EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT Trustee Council

Alaska Public Utilities 1016 West 6th Avenue Suite 305 Anchorage, Alaska December 19, 1991 6:30 o'clock p.m.

IN ATTENDANCE:

State of Alaska MR. CHARLES COLE Attorney General Council Meeting Chairman

State of Alaska Department Mr. JOHN SANDOR of Environmental Commissioner Conservation

Alaska Department of Fish MR. CARL ROSIER and Game Commissioner

USDA Forest Service MR. MICHAEL BARTON MR. DAVE GIBBONS Regional Forester

National Oceanic MR. STEVEN PENNOYER Atmospheric Administration Regional Director

United States Department MR. CURTIS MCVEE of the Interior Special Assistant to the Secretary

ACE 6792517

R & R COURT REPORTERS

4 MCU0040E

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the meeting of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustee Council. We're meeting this evening in the offices of the Alaska Public Utilities Commission, 1016 West 6th Avenue, Suite 305, Anchorage.

Initially, this evening I would like to again introduce the members of the Trustee Council, starting on the left is Curt McVee, the designee of the Secretary of the Interior; next is Mike Barton, he's the designee of Secretary Madigan, Secretary of Agriculture; to my left is Steve Pennoyer, designee of the NOAA Trustee, Dr. Knauss, Steve Pennoyer; on the extreme right is John Sandor, Alaska Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation; and, next to me on my right is Carl Rosier, Commissioner of the Department of Fish & Game.

This evening, in addition, I would like to introduce the designee of Administrator Reily (ph) of the Environmental Protection Agency, Mr. Robert Bird, he's from the Tenth Regional Office in Seattle. Mr. Bird.

MR. BIRD: You will recall, those of who attended the last meeting of the Trustee Council, that each member of the Trustee Council was afforded the right to name on designee to a subgroup, the name of which I obviously have difficulty recalling, but it's the RRCG group; and I think that stands for

ACE 6792518

Restoration, Resource, Coordination Group. It is a name which this evening I would like to mention or to have consideration given to simplifying the name; sometimes I read it Resource, Restitute — or Restoration Council, and then it's group, and then it's something else. And, it's really — I find it very difficult, I don't know if you ladies and gentlemen have the same problem with it that I do, but I must say I certainly do.

But in any event -- and, also at the last meeting, we were to hold, as we did, an executive session for the appointment of, you might say, an acting executive director. The following day, we met and appointed or elected an executive director, Dave Gibbons, who will I introduce to you now.

Mr. Gibbons, if you would stand and let these people have a good look at you, please.

Next, is Dr. Jerome Montague, the designee of Curt Rosier. Dr. Montague.

Stan Senner, designee. Marty Rutherford, she's the designee of Harold Heinz who is the Commissioner of Natural Resources, as you know, who is my designee; so, she's a sub, sub-designee. And, lastly, Ernie Piper

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Alternate designee.

MR. BIRD: alternate designee of Commissioner Sander. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

CONFERENCE OPERATOR: Excuse me. This is the bridge (ph) operator. Just to let you know, Soldotna, Cordova, Kodiak

ACE 5792519

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	and Juneau are on line.
2	MR. COLE: Thank you. Does everyone have a copy of
3	this evening's agenda?
4	JUNEAU MODERATOR: This is the Juneau moderator, and
5	we'd like a copy of the agenda, please.
6	MR. COLE: Sure. Do you have a fax machine there?
7	JUNEAU MODERATOR: The number is 465-2299.
8	KODIAK MODERATOR: This is Kodiak, we would like a
9	copy, too.
10	MR. COLE: Please give us the fax number.
11	KODIAK MODERATOR: 486-5264.
12	MR. COLE: Would any other station like a copy of the
13	agenda? It's sort of an nondescript document, but you're
14	certainly welcome to have it.
15	SOLDOTNA MODERATOR: Could you please send one to
16	Soldotna at 262-1881?
17	VALDEZ MODERATOR: Can you sent one to Valdez,
18	835-2097?
19	MR. COLE: Well, in any event, those of you who do not
20	have a copy of the agenda, the initial item on the agenda this
21	evening is entitled Opening Statements. Who here this evening
22	in officialdom (ph) would like to make an opening statement?
23	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Homer has none.
24	MR. McVEE: I guess one thing, that
25	MR. COLE: Mr. McVee

ACE 6792520

1	MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You guys might
2	recognize the Interior member on the RRCG, and we've identified
3	Pam Bergman, but she is acting on leave for some period of time
4	here, so we have acting Cornell Roy. Cornell, back there.
5	MR. COLE: Sir, would you like to sit at the table for
6	RRCG? And, Mr. Pennoyer?
7	MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. Following up on that, Dr. Byron
8	Morris will be the NOAA representative on the RRCG. Byran.
9	MR. COLE: And, sir, you're welcome to sit here at this
10	august table. And, Mr. Barton, please.
11	MR. BARTON: Mr. Ken Rice will be the Department of
12	Agriculture member for the RRCG.
13	MR. COLE: Mr. Rice, if you can find room here, if
14	that's your wish, you're certainly welcome to sit with your
15	fellow RRCG members.
16	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Cole, we aren't submitting
17	anything (indiscernible) so we'll stay back here.
18	MR. COLE: All right. Thank you, sir.
19	Now, opening statements, please. First, members of the
20	Trustee Council on the Federal side, please. Any opening
21	statements?
22	MR. McVEE: No, (indiscernible - away from microphone).
23	MR. COLE: And, State Trustees?
24	MR. SANDOR: None.
25	MR. COLE: Are there members of the RRCG who would like

to make an opening statement at this time? No opening statements. Do we, now, gentlemen, pass to the RRCG member identification? I think we've done that. And, what about subgroups, that's the next agenda. Mr. Gibbons, would you like to make a presentation of sub-groups?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Get over here by the microphone.

MR. COLE: For those listening in on teleconference, Mr. Gibbons, the Executive Director, has taken the seat at the special table with the microphone and will now make a presentation of his sub-groups.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the last meeting -- public meeting on December 5th, the Trustee Council requested the initiation of some tasks. And, those tasks were to initiate a meaningful public participation process, including the Public Advisory Group; and, secondly, to draft a restoration framework work plan to start initially.

And, in the interim status between the previous organization that we had, the Management Team and the Restoration Planning work group, and the new one that was formed that evening, which was the R2CG (ph) in the Trustee Council. To get these tasks done, I formed some small work groups to work on those in the interim until we get a final organization done. And, I used the existing staff that was onhand at the time, and we created four small groups. And, these groups are our restoration framework group, the damage

ACE 6792522

assessment restoration work plan group to develop a work plan for 1992, the public participate group, and finally, a budget and process group.

And, we'll hear from some of the members of those groups later. And, I just wanted to request the approval to continue those groups until a final organization is set; and, we can move forward with the organization at that time.

MR. COLE: How many members are in each group?

MR. GIBBONS: Well, right now, it's not firm. We've -
I've got either a chair or co-chair on each one, but the number

of members in those groups are not determined yet at this time.

MR. COLE: Does any member of the Council want to make observations on that subject? Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Gibbons said, we're going to get reports later in the meeting on the activities conducted by these groups and might be a little better able to comment on their adequacy in terms of composition or what have you. Certainly, the work we assigned you fell into these areas, and we'd like to hear the work that has preceded. These are ad hoc groups

MR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

MR. PENNOYER: composed from existing staff on the current various sub-groups that we've formed. So, this isn't a new staffing effort, it's basically making use of existing people?

ACE 6792523

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. GIBBONS: That's correct.
2	MR. COLE: Will all the members of the sub-groups be
3	members of the RRCG?
4	MR. GIBBONS: There are members on from the RRCG
5	group on every one of these; yes, that's correct; but they're
6	not solely only limited to the RRCG group. There's some other
7	expertise that we need to accomplish some of these tasks.
8	MR. COLE: Yes, Mr. Pennoyer.
9	MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. The RRCG, as we assigned
10	it, has called in expertise from the agencies to assist, which
11	I think is sort of what we had in mind rather than establishing
12	permanent groups that for different assignments they do just
13	that. So, pending hearing the report and seeing where we go,
14	I'd suggest we just proceed with it.
15	MR. COLE: All right. Mr. Sandor.
16	MR. SANDOR: (Indiscernible - away from microphone).
17	MR. COLE: All right. Thank you. Do you want to
18	continue then, Mr. Gibbons, please?
19	MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. That's basically I just wanted
20	the approval of the Trustee Council to continue with this
21	process until a final organization is completed.
22	MR. COLE: Is there objection? All right. It's
23	you're so authorized.
24	MR. GIBBONS: The next topic on the agenda is Operating
25	Procedures. And, we'd like to get the approval of the Trustee

Council to start developing some of those operational procedures, both perhaps for the Trustee Council, at you wish, or at the role of the RRCG group, too. We believe that there's some operation — operating procedures that are needed, and we just want your thoughts and/or approval to initiate some activities in these areas.

