
3 that's why it can't be deferred another year, I guess,  
4 so.....

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Ballard.

6 MS. BALLARD: Do we know what percentage  
7 this funding would be of the total funding for -- is this a  
8 big percentage or a small percentage?

9 MR. HAGEN: Well, what it's doing is taking  
10 advantage of the sampling opportunity that's ongoing with  
11 these other projects. These other projects are looking at  
12 the stable isotope. And this is allowing them to collect  
13 the samples so it's not paying for the sampling costs, is  
14 my understanding. It's paying for the analytic work that's  
15 involved with doing the stable isotope. So I don't know  
16 off hand how much funding that saves but.....

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Thank you.

18 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yes, please.

20 DR. MUNDY: What I would say is that Dr.  
21 Kline is one of the top experts anywhere on stable  
22 isotopes. And my understanding is that he's donating  
23 facilities and some of his time on this and we're also  
24 getting samples that we would otherwise have to pay for.  
25 Now I don't know what the exact proportion or the exact



1 percentage breakdown is but, you know, clearly collecting  
2 samples is one of the most expensive parts of an project.

3 The other observation I would offer is that  
4 the more geographic contrast we have, the more complete we  
5 are in terms of covering the nearshore areas and the down  
6 river areas and the up river areas, the more likely we are  
7 to have -- not to come up with any significant questions  
8 about how to launch a watershed monitoring program at the  
9 end of the day. So again, I thought this was a fairly  
10 attractive project based on the leveraging of the funds and  
11 the involvement of Dr. Kline in particular. So I -- you  
12 know, I see this as a valuable part of the watershed  
13 package that was put forward.

14 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Dr. Balsiger.

15 MR. BALSIGER: Dr. Mundy, Dr. Kline, is  
16 that -- what is he, in Cordova? Where is he -- and the  
17 facilities are at the Prince William Sound Science Center?  
18 Thank you.

19 MR. DUFFY: Maybe I missed it, Mr.  
20 Chairman, Dr. Mundy. So what are we buying for these  
21 150,000 for a three year period? Just -- is it salary  
22 we're paying or is it sample collection or what? It's  
23 unclear to me. Maybe because it's 5:30 at night, I don't  
24 know.

25 MR. MEADE: Pete's got the budget right

1       there.

2                       CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Dr. Mundy.

3                       DR. MUNDY:   Mr. Chair, I was going to say,  
4       that's a -- I could put my spreadsheet back up again.  What  
5       will you pay me not to put my spreadsheet back up again?

6                       MR. DUFFY:   140,000.

7                       DR. MUNDY:   My wife, maybe.  I know that  
8       this project, for example, has an escapement counting  
9       component to it and it's being coordinated with ADF&G and  
10      USGS and it's fairly complicated.  I think a lot of the  
11      cost of any of these projects is the stable isotope  
12      analysis itself and that's why they're interested in  
13      collaborating with us, is that they have these materials  
14      but they can't afford to do the stable isotope analysis.  
15      So I think that the lab costs are a substantial part of  
16      this.

17                      CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Commissioner Ballard.

18                      MS. BALLARD:   I wonder if we could take  
19      advantage of the category that the staff recommendation  
20      called fund contingent, move this into fund contingent, try  
21      to deal with some of the issues that are raised in the STAC  
22      recommendations about the weaknesses.  Because it may be  
23      that some of the weaknesses are what are making it  
24      difficult for us to understand it.

25                      CHAIRMAN RENKES:   Dr. Mundy.

1 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, I believe we  
2 could resolve those fairly quickly because the -- they did  
3 submit a rewritten -- a completely rewritten proposal in  
4 response to the STAC criticisms. So we could -- fund  
5 contingent is certainly an option and I would be happy to  
6 work with the Council on this if that was their choice.

7 MS. BALLARD: If we can't understand it, we  
8 can't come to consensus and we don't have a consensus right  
9 now. So we either have to drop it entirely or give it --  
10 give Phil a chance to bring it back to us in a more  
11 comprehensive fashion.

12 MR. MEADE: I think your suggestion is a  
13 good approach. We seem to have come back to it and not be  
14 willing to get rid of it so moving it into fund contingent  
15 and refining it seems to be a reasoned approach at 5:30 in  
16 the evening.

