09.23.03

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL

TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Public Teleconference Meeting

Wednesday, May 13, 2009

10:00 o'clock a.m.

441 West 5th Avenue, Suite 500

Anchorage, Alaska

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

STATE OF ALASKA DEC:	MR. LARRY HARTIG
(Chair)	Commissioner
STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT	MR. TOM BROOKOVER for
OF FISH AND GAME:	Commissioner Lloyd
	(BY PHONE)
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR:	MR. KIM ELTON
	Senior Advisor
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,	MR. STEVE ZEMKE for
U.S. FOREST SERVICE	MR. JOE MEADE, Supervisor
STATE OF ALASKA -	MR. CRAIG TILLERY for
DEPARTMENT OF LAW:	MR. RICHARD SVOBODNY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,	MR. CRAIG O'CONNOR for
National Marine Fisheries Svc:	MR. JAMES W. BALSIGER
(By Phone)	Administrator, AK Region

Proceedings electronically recorded, then transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, 700 West 2nd Avenue

Anchorage, AK 99501 - 243-0668

STAFF PRESENT:		
ELISE HSIEH		Interim Executive Director
CHERRI WOMAC		Associate Coordinator
CATHERINE BOERNER		Restoration Specialist
MICHAEL SCHLEI		Data Systems Manager
ERIKA AMMANN		NOAA
	(BY PHONE)	
DEDE BOHM		USGS
PETE HAGEN		NOAA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - May 13, 2009)

(On record - 10:00 a.m.)

MR. BROOKOVER: This is Tom Brookover. I'll be sitting in for Denby today.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Oh, okay. Thanks, Tom. I was just thinking that's the last person we needed. So I think we're all here. I guess we'll go ahead and call roll to make sure we got everybody.

REPORTER: Do you want to call roll, Cherri?

MS. WOMAC: Sure.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Or I can do it, if you want.

REPORTER: That's fine. Doesn't matter.

MS. WOMAC: Commissioner Hartig.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Here.

MS. WOMAC: AG Craig Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Here.

MS. WOMAC: Commissioner -- oh, I'm sorry. Tom Brookover for Commissioner Lloyd.

MR. BROOKOVER: Tom Brookover is here.

MS. WOMAC: Craig O'Connor for Jim Balsiger.

MR. O'CONNOR: I'm here, but I'm having

trouble hearing.

MS. WOMAC: Kim Elton.

MR. ELTON: I'm here also and having some trouble hearing.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And then we got Steve Zemke.....

MS. WOMAC: And Steve Zemke.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....right, sitting in for Joe Meade.

MS. WOMAC: Uh-huh.

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, that's correct. I can't hear Cherri very well either.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, well, can you hear me okay?

MR. ZEMKE: You're fine, Larry.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, I apologize that you can hear me well. Okay. Well, I guess I'll run the meeting if Craig's not going to grab the -- he's not. Okay. So it's a simple one today. We should have the agenda in front of us. If I get a motion to approve the agenda.

MR. TILLERY: Move.....

MR. O'CONNOR: So moved.

MR. TILLERY: Second.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Are there any

corrections, additions, changes to the agenda?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Hearing none, the agenda is approved. Okay. Next item, we look at the minutes from the last meeting, the January 16th meeting, I believe it was. Do I have a motion to approve the minutes from that meeting?

MS. HSIEH: March 9th.

MS. WOMAC: March 9th.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Oh, March 19th, sorry -- or March 9th.

MR. TILLERY: Move to approve.

MR. ZEMKE: Steve Zemke. I move to approve the March 9th.....

MR. TILLERY: Second.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Second, okay.

MR. O'CONNOR: I'll second it.

MR. TILLERY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any changes, corrections to the minutes?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Hearing none, the minutes are approved. Okay. So, let's see, do we have the other minutes to approve or is that it?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So I guess we'll go on then to the main item of business -- or do we want to do public comments first?

MR. TILLERY: Public comment.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Is anybody from the public here that want to make comments here in Anchorage?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Anybody online from the public that wants to make comments on anything?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It doesn't sound like it, so I guess the public comment period is closed. Okay. So, we've got in front of us today to look the Boufadel project proposal. I think everybody has got the material on that. It's been distributed and reviewed. Is there anything else that we need to cover on this, or should we just go into -- get a motion on and up and then some discussion? Okay. Elise is just nodding that she doesn't have anything.

MS. HSIEH: We don't have any additional materials.....

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Just the.....

MS. HSIEH: .....if that's what you're asking.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....written material.

MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh. And then of course online we have Michel Boufadel and Jacqui Michel to answer any questions that may come up. I don't think Al Venosa is online.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you. I guess we'll start, if I can get a motion to approve the Boufadel project 070836-A, Factors Responsible for Limiting the Degradation Rate of Exxon Valdez Oil in Prince William Sound Beaches in the amount of $437,497, which includes G&A, $36,124. Anybody willing to make that motion?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. O'CONNOR: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. And Craig Tillery, do you want to second.....

MR. TILLERY: I'll second it then.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....Craig O'Connor's motion? Okay. Well, I'll open it up for discussion then on the motion.

MR. O'CONNOR: Well, since I moved it, this is Craig. Let me just make a couple of comments. You know, Mr. Chairman, we're well on our way with a number of studies that are addressing the why and what to do about the lingering oil in Prince William Sound. And we are reaching a point where a lot of the information is coming together, an important component of which of course was Al

Venosa's study on whether or not the oil that's out there is in fact biodegradable. And it appears that he's gotten some preliminary results from Al that in fact that oil is biodegradable. And what seems to be the situation as to why it hasn't degraded at that this point, and it's in the last 20 years, is what would seem to be that the absence of oxygen is a controlling factor and perhaps a -- in addition the absence of sufficient nutrients.

Michel Boufadel's earlier project on limiting factors was taking a look at the -- sort of the why -- what is going on on the beach that is limiting the -- or creating a situation where the oil is either not being transported out to sea or is not otherwise being exposed to the appropriate nutrients and oxygen, because those are really -- seem to be the prevailing factors influencing the biodegradation in situ. Where these pieces are starting to come together, one of the important considerations at this stage will be if in fact, and it would appear to be the case, that oxygen is the reason the oil is not degrading, perhaps augmented by some nutrients. Why isn't it and how do we get that oxygen to it. Michel's work thus far along with Jacqui Michel's work is saying here's the way the problem looks to us in terms of the encapsulation of the oil, the way that the beach is structured, and how it's distributed on those beaches that

do have lingering oil, have certain geomorphological characteristics. And if we're going to be addressing the issue of the absence or the depletion of oxygenating chemicals on the beaches, how are we going to get them to the oil. And this is in essence a preliminary evaluation of how we go about injecting oxygen and/or nutrients into the beaches, looking at two study sites that would be fairly representative of the dif -- the types of geomorphological conditions that we're finding out there where oil is being retained in from the beaches.

And so we're going to be looking at how can we go about getting oxygen to the oil, how much injection pressure is necessary. How we're putting oxidants into the system, for instance peroxide, how are we going to get it distributed within the beach, how much pressure is necessary, how is it going to flow, and so on. And this is all preliminary information that at least in my mind will serve as the predicate upon which we base our solicitations for next year on how to go about remediating the oil in situ in a less aggressive, in a less aggressive fashion than the front loader going in and digging it up.

In reviewing the comments and concerns from the science panel, I recognize that at this stage, some may consider this study, one, to be unnecessary. Let's do it through the open solicitation process. Others may have

some sense that it may be unnecessary or perhaps is not as well designed as it could be. I think based upon my reading and the work that I have done in chatting with the technological experts here that it may not be perfect but it's the best we can do at this stage. And we do not want to make a substantial investment without understanding the hydrodynamics in play and what we may be able to do at least preliminarily by way of getting nutrients and oxygen into the beaches.

So, as a council member I want to know the information that's being solicited here. In some ways this was a result of some of the questions and concerns that I had as we were progressing. So, notwithstanding the fact that I generally do not feel comfortable taking an action that hasn't been for the most part fully endorsed by our science panel, I feel comfortable at this stage that this is appropriate to move forward with, and as a result I have moved its approval by the council.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thanks, Craig. Are there any other -- anybody else want to just add anything to the discussion? Craig.

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I have looked at the comments of the science panel, a number of which they are somewhat mixed. One of the overriding themes is that I'm not an expert in this field. And so actually I

would appreciate hearing from perhaps Jacqui Michel about the justifications that she sees for doing this particular study, and in particular perhaps responding to the idea of whether we shouldn't just go ahead and use oxygen, for example, rather than a tracer in this. But just in general her understandings of the most important justifications for going forward at this time.