MR. COLE: Mr. Tillery in the Department of Law has done some work on some operating procedures for the Trustee Council. Have you seen that work product?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, I have.

MR. COLE: Okay. Is there any objection by any member of the Trustee Council to that request? Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: I just had a couple comments on Mr. Tillery's product, if those are appropriate at this time.

MR. COLE: Sure. Certainly.

MR. McVEE: Okay. Thank you, very much.

MR. COLE: I mean since they're the Department of Law, how could I object to it, your comments?

MR. McVEE: It's a good effort, and I think basically that what's been outlined will work. One of the thing -- one of the areas that was of some concern was that the designation of a designee, that in case of failure of one of the Trustee Council members to be available for a meeting -- and, I know that it's difficult for all six of us to -- schedules to arrive at a calendar date where we can be present. But it seems to me

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

like we may want to broaden that out just a little bit, other than illness, emergency or vacancy, that there could be other extenuating circumstances such as, you know, the boss calls me to Washington and I'm not available and yet there's important matters to be considered.

I think there's -- if that is broadened out, there should be a clear understanding that whoever is designated would carry the same vote and be able to conduct business. I think that would fail if my designee, for example, were to say well, I've got to wait till Curt returns and talk to him before I can make a vote on a matter. But I think we should broaden that out a little bit.

MR. PENNOYER: I'll open that.

MR. COLE: Yes, Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: I think that Curt's quite right, since we reach decisions by consensus, if we're continually frustrated by individual travel plans, we'll probably never get the job done. But one additional factor I think is that we probably don't want to see different people at the table every time you turn around. So, if possible, the suggestion might be that we designate that alternate up front and in writing or something so that we know, on some consistent basis, who we'll be dealing with.

MR. COLE: Well taken. Any other comments on that subject? Did you have other comments, Mr. McVee?

ACE 6792526

MR. McVEE: No, I think that's all at this time.

MR. COLE: All right. Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: I have one additional comment that might be looked at, too, when you're going over this. There is a concept in here about quorums, and the wording is basically unanimous approval of all Council members. I think the decisions are taken by consensus, and I assume consensus means all six. So, quorums for certain purposes might be all right, but I assume that that's not what we're going to try to do because we're going to reach decisions; we'll have to have the six seats filled.

MR. COLE: Well, I --

MR. PENNOYER: Is that correct?

MR. COLE: I wouldn't think that a quorum is equivalent to unanimous vote of all six. I thought that at the last meeting, we decided that in accordance with MOA that we would follow the same procedure; that was my understanding, was I in error on that or does -- you're nodding say I was in error?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

MR. COLE: No.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was my understanding.

MR. COLE: Yeah. All right. Those of you in the back,

I see extra chairs up here in some places, you're certainly

welcome to move up and be seated.

ACE 6792527

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

All right. Well, they can take a look at that, and Mr. Tillery is here, and he can address that. Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one comment, under Item 6, Meetings. We talked about the notice of each meeting and the proposed agendas being given to the private sector; and, we specifically mention in there Anchorage, Cordova, Homer, Juneau, Kenai, Kodiak, Seward and Valdez. Then, in the next paragraph, we go on to say that the meeting of the Council shall be public except for matters concerned in Executive Session; teleconferencing will be used to the extent feasible to allow public participation in the cities listed above.

It seems to me that that list should probably be expanded a little bit. We've got a number of communities like Tatitlek, Fort Graham and Chenega Bay; these are communities that were certainly affected by the Spill. Certainly, some effort should be made to determine what we can do for those communities in terms of public notice and getting them involved in the teleconferences as well.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: No comments?

MR. COLE: Pardon? Mr. Pennoyer, please.

MR. PENNOYER: Just one additional comment, and this may be a technicality, but on Item 14, Item F, it says oversight of oil spill information center, including transfer

ACE 6792528

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to an appropriate facility. And, I know that's an item we've got under consideration, but I'm not sure we've made the decision relative to the cost of doing that or alternatives. And, maybe just taking that final phase out, including transfer to an appropriate facility, we'll leave it open to our choice in the future, which I don't think we've reached yet.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

MR. COLE: Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: I have no comments that haven't been raised, Mr. Cole. Thank you.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, I'd just like to say that my position with respect to notice is that we should not see how little notice we can give but how much notice we can give, and how much in advance we can give that notice; I think that's important, some people may wish to come here. I know that it's occasionally difficult, but I think we should take steps to put that on the radio, on Alaska Public Radio, so some of these outlying areas will have notice. And, I think that since we're getting a little better organized than last time, that it would be well to consider having the agenda published in the paper. And, may be that certain people in these areas have specific concerns about some subjects and would like to make a special effort to be present.

What is the consensus or the views of the Council on that, about publishing the agenda, for example? Yes,

ACE 6792529

Mr. Barton.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARTON: Well, I think we should publish the agenda presuming that we're organized far enough in advance that we have the time to do so.

MR. COLE: All right. Mr. Gibbons, if you could follow through on that, please. Any other comments on the work product of Mr. Tillery? Could we then move on, Mr. Gibbons, please?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. I want to make one more statement.

Mark Broderson, who's a member of the RRCG group is in the

audience, too, and I'd like to identify him; he's working with

Ernie on this.

MR. COLE: All right. Mr. Broderson, if you would please rise so the folks can take a look at you. Thank you.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. The first task that was identified on the -- at the last meeting was meaningful public participation. And, we've taken that on and come up with some thoughts on that process, including a public advisory group, and Ernie Piper is going to share some of those with us.

MR. COLE: Mr. Piper.

MR. PIPER: Mr. Chairman, for the record and for the teleconference sights, my name is Ernie Piper; I'm currently the on-site coordinator for the Exxon Valdez Spill for the State of Alaska, and I am the utility infielder on the RRCG for DEC. Mark Broderson will be taking the lead. I've been given

ACE 6792530

this

MR. COLE: Do you bat left-handed or right?

MR. PIPER: Actually, I'm switching.

MR. COLE: It's good to know. Thanks.

MR. PIPER: More power from the right side. What I have before you tonight are really four authorizations, administrative housekeeping type of things, and suite (ph) of guidance issues on this matter. And, I will sort of proceed from the concrete to the abstract, if that makes it easier.

The -- on the back of a memorandum that was passed out to you today, it's actually the Page 4, the back of Page 2, is a diagram that outlines some of the most significant ways that we think that the public can participate. These aren't intended to be the entire universe of things, and neither are they intended to be specific recommendations; but they are possibilities, and we would like authorization at some point in the evening to go ahead and make this part of a package that would be given out for public comment, and I'll get on to that later.

To summarize what is involved in that series of opportunities, for example, there's -- broken into three categories; information availability, access to the planning process and access to the decision-making process. The information availability would include such things as a resource center, and that's currently served by the OSPIC, the

ACE 5792531

Oil Spill Public Information Center. Public outreach done in the standard ways that we're familiar with in terms of news releases and so on, and also, in some of the more creative ways, such as the one that you mentioned in using APRN or, perhaps, RATNET to get some information out. Mailings, meeting agendas, and minutes and so on, and also, educational programs as the agencies come up with information; there are many plans for those among the agencies.

Under the planning process and making sure there's access there, there would be, of course, community meetings. We've made -- one option could be that the Public Advisory Group, when it's formed, have a Staff participant on the RRCG, since that's such an important part of this process; and, also of course, review and comment on draft products.

And as far as the decision-making process, open Trustee Council meetings, such as this; and, also, input from the Public Advisory. And, that is one of the issues on which I'll be asking your guidance as I get to more abstract.