17 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Sounds good? Sound good  
18 to everybody?

19 (No audible responses)

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

21 MR. BALSIGER: Well, our normal fund  
22 contingent means that once the contingencies are gone, Phil  
23 writes them the check. Now I have a feeling that.....

24 MS. BALLARD: That's not what I mean.

25 MR. BALSIGER: Well, I have a feeling we

1 have a different thing here.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: What's defer mean?

3 Tell.....

4 MS. PEARCE: Take it off.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Forever, well.....

6 MS. PHILLIPS: Fund contingent is -- and  
7 you can make that contingent upon getting the response to  
8 the STAC recommendations back to you for your approval.

9 MS. PEARCE: The same as the Dr. Spies.....

10 MR. MEADE: Let's make it fund contingent  
11 to bringing it back to us.

12 MS. PEARCE: .....project, it has to come  
13 back to us.

14 MS. BALLARD: I'd like to be able to see it  
15 again so that I can understand it.

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Sure.

17 MS. BALLARD: I mean, I put considerable  
18 effort into understanding all of these projects and since  
19 this one didn't make sense to me, I didn't have it on my  
20 list.

21 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, these -- fund  
22 contingent and deferred can work the same way. It's  
23 really, in this case, a matter of where we think the  
24 project is in its development. If the contingency is, and  
25 it will be part of the record here, if the contingency is,

1 is that it doesn't move forward until there's consensus  
2 from the Council on moving it forward then so be it. I  
3 mean, that's -- it will not move until that happens so.....

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And it sounds like you  
5 can get more information about it -- pretty quickly out  
6 so.....

7 DR. MUNDY: I have the revised proposal, I  
8 have not had a chance to go through it.

9 MS. BALLARD: And so we'll see it again.

10 MR. DUFFY: So we would see that again at  
11 our next meeting then?

12 MS. BALLARD: Or in some other fashion.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: We can send it to you and  
14 then take it up at -- on a teleconference meeting. We hit --  
15 we'll send you the details ahead of time.

16 MR. DUFFY: Okay.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: We have the three on ACC.

18 MS. BALLARD: Four.

19 MS. PHILLIPS: The four on ACC.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, so now we've added  
21 three and we've deferred three. We've changed the  
22 categories. I'd like to call it even.

23 MS. PHILLIPS: We get my consensus on that  
24 but.....

25 MS. PEARCE: Which ones are the ones that

1 we're.....

2 MS. PHILLIPS: The ones that have not been  
3 determined are Bechtol, Okkonen, Stabenow and Willette.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Well, in fairness, the  
5 ACC area was an area that I think that a couple of the  
6 State Trustees were having the most trouble with.

7 MS. BALLARD: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Is that fair?

9 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

10 MS. BALLARD: Absolutely.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And maybe now that we've  
12 moved Knudsen back in and we've funded three, I think, you  
13 know, we had the -- what I heard in the discussion of the  
14 ACC proposals was that we were looking for the projects  
15 where there was Batten and Weingartner where they were, you  
16 know, long term continuing projects. And then the Alaska  
17 Marine Highway project where we felt that a significant  
18 amount of effort had been put into working out the  
19 arrangement with the State agency and that we wanted to  
20 show good faith there. And also the project has a lot of  
21 value. So we had a rational basis for I think dividing up  
22 the seven projects that are recommended for funding and  
23 choosing three.

24 DR. MUNDY: Mr. Chairman, could I make a  
25 comment, please?

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, sure.

2 DR. MUNDY: The one project that I would  
3 point out here that has a significant continuing component  
4 and is relatively low in cost is Okkonen. And I point that  
5 out because they've got a substantial investment in  
6 learning how to work with this particular shipping company.  
7 They have a thermosalinograph down in the engine room on an  
8 oil tanker. And they've done a proof of concept for us.  
9 They've got data on the website that we can look at, that  
10 anybody can look at and they've done a good job for us.

11 If we drop the funding now -- again, this  
12 is one of those situations where they've devoted a lot of  
13 time to get to know the shipping company people and that  
14 and get good relationships with the crews on these vessels --

15 I would say that that's a relatively modest cost. It's an  
16 ongoing long term monitoring program. It's low cost data  
17 and it's relatively useful. I would ask that -- I don't  
18 particularly at this hour of the day, I'm not ready to  
19 really say that the others have to go forward at this time  
20 but I wish you would reconsider on the Okkonen project for  
21 the reasons that I've just given.