MS. MICHEL: Okay. This is Jacqui Michel and I appreciate the opportunity to answer that question because, you know, in reviewing the science panel comments, you know, I had the same impressions. You know, a lot of folks, you know, they believed wholeheartedly, you know, our hypothesis and felt like that we knew enough to go ahead and go straight toward, you know, sort of testing different kinds of oxygen addition methods. However, you know, for those of us who actually do the work, we felt very strong that there were additional data needs for us to be able to design a well-designed, best chance for success. Because we figured there's really on one time, one chance for success in order to try to do some remediation treatment testing, the pilot testing, and those had to be designed the best way we can so that we had the highest chance of success. So I think the work this summer is critical to doing that. Because even as the team of researchers who were trying, struggling with how to -- you

know, our first strategy was thinking about maybe we should take advantage of 2009 and try to do some pilot tests, but then as we started to design the test ourselves, we found out that we did not have enough information, we did not know area of influence, we didn't know the flow rates in that lower layer. You know, we talked about hydrofracturing and different kinds of injection techniques and we were -- you know, we were -- we could make best professional judgments but we were very concerned about the fact that, you know, we would be smarter after one more year and be able to make the best design.

I think these studies are going to be critical to sort of providing the basis so that not just us but other, you know, researchers and remediation technologists would have the results of this 2009 study, then we can have a broader range of options and a basis on which to evaluate those options. You know, for example we discussed, now do inject this stuff in trenches or in wells. Do we do slow release, are they going to be effective. We had a lot of arguments. No one had the right answer and we think we'll have better answers for those by the end of this, the survey.

MR. TILLERY: And Mr.....

MS. MICHEL: Does that answer your question?

MR. TILLERY: That was helpful to me, Mr. Chairman. And one kind of followup question would be when do we anticipate getting the results of this study? You mentioned that it would be the kind of study that we could then take the results and send it out to anybody to come up with a proposal for next -- perhaps the next field season, an actual pilot project, I think. When would we get the results from this study?

MS. MICHEL: Okay. Michel is online. He can answer that. But -- do you want to do that, Michel?

MR. BOUFADEL: Yeah, I would say im -- you know, immediately, like in late September, early October, we should have the results.

MR. TILLERY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions, Craig?

MS. MICHEL: And these would be published in a way that -- you know, very practical. These won't be peer-reviewed scientific articles but hopefully they'll be practical, kind of engineering feasibility study data that people could use to better design, you know, a pilot project for 2010.

MR. BOUFADEL: Yes, because -- this is Michel Boufadel -- because we, you know, if everything goes according to plan, we should start our experiments in early

August or say mid-August, depending on, you know, if -- you know, this. So mid-August we start collecting data and we kind of -- we'll make sure that they are processed in time and then presented in a report by -- I think the quarterly report is in September, so we should have most of them in early September. And -- but just considering the time line, I feel also we will have much more in there by the end of September. So I would say we could break down the deliverables between 70 percent -- I wouldn't say much more than that. The deliverable, I would say 70 percent should be in early September, and then the rest the end of September.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. This is Larry Hartig. I had a couple of questions too. My main concern on this, and it was also I think reflected in some of the science panel comments, is where this is headed. And that is, is do we really expect that with this impermeable layer and the lack of nutrients and perhaps oxygen there in inhibiting the degradation that we could go in and actually get enough nutrients and oxygen into that layer to effectively do the bioremediation without other significant disruption. You know, I'm worried that it's such an impermeable layer that we'd end up having to break it up somehow or do something to it, you know, to have effective bioremediation and that even if we were achieving

bioremediation, we'd have to use so many nutrients, you know, that we could disturb the ecosystem that way or that we would have the oil that -- as it is being broken down by the bacteria or otherwise released, that we'd start seeing sheens and other situations develop with the bioremediation that may not be acceptable to the public. And so I just don't know if bioremediation is a viable option with that impermeable layer or not and would be interested in other people's feelings on that.

MS. MICHEL: Well, this is Jacqui. I'll make a first response because that's exactly -- you know, that, whether or not it's feasible is just the answer that we're trying to create through these, this one more round of field specimens. Because as -- you know, we're not so concerned about, you know, I guess so much concerned about releasing oil and creating sheens. That's a possibility. You know, the big question for us in terms of feasibility and disturbances will be, you know, at what frequency do you have to create the injection. You know, do you have to drill wells every meter. You know, are they every five meters, you know. And -- because your digging these wells or installing these wells is a physical disturbance for the -- to the intertidal zone. So we don't know and I guess we'll never know until we do this next round of studies where we have enough model -- you know, field data,

modeling data to be able to predict those -- answer those questions about the effectiveness. And it's mostly -- you know, we're not going to overcharge the nutrients we don't think but we could -- because you know, the main thing that we need to add, is oxygen. And, you know, there turned out, in the Venosa study, you know, it took a long time before the nutrient augmentation took off because there was so much background nutrients in the sediments.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I guess I'm not so worried about the study itself, I'm just thinking that in the application on a broader scale, you know, in the field, you know, is it really -- is this realistically something that we would do, you know.