The first thing that we would like to get authorization at some point this evening is authority to take these options, add to them if you wish, and take those out and make them part of a public comment package on public participation between now and the time that the Restoration framework document is prepared. To do that, though, requires some sort of mechanism to get information out and to receive mechanism from the

ACE 6792532

R & R COURT_REPORTERS

public.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, what we would also like your authorization to do is to establish an interim public information organ, and we have several options available. One would be to delegate public information duties to the ADEC Oil Spill Response Center, which currently has a full-time public information staff, fax machine, telephone and so on; we could use the existing contractor, which is CACI, to funnel that information. We could also locate a public information specialist in the Oil Spill Public Information center. My personal recommendation is that it would be easier to do it out of our Oil Spill office, because we have the staff, we have the facilities; the public is used to dealing with this, we have that number. So, I would put that before you for consideration.

MR. COLE: So, would you -- shall we take these things up as Mr. Piper enumerates them, or do you want to -- does the Council want to wait until the end? I lose track of these things, to tell you the truth. Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: I'd like to kind of, I guess, hear the whole

MR. COLE: Okay.

MR. McVEE:program.

MR. COLE: All right. Please continue.

MR. PIPER: I shall be brief. The next point that we would like to bring out is to get a simple authorization;

ACE 6792533

again, this is one of the housekeeping ones; is once we have an interim organization in place to get information out, once we've listed some options that are available for people to participate, we would like the authorization from you to conduct some kind of public comment period.

Now, Mr. McVee made a specific recommendation in a letter a couple of weeks ago or last week, which was to hold public meetings on public participation; that would be one option. A second option would be to use the existing mailing list that we have, the existing public contacts that we have among all our agencies to ask those people in the communities for written comment or what they think, whether they think some of these are good or bad, what they think of the Public Advisory Group, how they think that group should participate and so on.

Then, we could collect all that information, whether taken by meeting or taken by written comment, in January, revise it in February based on what we hear. And, then, the intent would be to make a good, strong draft proposal for public participation part of the Restoration framework document, which will be going out to public meetings, and the target for that is March.

The pro to having meetings about public participation, of course, is it's a good populist (ph) way to get out and talk to people and hear from them in the communities. The downside

ACE 6792534

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to that is it's a very short time frame, it's an extra series of travel, and it's also a difficult time to set up public meetings in terms of getting to everybody; we've had that experience on some of our Oil Spill meetings in the winter.

So, I would ask on that measure to consider whether to have meetings -- if you desire us to take public comment on this, whether to have meetings or whether to do it with written, -- conventional written comment.

The more abstract, and the issues on which we would like to get some guidance, refer specifically to the Public Advisory Group. Obviously, the Public Advisory Group is supposed to provide meaningful oversight input into the Restoration planning process, an oversight of the way things happen.

Having made that very simple statement, it's important to point out that the mission of the Public Advisory Group -- what you actually expect that group to do and provide to you, has a very direct affect on the composition of the group and the way in which you might select them. As a practical matter, it also determines what a budget might be and how that money might be spent.

Here, following, are some of the real principal ways in which we think that a Public Advisory Group would participate.

And, again, these don't encompass the whole universe of options; and, they don't -- although, I list them in a

ACE 6792535

particular order, they don't mean that they're weighted that way, you can arrange these options with any -- having any given weight that you like.

I would point out, though, that depending upon how you would weight these tasks, or these missions, from the Public Advisory Group really would have a very big effect on how would you put that group together, how many members, where would they come from, how would they be selected, what kind of a budget they would have and what kind of activities they would undertake.

I think the most obvious and self-explanatory one is general oversight of government policy. Obviously, the intent of having a Public Advisory Group in this kind of role is to make sure that the Restoration program and the way in which we implement it are true to the intent of the settlement, and that the policy choices that are made within that reflect the wishes of the public.

The second one, of course, would be advice to Trustees. And, again, that sounds very self-evident, but implicit in the role of an advisor are two very important things; one is a mechanism by which the Public Advisory Group communicates directly and meaningful with the Trustees. If you have, for example -- pick a number, 18 people on a public advisory group, whether that's a good number or a bad number, I don't know. But if you had that number, as a practical matter, it would be

ACE 6792536

R & R COURT REPORTERS

very difficult to have 18 people communicate directly and effectively to you. It would be a very diffuse sort of thing, and it may be difficult.

So, we need to think of a way, and we have thought of some options that we've kicked around in our group where you may be -- where you might have that kind of meaningful and direct input from a group, depending on its size.

The second thing that's implicit in the role of advisor, and very important, is that the advisors have direct access to the Staff level deliberations about the Restoration program. It tends to be complex. It tends to be something you have to follow closely. And, it tends to be something that in which you need some kind of technical background. And, for a public body to have meaningful input and to be able to analyze and consider the things that the Restoration plan is attempting to do, they need to have access to someone whom they trust completely and who answers to them to analyze the information and synthesize it for them.

The third one would, of course, be scientific oversight; what weight that gets, I don't know, it would largely depend upon how important the science aspect is there as opposed to the public. A lot of the information, again, is technical and relates to specific scientific studies, and the Public Advisory Group may need some sort of technical assistance, whether that comes from the Staff member or not is

ACE 6792537

another issue.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A fourth would be fiscal oversight, which is again, fairly obvious, making sure that we're spending our money the way we ought to.

A fifth, which I think is not very abstract or a very important point, is what you are seeking from this group, is it — if it is something like consensus, then a group of 18 of very, very diverse interest, some of which may be very polarized, you may have a very, very difficult time getting consensus and render the group useless. If the goal is access, you can have a very large, diverse group with potentially polarized interests because they would all have that access. And, they wouldn't necessarily be expected to play — to make political trade-offs among themselves to mollify decision—makers, they could just say directly what it is they wanted to do.

So, what we are seeking at this point is some guidance on the types of things that you're looking for from the Public Advisory Group; and depending upon that guidance, we can pop up with some recommendations that we've had about that.

The last thing that I've listed here is identification of principal interest on the Public Advisory Group. This doesn't necessarily mean that this is a designation for a special interest group, it doesn't necessarily mean it's the only interest that would be represented on Public Advisory

ACE 6792538

Group. But it's clear that if you're going to be dealing with the Exxon Valdez Restoration in Prince William Sound, Gulf of Alaska, they're very clear and identifiable interests that somehow need to be represented from among the group. They would include, but not be limited to, aquaculture; commercial fishing; commercial tourism as opposed to recreation; conservation groups; environmental groups, there are some very distinct differences between each of those classes, forest products; considering the level of activity in Prince William Sound in that respect; local government; Native landowners, both regional and village corporations or other principal private landowners in the area; recreational users, which aren't necessarily represented by tourism; science; sport hunting and fishing; subsistence.

And, what we would ask is authorization to take this list of principal interests ang bring it to the public and ask them to either add to it, delete from it, comment on those that we've put on there; split some hairs, if you will. And, that's where we are on that.

If you would like, Mr. Chairman, you can have discussion on each of these issues that you wish; and, if you have questions about some of the approximate costs, or management options or things like that, I could give some ideas on that as well.

MR. COLE: Does any Council member have any general

ACE 6792539

R & R COURT REPORTERS

comments on Mr. Piper's presentation? Mr. Pennoyer?

MR. PENNOYER: Well, this goes back to one of the options, as well. But in general, the options you're discussing are then going out, you would envision, to public review through a series if public hearings after you've initially canvassed and received input; your total package would go out as part of the framework plan process to public hearing. So, you would have extensive public hearings on this issue before you reached a final decision?

MR. PIPER: If hearings were the way that the Trustees would want to go, that's what we'd do. My personal recommendation, given the time frame, would be that we get together a good proposal for public participation with the best options that we seem to have available among us; put that together as a package, and then use mailing lists and conventional communication methods like that to get to the principal stakeholders, if you will, who could then provide us with written comment during the month of January and part of the month of February, perhaps.

Then, based on that comment and whatever instruction that we have from the Trustees, we'd put that together into a draft plan, which would have the framework of the Public Advisory Group proposal in place -- public information proposal in place. So, that when the hearings on the Restoration framework came up in March, the public participation process

ACE 6792540

R & R COURT REPORTERS

was largely in place; we could alter it based on the hearings, obviously. But there would be a mechanism that for the public to do it, they'd be starting even with us rather than having to catch up.