22 MS. BALLARD: I can go with that.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, we can go with  
24 that.

25 MS. BALLARD: Okay.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:  So we'll add Okkonen.  
2   What I'd like to do now if you're ready -- yes.  
3                   MS. PHILLIPS:  Mr. Chairman, before you get  
4   to that point, I just need to verify, we have nine projects  
5   that were on the defer list and I'm keeping those on the  
6   defer list.....  
7                   CHAIRMAN RENKES:  Yeah, they were.....  
8                   MS. PHILLIPS:  .....unless I get  
9   direct.....  
10                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:  In the Work Plan they  
11   were on the defer list.  
12                  MS. PHILLIPS:  On the defer list.  
13                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:  And we kept -- we've move  
14   three off.....  
15                  MS. PHILLIPS:  Right.  
16                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:  .....defer to fund and  
17   we've kept nine.....  
18                  MS. PHILLIPS:  Right.  
19                  CHAIRMAN RENKES:  .....that were  
20   recommended for defer, in the defer category, okay.  
21                  MS. PHILLIPS:  And I'm keeping those on the  
22   defer list.  Do you want -- would you.....  
23                  MR. BALSIGER:  Well, I'm not -- Mr.  
24   Chairman, I'm not sure how we're going to deal with the  
25   defer list but if we're not going to deal with it right



1 now, I would propose adding Stabenow's project -- which is  
2 a closeout year, a second year we funded -- to the defer  
3 list and make that decision later on if we're not making  
4 those decisions now. And I guess I'd do that.

5 MS. PHILLIPS: Change Stabenow.....

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Change Stabenow.....

7 MS. PHILLIPS: .....to defer.

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....from fund to defer,  
9 uh-huh.

10 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

11 MS. PEARCE: I have a question.

12 DR. MUNDY: Yes.

13 MR. HAGEN: No.

14 MS. PEARCE: No.

15 MR. HAGEN: Change Stabenow from fund.

16 Stabenow is a closeout project and it -- this is the last  
17 year of it coming up. It committed funds last year so  
18 it's.....

19 MR. BALSIGER: Well, obviously I'd rather  
20 fund it but I didn't see the sympathy here for it. So if  
21 we can put it into the defer thing where we have money left  
22 over from the lapsed projects last year.....

23 MR. HAGEN: Yeah, if their field season is  
24 next summer -- so there's a window there to work, I guess.

25 MR. BALSIGER: That's what I was thinking.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Pearce.

2 MS. PEARCE: So you've got a deferred list

3 but those were the ones that you had.....

4 MS. PHILLIPS: On the deferred list.

5 MS. PEARCE: .....that you all had already

6 had said deferred. So setting Stabenow beside, where does

7 the Willette and the.....

8 MS. PHILLIPS: Bechtol.

9 MS. PEARCE: .....Bechtol and the Cooper

10 projects go?

11 MS. PHILLIPS: They just go away.

12 MS. PEARCE: Well.....

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: My.....

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Unless you want to put them

15 on the deferred list.

16 MS. PEARCE: I -- we had things that were

17 recommended for funding that we're suddenly just getting

18 rid of and things that were recommended as being deferred

19 that we're keeping. That seems.....

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I think they go to

21 the.....

22 MS. PEARCE: .....backwards.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....defer list.

24 MS. PEARCE: Okay, that's what I was just

25 trying to clarify.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay, that makes more sense  
2 to me.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That's what I thought we  
4 were.....

5 MS. PEARCE: It makes more sense to me.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....doing.

7 MS. PEARCE: But that's not what I was  
8 hearing.

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: I thought we were  
10 flipping things between fund and defer here as we went  
11 along.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay, Bechtol, Stabenow and  
13 Willette all go to defer.

14 MS. PEARCE: Well, and Baird and Cooper.  
15 Even those are community involvement.

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Right, right.

17 MR. BALSIGER: Oh, yeah, yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, and we put those  
19 in.....

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Then we have one other  
21 project that did not fall in those categories and it's a  
22 management -- an EVOS management category and that's our  
23 project management cost. It's 140,000 that needs to be  
24 done. So we just need to have that one approved. And that  
25 was approved by the -- it was on the State's list.