MS. MICHEL: You know, and that's -- part of the realistically is it something we would do would be, you know, how many wells do you have to dig to inject what -- you know, what radius of influence. And so -- but also remember the oil itself is not in huge patches. The oil is in -- is patchier. And so we're not -- you know, our plan is, you know, even in implementation or pilot testing, you know, we're treating oil on a patch level. And so that's one other thing to think about, is that we are dealing with discreet units that might minimize -- brought the large scale of, you know, disturbance that people might think of an entire -- you know, all of Point Helen or all of Smith

Island.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right. No, I appreciate that's a good point, because that was another concern, is just what the ultimate cost would be because if -- just do a study with a couple of injection or, you know, two series of injection wells -- or I don't know what you'd call them, injection, they're pretty shallow, the -- beyond the cost of that, you know, if you scaled that up, that could become terribly expensive. You know, if this study is 400,000, you know, what would it cost to do some.....

MS. MICHEL: You know, definitely there.....

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....remediation.

MS. MICHEL: .....would be economy to scale when you -- if and when -- if the decision was made to go back. But it's going to be expensive, I mean, you know, largest oil spill cleanup in the world and, you know, I'm sure some of those factors would apply to the in situ by remediation as well.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I guess the last question -- and these are significant, major question I think that I'm asking, you know, maybe some policy questions, is, is it necessary before -- to do the study this summer? You know, what's driving the schedule here. Because it is a pretty short time period, you know, to review this and

consider it and perhaps -- I'm a bit worried too that we -- I don't have the benefit of having remediation experts, you know, as part of the science panel reviewing it too and giving their thought on whether this is a good course. Is it that we have to do it this summer?

MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I guess -- it seems to me -- my understanding is that we wouldn't of course have to do it this summer but if you don't do it this summer, you're going to lose another field season and then you're going to be faced with the same thing next summer. Do you go forward with the pilot project or do you try to go and define things better so that you can make that project more effective? Or determine that you don't even need a pilot project because it's not going to work. And given where we are, it would appear to me that getting this information now to better define what we can do next year is probably a useful exercise.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Expensive one.

MR. TILLERY: It's an expensive exercise, but as you note, it is -- the pilot project is going to be a lot more expensive but any the actual work that comes out of this is likely to be even more expensive.

MS. MICHEL: But we'll be able to answer the question to the public about, you know, are there feasible alternatives to treatment of the lingering oil.

And otherwise, you know, the longer we wait, the longer that question remains.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No, that's an extremely important question to all of us. Any other questions or discussion?

MR. ZEMKE: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is Steve Zemke. I had one question. Do you think there are other studies that are going to be needed before -- in addition to this one that's going to be needed to supply the critical information for the pilot studies or do you think this is an -- what would be needed and give us adequate information to proceed?

MS. MICHEL: Do.....

MR. ZEMKE: And it would be Jacqui or Michel or.....

MS. MICHEL: Well, I'll answer first and then Michel can then jump in. You know, we've tried to think of everything we would want to learn when we designed this study. And so, you know, there's always -- scientists always want more studies, but I think what you have working for you is a team of people who are practical. We're trying to answer the question from an engineering hydrology perspective. So we tried to identify everything we know now, and that's not to say that by the time, the end of study, we'll have found new things, but that's what science

is about. But we don't think so. Michel.

MR. BOUFADEL: Yeah, I agree.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay. Hearing that, also looking at the document that was presented, a justification for the 2009 limiting factors field study modification, that I think in my mind answered a lot of questions that were brought up by the science panel. I had one kind of implementation question. I know that you're going out two times, proposed going out two times, first to put in the well and then two months later to come back, and I guess the two month period is for the sediments to kind of return back to their normal. Do you consider that an adequate period of time or would it be better to come back the next year to allow the sediments to kind of go through the normal winter period and reestablish a more natural situation?