MR. COLE: Mr. McVee?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MCVEE: Yes. I guess I'm a little concerned; you know, the fact that from experience we know that when you hold a public meeting, that you'll get 40 attendees that will get up and say something for every one that will write. guess it bothers me to go out with just a written inquiry. quess I've been a proponent of going out with a one page listing of issues, an update of injury, maybe an update of the summary that was done last April, the organization material that we have prepared, information on kind of what we're thinking about or just an issue of the Advisory group, the issue of restoration criteria, you know, and asking people early on to give us comments of the community; you know, and conducting a meeting to collect those comments, conducting a series of meetings.

You know, I recognize that January is not maybe a good month to travel, but generally, it's a pretty good time to catch people, they aren't out fishing. And, I think that, you know, the perception we would convey, a stronger perception, of what we want and how we intend to operate is with the maximum input from the public. And, I guess -- you know, I feel that

ACE 6792541

it would be a very positive thing we could do, followed up then, of course with the development of the draft and another series of public meetings. I recognize that this represents additional cost, but it seems to me like it would probably be money well spent.

MR. COLE: Other comments on that general subject?
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, I had a couple of general comments in regard to the presentation here. In the first listing that you ran through under the planning process, I notice you have a Public Advisory Group staff participation on RRCG. It would seem to me that that would be a question that we'd probably want to address within the Council in terms of whether there would be a separate staff from that of the Executive Director. That it's not a done deal, as I understand it at the present time, in terms of a separate staff for the Public Advisory Group.

The other kind of -- it may be a nit-picky point here on this. But -- and, I certainly agree with your Part A under the options here, the job of this particular group, where you talk about general oversight of government policy. The reference there to Government restoration program, it seems to me that we're really talking about a restoration program, not a Government restoration program.

MR. PENNOYER: Point well taken.

ACE 6792542

R & R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. COLE: Commissioner Sandor?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SANDOR: Well, I certainly endorse the utilization of an existing public information structure, an organization that has had the experience in the cleanup work on the Exxon Valdez. And, I think we'd be well-advised to approve the continuation of that effort.

With regard to agency mailing lists as opposed to public meetings, the timing is bad for -- but I'd like us try both, that essentially option -- the second option.

I do have some concerns, Mr. Chairman, though, about the Public Advisory Group.

MR. COLE: Well, may I say, we

MR. SANDOR: Yes.

MR. COLE: can maybe get to that later.

MR. SANDOR: Yeah. Only this one point, and that is let's look at alternatives to establishing our own public advisory group or utilizing other existing public advisory group mechanisms already in place, including community assemblies and existing structures, as well as the Regional Citizen's Advisory Councils that are in place. That's all.

CONFERENCE OPERATOR: Excuse me. This is the bridge operator. Could I get Glenda to give me

MR. COLE: Would you say again, please?

CONFERENCE OPERATOR: (Indiscernible - telephone cutout) can I get Glenda to give me a call here at the LAO

ACE 6792543

(ph), we're experiencing little technical difficulties where some of the sights are having a problem hearing the conference.

MR. COLE: I think Glenda is no longer with us or certainly not with us at the present time. Is it because we're not speaking clearly or loudly?

CONFERENCE OPERATOR: No. It appears they're getting a little bit of like a snow sound (ph) -- a little snowy sound to it. And, I'm getting a little bit of feedback, also.

(Off record comments)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Well, maybe we can continue to see how it goes; if you have difficulties, feel free to let us know in a moment or two.

CONFERENCE OPERATOR: Thank you (ph).

MR. COLE: Mr. Pennoyer?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to suggest that we've made some general statements, that we go through these items one at a time and try and come -- reach a conclusion on that.

MR. COLE: That's precisely what I had in mind, only I wanted to make a personal comment about the notice. I've stated my position on that form of solicitation of comments in dealing with the Governor's Task Force on the infamous Cordova Road. At that time, I pointed out that I think it's important that people who have, you know, the belief that they don't write well, and an inability to express themselves, at least

ACE 0792544

perceived by them, in writing, are hesitant to express their views in writing. And, that my experience has been that when people who don't write well but who have the most magnificent oral presentations stand up and we're able to hear them, and they can express their views in their own language with their own syntax; there's just some beautiful expressions of individual views.

And, I agree with Mr. McVee, that we've got to get out to the Bush, you know; hold meetings there, let these people talk to you in their own language and express themselves fully. I think it's just essential that we do that. Can we -- are we all sort of agreed on that, or does anyone dissent on that subject? I mean -- you know, so

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLE:get your airline tickets or

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, sir.

MR. COLE:ferry tickets and arrange your schedule, please. Yes, Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Sir, it's not a dissent, I think the more often we can do that, the better off we'll be. And, I think there's probably some confusion as to what this process is all about out there anyway, that's just in the way we're organized and what we're trying to do.

So, if we did it the way it was proposed, we'd hold basically two rounds of public hearings; one preliminary one,

ACE 6792545

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

kind of explaining the process and talking about we know today, what we can explain of what we know today, 'cause even the (indiscernible) damage assessment stuff won't really be available until March, if then. And, so -- and, then we go out and get that input, then we come back and come up with a plan, the restoration plan, including the public participation plan and go back out again and hold a second round of hearings.

I think that's desirable, the only comment or question
I'd have as Staff, whether we can do it in the time that's
proposed. And, if we can, that, certainly, I think is the more
desirable way to do it.

MR. PIPER: Mr. Chairman, we did a series of meetings exactly this last year on the State Response Plan when it came out, and in a very short time frame, and we managed to get everywhere and despite bad weather and everything else. It was difficult sometimes but we can do it, and that's not a problem. We're experienced and am prepared to go.

MR. COLE: Go hear the people.

MR. PIPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COLE: Thank you. All right. Shall we go down these items one by one in which Mr. Piper wants decisions? List the first issue, please.

MR. PIPER: The first one is the diagram on the back of your memo. This is just meant to visually list some of the options, give people an idea of some of the options we've been

ACE 6792546

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

considering. And, we would like authorization to bring these out as part of the package for public comment.

MR. COLE: Comment on that issue?

MR. McVEE: I've got (indiscernible - interrupted)

MR. COLE: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Maybe it's more of a question than a comment. But as I understand it, the proposal would be to use the Resource Center -- Public Access Resource Center as a focal point for responding to inquiries?

MR. PIPER: Actually, the intent -- the Public
Information Center, at this point, functions a little bit more
as a library and an access point for people coming in, getting
materials and things like that. The -- what would be involved
in collecting public comment and synthesizing it all, that is a
little different kind of task, and it's something that we've
done in our organization; and, that's why I would suggest that
it be located within our Public Information staff at DEC. We
wouldn't pretend to have DEC speak for the entire Trustee
Council, we would just be the funnel for public inquiries about
this specific process.

MR. COLE: Are you going to charge rent for that?

MR. PIPER: No, sir, it's my budget, we're there.

MR. McVEE: I guess what I was looking for is maybe the linkage between the DEC group and our RRCG, our folks sitting

ACE 6792547

R & R COURT REPORTERS

ANCHODACE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

here, that would be representing us, and I guess we could work that out. But there would need to be a linkage there when it comes to responding to any issue that has any -- you know, any policy, or schedule, or fiscal response.

MR. PIPER: Right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Any other comments on this?

MR. PIPER: We've also taken care of one of the other ones, which was to request authorization to conduct hearings or meetings in each of the affected communities to collect comment on this proposal; and, I assume that that's been decided, so that's two down.

MR. COLE: I'd like to say one thing as a matter of personal request for the uninitiated like me, would you try to limit the use of acronyms, 'cause I just have a lot of trouble; I don't know what they mean all the time like this.

MR. PIPER: We've had an acronym spill in this response, believe me.

MR. COLE: I mean, you know, just

MR. PIPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COLE: I would appreciate it, I tell you. All right. The next issue, please.

MR. PIPER: The next one would be Letter F under 3, which was the Public Advisory Group. We were seeking, as also to make part of this package, using the identification of principal interests as a discussion point in that package of

ACE 6792548

public comment. So, that we go out and say here is, as best as we understand it, the 11 or 12 principal stakeholders, if you will, in the development of restoration plan among the public. And, we would like to hear the public comment on whether we've got them all, whether we've too many, whether we've gone about it the wrong way.