1 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay. Any objection?  
2 Any discussion? Nothing, okay.

3 MS. BALLARD: May I add a general sort of  
4 good of the order. It seems to me that since two of the  
5 major agencies are represented at the table here who are  
6 still surprised at the method of assigning projects to  
7 agencies for supervision. It seems that as a matter of  
8 principle we should move towards having EVOS manage its own  
9 projects. I don't understand why we do that through these --  
10 I mean, it's really too late in the day to bring that up  
11 but when both Jim and Kevin sort of roll their eyes and say  
12 we don't know how it gets assigned to us, I wonder what the  
13 logic of it is.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: It is something that we have  
15 been talking about and looking at and we have a proposal  
16 for you.

17 MS. BALLARD: Good.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Oh, yes.

19 MS. BANKS: Mr. Chairman, if I may. The  
20 projects that were recommended for defer by the EVOS  
21 Executive Director, were you intending to keep those on the  
22 deferred list or were you intending to just eliminate those  
23 completely. Because I know you went through some of the  
24 other projects that were -- like for an example, Alaska  
25 coastal currents, you've got projects that were recommended

1 to be funded by the Executive Director such as like  
2 Bechtol. And your decision was to defer. But if you go  
3 down to Matkin -- I'm not sure how to pronounce it --  
4 Vaugin [sic].

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Vaughan.

6 MS. BANKS: Vaughan, Kline and Baird, all  
7 those projects were recommended by the Executive Director  
8 to defer, are you wanting to.....

9 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, just keep those on  
10 the defer list.

11 MS. BANKS: ....continue -- keep those on  
12 the deferred list.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Uh-huh.

14 MS. BANKS: Okay, so then that would be the  
15 case then for the remainder of the Work Plan, is that  
16 correct.

17 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, I know it's  
18 getting late but that's not my understanding of what we're  
19 doing here. My understanding is that of those we -- for  
20 the ACC proposals we funded a suite of projects. We put  
21 three on the deferred list but under what I thought we were  
22 doing, those would in fact go away.

23 CHAIRMAN RENKES: The deferred -- as a  
24 practical matter, things that are on the deferred list are  
25 not funded -- that's my understanding.....

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....I'm trying it out --  
3 are not funded unless we come back and say we have some  
4 money from.....

5 MS. PHILLIPS: And what would you.....

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....the '03 funds.....

7 MS. PHILLIPS: .....be interested in.....

8 CHAIRMAN RENKES: And what off that list do  
9 we want to fund.

10 MS. PHILLIPS: And we will -- you know,  
11 once we know -- once we have put the figures together of  
12 what we have funded and we have the dollar figure that --  
13 for the amount that we have left, so we'll have to come  
14 back to the Council.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right.

16 MS. BALLARD: I guess for the record, I  
17 want it clear that I don't feel compelled to spend every  
18 dime that we have.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: No.

20 MS. BALLARD: I think it's important to put  
21 together a proposal for funding that we're all comfortable  
22 with. So if deferred truly means deferred and we  
23 understand and those people understand that that doesn't  
24 mean that they automatically get some status relative to  
25 lapse funding.

1 MR. DUFFY: A quick question, if I could,  
2 to Dr. Mundy. The Matkin killer whale observation project,  
3 what time of year does that take place? Because I heard  
4 public testimony to that and it caught my attention. It's  
5 a \$20,000 project. If it enhances our knowledge base  
6 relative to killer whales and a one pod which is  
7 apparently being listed and.....

8 DR. MUNDY: I don't, strictly speaking,  
9 know the answer to that. I know that Craig is out just  
10 about anytime that you can operate in a small boat. Okay,  
11 so he's not out in the dead of winter but he's.....

12 MR. DUFFY: Right, so.....

13 DR. MUNDY: .....out a lot of other times.

14 MR. DUFFY: Thank you. So if we -- so then  
15 if we as a Trustee council decide that that's a good  
16 expenditure of \$20,000 to do that work and we approve it  
17 sometime in February, whenever our meeting is, it could  
18 occur this summer, without any hitch?

19 DR. MUNDY: Yes. Yes, I believe that's  
20 correct.

21 CHAIRMAN RENKES: How large is his boat?

22 DR. MUNDY: It's not -- I mean it's like --  
23 it's about a 30 footer. Because I mean it's not a huge  
24 boat.

25 MS. PEARCE: We should all go. We love

1 going across the Sound in smaller boats.