MR. BOUFADEL: This is Michel Boufadel. We placed sensors in between summer 2007 and then during the winter take them up, we took them out in summer 2008. And based on these sensors we concluded that about six weeks, you know, would be sufficient. And then we considered two months, you know, as a safety factor. But again, this based on these data. It is possible that this particular hypothesis would need to be further confirmed and that's why I said early on, you know, we ideally, we put the wells

in early June and then we start the experiments in early August. But, you know, if it doesn't work out, we might need to give it two more weeks or even a whole month. But -- so that's evaluable. But based on this six weeks, I don't think we should go more -- we would go more than maybe two and a half months or two months.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay. That's -- that sounds good. I had one question about the budget, but I'm not sure if we want to discuss that or -- right now or move on through the rest of the technical discussion.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, why don't you go ahead and ask your question now, Steve.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay. It was kind of in the GA portion of it. They were talking about 26 percent. And then I know that's, you know, with other universities we've kind of dealt with some of that. I don't remember exactly how, but it does seem rather high, you know, the 80,000. And then on top of that we fund another nine percent of our own overhead on their overhead, so it's effectively even higher than that. In some way it just seems like that was should at least take the 26 percent and take the nine percent off of that and provide for 15 percent overhead for them if we think that's acceptable.

MS. HSIEH: Mr. Chairman, just so.....

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Elise.

MS. HSIEH: .....that everyone is aware, NOAA has declined the project management fees. Does everyone have that in their -- that was sent around via email. That was a late change that was made.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I don't know if you heard that, Steve.

MR. ZEMKE: No, I didn't.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Elise was just commenting that there was an email that went out that NOAA is waiving their fees on this for their oversight, managing the contract.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay. So the nine percent, it would be eliminated then on it. Okay. That was my concern then. So that would resolve that.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Is that.....

MS. MICHEL: Oh, good. So it's only a $400,000.....

MS. HSIEH: That's not right.

MS. MICHEL: .....cost.

MS. HSIEH: Just one moment, please.

MS. BOERNER: The nine percent is still in the project. We're just not going to charge the $9,000 project management fee.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

MR. ZEMKE: I assume that it brings the

cost down.....

MS. BOERNER: There's still the nine percent.....

MR. ZEMKE: .....to 401,000.

MS. BOERNER: .....on the project.

MS. HSIEH: The nine percent still is on the project.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, let me get that clear, Steve. The nine percent is still in there. What NOAA is waiving is $9,000 project management fees.

MR. ZEMKE: Oh, okay.

MR. BOUFADEL: This is Michel Boufadel. In 2007 when we were submitting this proposal we checked what the University of Alaska Fairbanks, I mean the rates, and what we got was 25 percent. And Temple University, you know, for it to support the graduate students, it requires 26 percent. So we went up from 25 percent overhead to 26 percent. So that was the basis for it. Temple University usually charges 50 percent overhead on projects. So we negotiated it down to 26 percent.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay. That kind of resolves that. As long as we just kind of sharpened our pencils on that we could probably get.....

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion?

MR. O'CONNOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd call for the question, but I don't -- I can't see whether anybody else is getting antsy.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No, I don't see anybody else getting antsy in this room, so thanks for calling for the question. We'll go ahead and I guess do a roll call vote. And, let's seek, Craig Tillery.

MR. TILLERY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Tom Brookover.

MR. BROOKOVER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Craig O'Connor.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Kim Elton.

MR. ELTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Steve Zemke.

MR. ZEMKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. And I'll be yes. So the motion passes.

MR. ZEMKE: I guess we should have one question. If the fees are waived, that 9,000, does that -- what was the total for the project then? Has that been changed?

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: The total project is still $437,497 including G&A at 36,124. Is that correct, Elise?

MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh. That's what I have as well.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

MR. ZEMKE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So, yeah, the motion is correct. Okay. Is there -- I guess I'll just ask again on public comment, since we asked people earlier before what was the scheduled time on the agenda if they had comments, if there's still anybody from the public that has any comments for today?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It doesn't appear so in Anchorage. Okay. Is there anything -- any other business to come before the meeting then? I see a tentative executive session.

MS. HSIEH: That's up to you guys.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do we need one?

MS. HSIEH: We don't.

MR. TILLERY: I'm not aware of any need for an executive session.

MS. HSIEH: No, I think it's all right.

MR. TILLERY: I don't know if anybody else has -- online has a need.

MS. HSIEH: I think we threw that on there because.....

MR. O'CONNOR: Well, as much as I love getting together with you guys, I think we can probably pass today.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

MR. ZEMKE: Definitely.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, I don't hear any -- do I have a motion to adjourn then?

MR. O'CONNOR: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TILLERY: Second.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposition?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We stand adjourned. Thanks everybody.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(Meeting Adjourned - 10:31 a.m.)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 4 through 100 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council's Meeting recorded electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 13th day of May 2009, commencing at the hour of 10:00 a.m. and thereafter transcribed under my direction and reduced to print:

THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the request of:

EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL, 441 W. 5th Avenue, Suite 500, Anchorage, Alaska 99501;

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 19th day of May 2009.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY:

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/12