And, like the little diagram of opportunities, we would request authorization to make this list of stakeholders a part of the comment package.

MR. COLE: And, do Council members have views on that?

Commissioner Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Excuse me. This may be the time where I could just raise my concerns or questions about the definition of this group itself and, perhaps, alternative mechanisms of identifying interests that would provide the service and objectives that we're seeking. And, that is this: We had received one letter, which had suggested that we might want to consider utilizing community leadership itself; that is mayors, city councils, such as that. Additionally, we have, as you know, the Regional Citizen's Advisory Councils, and it seems like it might be possible to have representatives or a representative from those councils. There may be other established groups that are out there that a representative of which would, by definition, represent either the entire community or the entire advisory committee that's already in-

ACE 6792549

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

place.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Have you thought about that possibility in what -- how might that be involved or integrated into this kind of a public participation plan, and specifically, this kind of an advisory group?

MR. PIPER: This gets back to the point made in Letter E about consensus or access. If we're looking for consensus from a group of users and that kind of thing to provide information to you, then you would want, probably, a fairly small group; the selection process would have to be such that you really included on that small group people who represented five or six of those different interests each, or three or four each, so that there was overlapping and broad representation. If the point is access, where you have, again, stakeholders, people with a real direct and recognizable stake in how this goes, having that mechanism to get right to you and give their information right to you in a meaningful way. you can expand that a lot more.

Now, in terms of using existing institutions, we've kicked around some of the ideas about how you do that. It's certainly conceivable that the Trustees could say that you've looked at all the options for meaningful public participation and figured out about how much it could cost to do that, for the Government to do it, and that, perhaps, there's an existing organization; and, I'll just throw out RCAC (ph) as an example,

ACE 5792550

the Regional Citizen's Advisory Council, that you could contract out for them to handle a lot of those types of things. That may or may not be desirable, but the options are there.

The problem -- or one of the issues with using strictly community leadership, the broad leadership, in an access kind of operation is that community leaders may not always be able to hone it directly; they are by nature consensus and compromised (ph) type of people; that's what it takes to be a leader in a small community, you have to bring lots of little things together. That might be desirable, but what the Restoration group -- planning group may really be looking for is very specific information and very specific feelings about -- from the forest products industry, from subsistence users, that kind of thing.

So, those are the two ways that they go.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does that

MR. SANDOR: Yeah. That answers part of the question.

I guess the interest that I have, Mr. Chairman, is that we not miss an opportunity to utilize the extensive knowledge that has been built up over time, since the Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet Citizen -- Regional Citizen's Advisory Councils have been functioning with respect to the cleanup work and associated activities of the Oil Pollution Act, which established these organization. And, that we ought to take advantage of that expertise that's available in those existing

ACE 6792551

R & R COURT REPORTERS

advisory councils; although, they were formed for, you know, an entirely different purpose. I'd like to see a bridging of knowledge between what those folks had dealt with in the actual spill and cleanup, and then now, in the restoration work.

It just seems to me that we'd be missing an opportunity if we didn't plan our public participation effort in a way in which that was assured. One option of doing that is to actually designate a member of that group on this Public Advisory Group. Yet another way of doing it is simply to -- as a part of the public participation process, to regularly interface with those groups, and I guess we can do that. I guess we can go either way, but we do want to take advantage of that.

MR. COLE: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: I think Mr. Sandor raises an excellent point, and I think we need to look very carefully at how we might use existing institutions, and if, in fact, we can conclude that there isn't one or some group that provides the same objective for us; then, we do need to figure out how to utilize the information and the background that a variety of organizations, quite frankly, have built up over the course of the last two and a half years.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLE: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. Mr. Piper, I don't know whether

ACE 6792552

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you've had some -- you know, some guidance from some of the Federal members on your group about the Federal Advisory Committee Act and whether it applies or not. I guess maybe the jury's out yet on that one. But if it does apply, there are -- there is some specific guidance in that law; one of the things that I remember it requires a cross-section of all interests to be represented on an advisory group. But I guess I'd just ask you to look at that or have the Federal members on your subgroup look at that closely and maybe get, even, some legal guidance in that area.

MR. PIPER: Yes, sir. We're in the process of doing that. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that -- the point that you raise is an excellent one because if it does, indeed, apply -- if the Act does, indeed, apply, the identification of principal interests becomes a very important thing for that cross-section, as you said.

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. PIPER: And, it becomes a very definite process.

MR. COLE: Other comments on this subject? I have one.

MR. PIPER: Yes, sir.

MR. COLE: We received, from one of the Legislative leaders, a Mr. -- Representative Covina from Valdez, in which he recommends the broad use of elected community leaders; but I disagree with that, notwithstanding the high regard I have for Representative Covina and that part he's played in the Exxon

ACE 5792553

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Valdez Settlement.

2

3

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I think that it's vital that with respect to the policy decisions which this group makes that we have a broad range of view by the interest groups in the Oil Spill area. The concept and this battleground, which anyone who's thought about it know that we're going to be facing, with respect to the choices that this Council is going to have to make regarding the expenditure of funds. We need the views of, you know, the broad spectrum of these groups out there.

And, I think to the extent that we get those views to help us make the choices; I mean do we want more studies, do we to buy, you know, land or -- et cetera, et cetera; we will make better decisions. And, I think it's a mistake to try to, you know, utilize groups which were formed for some other purpose. And, I just don't have the slightest idea of what -- you know, I should probably but I don't, what these groups were formed for and who selected them and why they were selected. And, I think that we should start afresh; you know, I feel very strongly about that.

Mr. Rosier, Commissioner?

MR. ROSIER: A couple of comments along those lines.

It appears to be, in reviewing the list here, at least in my view, there's pretty good balance in the groups that have been identified so far. And, certainly, you know, groups such as local government, Native landowners, certainly subsistence, for

ACE 6792554

instance, I think that we're going to see leadership from certain entities, you know, that have participated in this process to date. And, it would just seem to me that that's been accommodated to one degree or another within this group. I personally don't have anything to add to that particular list at the present time, I think it's a pretty good list here at the present time, to go out to the public with, anyway.

In regards to the consensus or access question, while my feet certainly aren't stuck in concrete at the present time, it would seem to me that from the size of the issue that we're dealing with here and the types of issues that we're going to be dealing with, I think we do want specific information, but I think we want some consensus from the public as well in terms of the decision process.

I would hate to have us go through these processes and suddenly have segments of the public out there that don't like what we're doing, which is probably going to occur anyway.

MR. COLE: You know that.

MR. ROSIER: Yes. And, but it would seem to me that certainly the consensus type of structure certainly appeals to me at the present time in terms of how we structure the group.

MR. COLE: I just think it's a big mistake if we don't listen and listen closely to these interest groups, and to try to make an end run for whatever good purposes in good faith views would be a mistake. Because if we don't listen to these

ACE 6792555

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

people, they will find some mechanism to make their voice heard, and it's best to have them follow along in the process. So

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Yes, Mr. Pennoyer, please.

Ernie, one thing I don't see here MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. is a commentary of how this group relates to other public access methods to this Council. These groups you've got probably -- may never represent all of the views out there, so we're probably going to have an open, public participation process in addition to this group. Do you view this Public Advisory Group as being a funnel for all of that into us, or do you view it as two separate mechanisms, are we dealing with just this list here or are we -- it seems to me we can't have a closed process. We're going to have a group of ongoing advisors who will have some consistency in their participation in the process, but we'll still have it open to councils and other bodies and so forth to comment to us; I don't think we can force all of that comment or we want to through this group.

I'm not sure about consensus versus access, I'm having trouble envisioning how we get this group to not report to us unless they have consensus, because I just don't see that all of these people have the same interests and are probably going to achieve like comments on our various proposals and actions. I don't know how that mechanism would operate, but I think

ACE 6792556

we're going to probably just be open to reports from this group, which may not be consensus 'cause I'm not sure we're going to get it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Any other comments. Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes. Just a suggestion. You know, maybe the way to start to get some focus on how the advisory group — the advisory body would function and what we expect from it would be to, you know, start to develop some type of charter. I think there's been a little bit of work done on that already within our organizations, maybe to, you know, pursue that; that seems like, you know, something that could be done fairly quickly and available to the public to take a look at, it would be a good item to get response back on.