2 MR. BALSIGER: I propose then that we don't  
3 lose this defer. This defer goes into our -- doesn't go  
4 away. It stays on our defer list. That is supposed.....

5 MS. PEARCE: Which defer are you talking  
6 about? All of them or a specific.....

7 MR. BALSIGER: The Matkin one in  
8 specifically.

9 MS. PEARCE: Is the Matkin one would  
10 evaporate.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So we could come back and  
12 fund that if we want to come back and fund any of the  
13 projects on our deferred list. But we're not --  
14 Commissioner Ballard is saying that we'll do that by  
15 consensus and folks on the deferred list -- projects on the  
16 deferred list shouldn't feel that they've got some special  
17 status. In other words, if the fund.....

18 MS. BALLARD: Right. They're not just  
19 waiting for money.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: That's right. That's the  
21 way to put it.

22 MS. BALLARD: Like fund contingent.

23 MS. PEARCE: Don't go buy gear.

24 MS. BALLARD: Yes, don't go -- don't go buy  
25 what?



1 MS. PEARCE: Gear.

2 MS. BALLARD: Yeah, gear.

3 MR. MEADE: If I may, to come back and  
4 address the killer whale that Mr. Duffy described. I read  
5 two letters sent to me I think through EVOS and I did hear  
6 it on the public testimony. I certainly am not opposed and  
7 I'm very supportive of that low cost to maintaining that  
8 long term data benefit. So if there's no opposition there,  
9 why subject it to deferment if there's a consensus  
10 potentially for at least that specific project? For all  
11 the reasons I heard Commissioner Duffy mentioned.

12 MR. BALSIGER: I would support it.

13 MR. MEADE: To me it's just one more  
14 opportunity to show that we've listened to public comment  
15 and we're making our decisions responsive to that, in  
16 accordance with the direction we want to go.

17 MS. BALLARD: It's all right with me.

18 MR. DUFFY: I concur with that observation.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Deferring to the folks  
20 with fisheries responsibility.

21 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay on Matkin?

22 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

23 MS. BALLARD: But not in a dangerous set of  
24 seas.

25 CHAIRMAN RENKES: It was a 14 foot skiff, I

1 was going to say he had a -- he's got a good deal.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay, that's all I have as  
3 far as the Work Plan, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay, so now.....

5 MS. PHILLIPS: You do need to take -- I  
6 have some other action items.

7 CHAIRMAN RENKES: So now after we've gone  
8 through this process, can we agree as a group to make this  
9 our action on the Work Plan?

10 MS. BALLARD: Yes.

11 MR. DUFFY: Yes.

12 MR. BALSIGER: Yes.

13 MS. PEARCE: Yes.

14 MR. MEADE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Good, we've got  
16 consensus.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: Great. There's two other  
18 items that we need to take up. I will hold the lapsed one  
19 for an -- issue for our next meeting and that way we'll  
20 have an idea of the exact dollar figures. I do need you to  
21 give me authority to sign the memorandum of agreement  
22 between the Alaska Marine Highway system and DOT now that  
23 you have pursued that.

24 MS. BALLARD: So moved.

25 MR. DUFFY: Second.

1                   CHAIRMAN RENKES: Seconded. Approved  
2 without objection.

3                   MS. PHILLIPS: Great. And I need you  
4 to.....

5                   MS. PEARCE: You sign it?

6                   MS. PHILLIPS: Yes. I also ask you to  
7 authorize my doing a report on various related  
8 organizations in the state who are sponsored by where they  
9 get their funding and what their scientific work entails.

10                  MS. BALLARD: I asked for this, Mr.  
11 Chairman. I asked that we get a map that show us where the  
12 money is.

13                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: I'm sorry, a map of.....

14                  MS. BALLARD: Of all the funding for all  
15 the science in this area so we can understand how this all  
16 fits together a little bit better.

17                  CHAIRMAN RENKES: Right. I agree to that  
18 also. Thanks.

19                  MS. BALLARD: I want to be on a level  
20 playing field with Jim and I'm so far behind him.

21                  MR. BALSIGER: Are you including private  
22 foundations and that kind of stuff?

23                  MS. PHILLIPS: Everything.

24                  MS. BALLARD: The best she can do.

25                  MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah.

1 MS. BALLARD: I mean, the best she can do.  
2 It will be fascinating.

3 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Can I make a request.....