MR. COLE: Any other comments right here? Does that give you consensus or some views to start with?

MR. PIPER: It's very helpful and it really will help us. The idea of a charter is, as you said, well on the way among several members of the organization, and we need to that; and the guidance that we've gotten from you here tonight will help us do that.

MR. COLE: Could we talk just a little bit more about the public participation policy. What are we going to specifically expect from this group of diverse interests? And, what are we going to ask them for? Obviously, there will be a lot of scientific documents come to us in studies and so forth.

ACE 6792557

As I visualize it, I think that I would like to see them help us make these basic policy cuts as I call them. I mean, -- you know, I mean where do we put the resources, you know, the monies. I think that's the most important thing that we're going to want to listen to, not whether, you know, how you deal with an enhancement of the fish runs and such, but the choice between enhancement of fish runs and say buying up property, land, habitat.

Do any of the Commission members have views on that?

Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes. I guess that I would see, you know, the public and the advisors. I'm a little concerned that the process of selecting and appointing an advisory group, you know, is going to take some time. But it seems to me like that input into the criteria that we use for selecting further studies, further monitoring efforts, the resource assessments or the monitoring of natural resource recovery, but that the criteria be used for that, the criteria that we use for selecting restoration projects. It seems like that, you know, area is very essential. And, granted, you know, they will have to — we will have to provide them some background on that.

But I would submit that -- you know, that advisors and the public is probably well-equipped, as some of us, I may be speaking for myself but, to reach some conclusions on those kinds of matters. But it seems like that is really an

ACE 6792558

R & R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

important area.

MR. COLE: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. I certainly agree with you, and I think it should be emphasized we're looking for that type of input. I, from past experience, know that we're going to get a lot of other input as well from any group we appoint when they start to talk about where to put a hatchery or what species go into it. And, I'll guarantee that some of these groups are going to have an opinion, and I suppose will voice it and we probably should welcome that expression; although, we might indicate our primary interest isn't getting help in doing the type of choices that you've outlined.

MR. COLE: Mr. Barton, did you have an observation?

MR. BARTON: Yes. I think the advisory group can be of the most help in dealing with some of the basic policy issues and the basic cuts. But I think Mr. Pennoyer is right, we'll get a lot of other advice and help which we should consider and evaluate as well.

MR. COLE: Of course. Of course. Mr. Sandor -- Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I agree with Curt McVee that it's unfortunate that it's going to take some time to get this group up and rolling. At the same time, this organization is going to be in operation for some time, and I think, perhaps, as it gets organized, we ought to listen to it and, in effect, make

ACE 6792559

some adjustments in our operations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I do think the group is going to be very helpful in policy issues and in "how to spend the money"; but I think as well, that we've just got to look to other entities as well and especially the local communities. And, so we shouldn't -- well, we're going to expect a lot from this public advisory group, but I think this public participation is so crucial that we're going to have to cultivate and make it very clear that we're willing to listen to everyone out there as well.

MR. COLE: Do you have a comment, Commissioner Rosier?
MR. ROSIER: No.

MR. COLE: Well, the reason I brought that up is because I thought it might give you some help or guidance in how you approach this principal interest group, and possibly composition of those and others.

I'd like to mention -- or to have your comments on Subsection D here, Fiscal Oversight. What part do you foresee this public advisory group playing in fiscal oversight?

MR. PIPER: A similar role to what the public would play in commenting on the regular general fund budget type proposals, whether it appears that we're spending too much or too little in a needed area, whether we seem to be placing -- putting importance in one area and then backing it up with the money necessary to do that, that kind of thing, not necessarily auditing or accounting.

ACE 6792560

MR. COLE: Okay. And, because oversight might be perceived to be somebody seeing whether there's an invoice for each check,

MR. PIPER: Correct.

MR. COLE: and I wanted to get your thoughts on that. And, what about scientific oversight, that's in Subsection C, what do you have in mind there?

MR. PIPER: Well, clearly the -- whatever the group is, it needs to have the capability to -- not just to comment on but understand and come to some good kinds of clear judgments about whether the science that's being proposed is (A) good science, and (B) being done -- being put in the proper areas. You don't need to have, necessarily, some science background to decide whether it's good or bad, but you do need to have some kind of technical guidance.

There were some comments that we had from among the members of the sub-group that worked on this was that whatever this group is, and it does have diverse community interest on it, that it also have what was termed the Graybeard (ph) component of people whose business would do some kind of -- something akin to independent peer review of what we're doing, not necessarily questioning every study that comes up or raising every issue, but just making sure that the science is good and that we appear to be putting the right kind of scientific effort into -- for our money.

ACE 6792561

MR. COLE: That makes me a little nervous. But, Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I think it does me as well. I think we are going to want scientific oversight; I think we haven't gotten to that yet, but I think we're going to want some type of a peer review process that isn't simply the participants being part of the peer review. But I'm not sure the pag- -- I understand what you're saying, I think, in terms of the public advisory group should understand what the projects are about, and may want to comment on generally the direction they're going. But when you say scientific oversight, I have envisions (ph) of people looking at statistical procedures

MR. PIPER: Sure.

MR. PENNOYER: and that sort of stuff. So, as you send this out, I think to make it clear, we are going to have some type of science audit function; and, this probably is not the place for that audit function, but they certainly can contribute and can comment.

MR. PIPER: So, clearly, the direction I'm getting here is that when we say oversight, we don't mean either scientific auditing or the literal ledger kind of auditing in terms of financials, correct? Yes. Okay.

MR. SANDOR: One other question. Do you have any idea how much time it's going to take to develop the charter and

ACE 6792562

actually organize the group?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PIPER: The way that we're targeting is that the comment would be collected during January and probably the early part of February with actual meetings, we'd probably spill over into February. And, that we would spend the rest of the time in February actually revising whatever the charter is or whatever the proposal is so that when we come to March, before this goes into the Restoration framework document, that it has the stamp of approval from the Trustees. We don't want to have this limping along into the Restoration framework hearings.

MR. SANDOR: Thanks.

MR. ROSIER: Thank you.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Question along those same lines. In regard to the actual recruiting process for these people, have you given any thought to that at the present time?

MR. PIPER: I think the fundamental principle of the recruiting would be that whatever the interests are that are identified, and however the seats on this group wind up coming out, whether it's one seat for each interest, whether it's clusters, whether it's local government or whatever, that the nominations come from within the groups that are listed or within the communities; that it not necessarily be -- that is

some -- the kind of place where we do need some consensus, I think, from communities and from groups and interest groups rather than leaving open to the possibility that we somehow could handpick whomever it was that we wanted without really making sure they had the endorsement of what the interest groups or the stakeholders are.

MR. COLE: Further comment on that? Well, why don't you look at that closely and give us some thoughts on that at the next meeting. I think that's a very important area. And, Mr. Barton, Mr. Pennoyer, Mr. McVee, do you agree with that?

MR. McVEE: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. COLE: I mean, you know, we could get in -- let's say we could get in a lot of trouble in that area, so let's just think about it very closely and give us your recommendation so that, you know, you don't get ahead of the Council in that area. Did I express it, I think, reasonably well?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

MR. McVEE: Very well.

MR. COLE: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. Well, do we have anymore subjects to address on the public advisory group segment of Mr. Piper's presentation? If not, does that conclude your presentation,

MR. PIPER: Yes, sir.

ACE 5792564

MR. COLE: Mr. Piper? Thank you very much.

MR. PIPER: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: I'd like to mention on other thing before we go further, it's a quarter to 8:00 now, in session about an hour and 15 minutes, and how late does the Commission want o -- or the Council want to go this evening? One thing before we conclude tonight, I would like to reserve time for, you know you might say, public comment here this evening. And, I know we did that last time, and there was some incisive comments made by the people in attendance at the meeting; and, so that might take -- we should, I think, reserve 30 minutes for that. And, so how late do we want to go with -- and then, plan on reserving 30 minutes for comment.

Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, I'll take the first cut at it, I would say now if we go until, perhaps, 9:00 o'clock with the business session, and then open the floor or the mikes to the public.

MR. COLE: 9:00 to 9:30?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's fine.

MR. COLE: How does that suit the people here? I mean do people want to go home and, you know, have a cup of hot chocolate before that, do you want to stay a little later? You know, we're public servants, and I think we ought to listen to the constituents here. It's -- yes, sir.

ACE 6792565

Sir, why don't you see how many

people might want to address you tonight? 2 MR. COLE: Well, it might be premature, they may say 3 hey, we haven't heard the -- you know, some of the things that 4 we're interested in, you know, they may pop up here in the next 5 hour. So -- but nonetheless, does anyone want to express a 6 thought on it? Yes, sir. Mr. Groh, Council, you know -- the 7 ladies and gentlemen know Alaska's -- one of her most prominent 8 attorneys, Mr. Cliff Groh. 9 MR. GROH: I'd like about five minutes of your time at 10 11 the end of the hearing. MR. COLE: All right, sir. 12 13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll go for two. MR. COLE: Yes, sir. 14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right here (ph). 15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 16 One. MR. COLE: Sir. Well, how about 9:00 o'clock, is that 17 18 late enough, everybody want to knock it off at 9:30? UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible - away from 19 20 microphone.) MR. COLE: Okay. Yes, Mr. Pennoyer. 21 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that's agreeable, 22 I think we should ask Mr. Gibbons, though, as we get down 23 toward the time if there are any urgent matters that he 24 25 requires us to take action on tonight that might take

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:

1

ACE 6792566

precedence over something else.

1

2

3

Δ

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: I think we can meet that schedule.

MR. COLE: All right.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. COLÉ: Thank you. Mr. Gibbons, if you would like to continue, please.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. Following up with the public involvement, I'd like to mention to the crew — the group here in Anchorage, there is a sign-up sheet at the front desk up here, I'd like to get you to sign up so we can put you on the mailing list, if you're not there. And, all the teleconference facilities, I'd also like to have a list from those folks, and you can send those to me, Dave Gibbons, at 645 "G" Street in Anchorage, and I'll make sure and get those over to the Public Involvement Group of DEC. So, to emphasize that, we need to get this mailing list going.

The next agenda item, 1992 Restoration and Damage
Assessment Activities was split into two sub-groups; it's a
very large task. And, the first group we'd like to address on
that is the Restoration framework, and Stan Senner from the
Alaska Department of Fish & Game is here to talk about that
framework process.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Mr. Senner, please. Mr. Senner, do you spell your last name S-E-N-N-E-R?

MR. SENNER: That's correct.

ACE 5792567

MR. COLE: All right. Thank you.

MR. SENNER: I am the Restoration Program manager for the Department of Fish & Game. I'll try and move through this fairly quickly without resorting to acronyms.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

MR. SENNER: If you'll turn in your -- the materials that you have to -- there is a page for the agenda item 1992 Restoration and Damage Assessment Activities, and then following that is an outline that says at the top Draft Restoration Framework. Has everyone identified those?

The -- just to put it before you, the approval item to be considered on this topic is requesting approval to proceed with the development of a draft restoration framework document. And, the outline that you have is a proposed outline for that document, and what I'm going to do is just address briefly what the contents are.

The framework is a way to brief the public on what we have been doing and what we propose to do in the way of a restoration program. We envision really two documents, Volume I which is what you have an outline for is the framework itself; secondly, there is a Volume II which is a draft 1992 work plan describing specific damage assessment, restoration studies and planning activities. These documents would come out simultaneously, and the combination of the two of them would provide a substantive basis to kick off meaningful public

ACE 6792568

participation. And, we would propose to have them ready for distribution in March of '92, this coming year.

Dr. Montague will discuss, following me, the damage assessment and restoration studies part of this Volume II, but I want to at least touch on a few of the key elements of this outline; and, I won't go into each of these items but just some highlights.

Again, you know, the real purpose here is to provide a substantive base of public participation and, thus, the document would open with an invitation for comment on the entire contents of the document. And, we might look to various mechanisms to facilitate written comments in addition to what would happen through the public meetings following release of the document.

The heart of the document begins probably in Section 2 where we would summarize the restoration planning activities over the last two years, and what we've been doing and highlights of what we've learned from those exercises. We would, again, include a summary of injury, which would represent — this is Section 3, which would represent an updated version of the 18 page summary released in April of 1990. And, the key here would be to include in that document all of the damage assessment results that have been completed and peer reviewed so that we're not going out prematurely with something but our best snapshot of results.

ACE 6792569

R & R COURT REPORTERS

The next four sections, IV through VII, cover proposed criteria for selecting injured resources, some background on those injured resources, life histories, for example, of some of the injured species, proposed criteria for selecting restoration options, and finally, the description of restoration end points and options that have been identified to date. These sections represent a mix of reporting on what we have learned already from restoration planning as well as proposing to the public criteria for comment.

And, so we would both propose and explain the criteria that may be used to select resources that are in need of restoration and to -- the criteria to select options for real evaluation; do we use fish passes, do we build hatcheries, do we buy habitat, all of these are options. And, we are going to need criteria to nar- -- relevant to restoration of the injured species.

So, based on a preliminary application of the criteria, we can then describe options that appear worthy of further consideration. And, these, in part, are based on the eight scoping meetings we held in communities in May -- April and May of 1990; so, we have done one round of scoping meetings, and got a lot of input there. And, building on that from our principal investigators, outside experts, we've been able to identify a number of options that we think are worth developing. We can present those and invite public comment on

ACE 6792570

them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Tape change)

The last section, Roman numeral VIII, implementation of the settlement, we would describe the structure that is being set up; the process for evaluating restoration options; a tentative program for public participation; and lastly, what is envisioned in the way of a restoration plan which is really the document that we're ultimately heading toward.

Let me just note on public participation, it sounds from the previous discussion that some things will have been set up, other things may still be under consideration at that point, but the framework will just have to capsulize where we stand right then and invite comment on it and then presumably, you may want to make decisions to refine things based on that additional comment.

Following the round of comments and meetings, we should have a solid basis from which to proceed to draft an actual restoration plan, and our target for that document, just as the target, would be March of '93, approximately a year after the framework document is released. I'd like to just explain briefly the difference between the restoration framework which we're talking about for this spring and the proposed restoration plan which is a longer term document.

The framework that I've just been discussing is really a programmatic document. It's a preliminary statement that

ACE 6792571

provides background to invite and encourage substantive public participation, get comments on process and needs and priorities. The draft of the restoration plan, however, evolves from this framework and presents — is a much more detailed presentation of restoration alternatives and groupings of specific options that can be employed to address the restoration needs of the various resources and services. These options by a year from this March will have had the benefit of a full round of public participation as well as continued scientific review and when we present them, and we want to do it carefully, we need to be able to give the public an idea of the — how these options would benefit the resources that have been injured as well as the environmental and economic consequences of carrying out those options.

The final restoration plan would then be supplemented we envision by annual work plans and that will then be the document that will guide implementation of the restoration program over the life of the settlement.

This is no small undertaking. The stakes are high and there are numerous public or numerous policy questions that need public input and your resolution as this process moves on. That is one reason we expect it will take really a full year after the framework is out to produce a plan. There are a number of factors that fit in there and you may have questions or comments about them. I'd just note five of them. The key

ACE 6792572

R & R COURT REPORTERS

variables are the staff resources that are dedicated to the task; the ultimate nature and degree of public involvement and what level of public interest there is in the program. Another factor is how quickly we're able to complete and synthesize the results from the damage assessment because many of those things are still in progress. Another big variable is what are the steps necessary to ensure compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, Coastline Zone Management Act and other federal and state laws. Lastly, and I think the bottom line is that the length of time required to prepare the document depends on the level of detail we want to present it in and at what level of credibility we want to achieve. that is a quick overview of the restoration framework and at least a little bit of a suggestion of where we would recommending heading in the way of a restoration plan. Thank you.

MR. COLE: Thank you, Mr. Senner. Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: The volume I outline -- you know, I think that's a good outline and probably Mr. Cole could answer this specifically, but -- you know, it appears to me from my knowledge, that it would meet the requirements that were approved by the Court for a framework plan. I think that's critical because our ability to get money, actually get money approved from the Joint Fund is based upon that plan and its acceptance.