4 MS. BALLARD: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN RENKES: .....for information.  
6 I'd like to have available to all the Trustees a list of  
7 all the money that has been spent since the inception of  
8 the Trustee Council and.....

9 MS. PHILLIPS: You -- I did send it out.

10 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Do we have that?

11 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah, we do.

12 MR. DUFFY: That we have.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: A couple -- a month or so  
14 ago.

15 CHAIRMAN RENKES: But wasn't that just by  
16 category as opposed to specific.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: You want the detail?

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah.

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN RENKES: If you have the detail, I  
21 think that would be helpful. Because that was by like  
22 habitat, acquisition, right?

23 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

24 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Yeah, it was broad  
25 categories as opposed to the specific projects.

1 DR. MUNDY: We have the Work Plan.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah.

3 DR. MUNDY: The past Work Plans. We can  
4 send you a collection of those that tells you every project  
5 that's ever been funded.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

7 MS. PHILLIPS: One other thing, Mr.  
8 Chairman, before everybody leaves, they must walk right by  
9 Cherri and sign the resolution tonight for approving and  
10 spending the money for the Work Plan. We have to have your  
11 signatures on resolution that then will go to the courts so  
12 the courts will know to release the funds and such.

13 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Okay.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: That's all I have for  
15 tonight, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate very, very much you --  
16 everybody staying and getting through this.

17 MS. BALLARD: Move we adjourn.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Trustee Pearce.

19 MS. PEARCE: Thank you. You had talked  
20 about an executive session. Do we need to not adjourn so  
21 that if you need to do a phone executive session we could  
22 do so?

23 MS. PHILLIPS: I could do the executive  
24 session in just a very few minutes if you wanted to stay or  
25 else I could do it by phone, it doesn't.....

1 MS. PEARCE: But the point is, we shouldn't  
2 adjourn if we're going to do it by phone. That's my point.

3 MS. PHILLIPS: No, because we could set it  
4 up with other business beside the executive session on the  
5 phone.

6 CHAIRMAN RENKES: If it's a matter of just  
7 a few minutes, why don't we deal with it while we're here.

8 MS. BALLARD: Why don't we just deal with  
9 it.

10 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay, it will just take a  
11 few minutes so.

12 MR. BALSIGER: Would you like to convene us  
13 into executive session?

14 MS. PEARCE: We have to know what the topic  
15 is before we can.

16 MS. PHILLIPS: It's legal issues and if I  
17 could have Craig stay and Ron and Phil, please.

18 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Commissioner Duffy.

19 MR. DUFFY: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make  
20 this short and hopefully I'll speak for most of the Trustee  
21 Council members. I would like to thank the staff, the  
22 science director, Gail Phillips, the STAC, the PAC and  
23 everyone else who put all the effort as well as members of  
24 the public who participating in the development of the FY-  
25 04 Work Plan. This is the first time that I've really gone

1 through this in detail and come to a consensus in the  
2 Trustee Council process. For those out in the audience,  
3 I'm sure it was somewhat laborious. But I think by this  
4 level of scrutiny, this level of dialogue, the members of  
5 the public sitting here, I think it just enhances the  
6 credibility of this organization. So with that in mind,  
7 I'm ready to adjourn. Thank you.

8 MR. BALSIGER: No, we're ready to move into  
9 executive session.

10 MR. DUFFY: Executive session.

11 CHAIRMAN RENKES: We'll move into executive  
12 session. So we'll need to cut off the telephone.

13 MR. DUFFY: And you'll need a motion, Mr.  
14 Chairman

15 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman, I move we move  
16 into executive session for the purpose of discussing some  
17 legal issues.

18 MR. DUFFY: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN RENKES: Without any objection, so  
20 moved.

21 (Off record - 6:03 p.m.)

22 (On record - 6:09 p.m.)

23 MS. BALLARD: Okay, Greg, I move we  
24 adjourn.

25 MR. DUFFY: Second.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN RENKES: Without objection, we're  
adjourned.

(Off record - 6:09 p.m.)