ACE 6792573

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I think that -- you know, that our policy should be to close out the NERDA (ph) studies so that we have the information, so it's available to us, and I think that that's what's anticipated here and that's information that would be available -- you know, as soon as possible to the public so that they can respond from a knowledgeable

I quess -- you know, we have a sequencing dilemma, and I'm sure you've struggled with that, but that -- that we're talking about a 1992 work plan -- you know, so that we can start to initiate some restoration activities, restoration plans and there is critical work to do there. The one that I can recall from briefings is the fact that we've got some monitoring equipment on otters that is powered by batteries and those will expire in -- sometime during the next year so we need to collect that data. But -- you know, we need to, at some point I quess, inform the public and maybe you don't want to say solicit projects from the public, but we need to develop a structure I think as rapidly as possible so that they will know how to do that. You know, how to submit proposals. think there's four or five of them already on my desk, and I quess -- you know, that should be built into -- into our work planning activities and maybe considered as part of the '92, but -- you know, everybody has to have an equal shot when we start to do that. You know, it has to be in a forum where everybody has an equal opportunity. But we're going to get

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

those, so -- you know -- and I can see problems if we just deep six 'em until next year, until we have -- you know, the final restoration plan, but we need to have some way to deal with those.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: When you anticipate the completion of the draft plan?

MR. SENNER: Under the scenario that we're proposing, we would have a draft restoration plan, the target would be March of '93, so that would be one -- we're looking to this framework document this coming March, '92 and we're looking to one year after that.

MR. SANDOR: Will it be possible to still I guess the answer to the question — the question was when will the draft restoration plan be completed and the answer was March of 1993. With the restoration framework completed in March of 1992, I guess the hiatus that is of concern to me is what happens in the interim. Is there a process of identifying projects of high priority need, that the restoration work might be actually done in 1992?

MR. SENNER: Well

UNIDENTIFIED: Mr. Montague will address that.

MR. SENNER: Well, I was going to say there are a number of policy components to those questions, and one of them is whether one -- whether you do want to proceed with actual

ACE 6792575

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

implementation of restoration work in '92 or limit activities in '92 only to further studies that would support restoration.

MR. SANDOR: That's I guess the point that maybe -- a question can be reserved until when Dr. Montague makes his presentation, but I think that needs to be laid on the table, Mr. Chairman, and I guess I'll reserve further questions and comments at this time.

MR. COLE: Back to Mr. Barton, please.

MR. BARTON: Well, I think I have the same concerns that Mr. Sandor was going to express and if we're going to wait to discuss '92 activities for Dr. Montague's presentation, I'll wait till then.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Pass.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Mr. Pennoyer?

MR. PENNOYER: I'll wait until you get the whole package.

MR. COLE: Let me say this. I have a lot of reservations about this proposal and it's hard to express them, but -- you know, I sort of see this big bureaucratic machine starting to get formulated -- you know, and here is -- you know, all these things and then we're talking about the studies we'll do in '92 and the restoration plan in '93 and pretty soon -- you know, I think I foresee stacks of studies and papers like this, but not, I'm fearful, a lot of bang out there in the

ACE 6792576

Sound for the buck and I'm really concerned about that.

I'm concerned about the process that we're getting into here, but I come from a -- you know, a different background that these scholars and the scientists and government people, but it just worries me a little bit when I see this. Now, maybe my fears are ill founded, but I must say I'm apprehensive.

For example, let me say, I mean I know that Secretary Lujan has expressed the thought of endowing a chair at the University of Alaska for certain things, and the Governor has expressed some views of Prince William Sound, and I just want to be sure that we don't — that we husband these resources which we have very carefully and that we concentrate on expending them for the restoration of the Sound, and I'm not talking about — you know, building roads to Timbukto or anything, but I'm talking about putting bucks right into the Sound and not getting awfully deep in — you know, in the structure that I sort of foresee developing. Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, that's somewhat along the lines that I was going to defer on, but since we've started it, I'll start it or add my comments. I feel very strongly that we've got to get the maximum amount of this money into actual restoration activities on the ground in the Sound and in other oil spill impacted areas.

We can't, I don't believe in good conscience, spend the

ACE 6792577

R & R COURT REPORTERS

bulk of the money on studies and bureaucracy and the lesser amount of it in restoring resources. The whole purpose that we're here for is to restore resources. We've got to do it in a sound manner, scientifically sound manner. I don't think anybody disputes that.

I would -- I don't know when the appropriate time is going to come, but it's occurred to me that perhaps the framework that we're talking about developing with some modifications or additions might serve the same purpose as the more comprehensive plan that Dr. Senner's talked about that's due for development in March of '93. Perhaps there's a way that this document could serve both purposes with some additions. I don't know; I think it's something we ought to consider. I don't know yet whether I advocate it. I do advocate considering it.

MR. COLE: Well, let's see, let's just go back and forth, one State and one federal. Commissioner Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first thing I want to do is get you off of the hook because you were speaking specifically to the expenditure of the money in the Sound which I'm sure is going to benefit but there are some other areas of the state that were affected here.

MR. COLE: If Representative -- (indiscernible - simultaneous speech)

MR. ROSIER: I'm sure you meant the other areas of the

ACE 6792578

R & R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

state as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: If Representative Davidson is listening, I certainly want to correct that and thank you very much.

MR. ROSIER: I would just like to say that I think that at least based on the information I have right now that I hope that we are striving for balance here between the research work and actual expenditures of the dollars. I think that as we all know, we have to bring that damage assessment work to a logical conclusion and that this could prove to be quite important to us further down the road in making further determinations of damage that we may not sense at the present time. But I think that we need the information to make the decision. I think that we want to be sure that we have a balanced approach here between the actual doing and the research that supports the actual doing. In my view, I'm not for building the bureaucracy for one minute on this, but I think on the program side, I think we've got to be very careful how we approach it.

MR. COLE: Mr. Pennoyer?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rosier said about what I was going to say. We are faced with a dilemma and that is that we want as much as possible these resources to go directly into restoration of the resources of Prince William Sound and other affected areas, but we also want to make sure that we do the right thing and we do need to have a good look at the damage assessment results so we're not trying to repair

ACE 6792579

something that's not broken, for example, or missing something that is broken. We need to have a good background on the type of things that may be proposed for restoration so we can look at the alternatives and assess how great they're going to be.

I agree with you. I don't think that we want to wait forever and I don't think that we want to build a bureaucracy and I'm hoping the work plan shows a real crank down when we get to it for '92 on damage assessment except for finalizing that the results of it, and increase in the amount of looking at the type of restoration that should be done and I hope we also retain an open mind if a good idea comes along and it's -- (indiscernible) -- that it actually is a good idea and fits in with what we already know quite well, then we can jump on it. But I agree with Mr. Rosier that we do have to -- have to look at the information and make sure we're making the right choices.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I think it might be advisable to maybe hear Dr. Montague address the issue of the 1992 work that's planned, but I think before we get off of this subject, I'd like to at least have a projected fiscal note of what in effect — what we expect to be expending on — in 1992 with regard to the development of the long range plan and the studies and so forth because I really am concerned not only with the question of the bureaucracy but how much funding, in fact, we're going to be committing to this plan of action.

ACE 6792580

R & R COURT REPORTERS

2

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 i

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: I think for the benefit of everyone concerned here on this, it's not only the expenditure that is related to the '92 field work, but I think that it's also -- I'd like to have some feel for -- you know, how the total dollars that we're dealing with this year are, in fact, being expended.

MR. COLE: Yes. How much money do we have available for expenditure in 1992? How much money is in the bank so to speak?

MR. SENNER: I would have to defer that to Dave Gibbons or

DR. MONTAGUE: Maybe I give the -- no -- (indiscernible).

MR. COLE: Okay, but let me say this -(indiscernible). I would like to comment on Mr. Pennoyer's
comments and Commissioner Rosier's. I mean it's a free
wheeling outfit here and everybody has some strong views, but
look, I mean in the year 2005, there will still be scientists
out there who say we don't have the answer yet; we have to
study this a little more. I guarantee you that will be the
case, not that my guarantee is worth very much, but I mean -you know, there comes a time, you see, to say the time for
study is passing us by and it's time for restoration and
enhancement. Not that -- of course, we're not going to look at

ACE 6792581

scientific studies. I mean that would be folly not to have some sense of what's going on out there, but I just want to say that in my view at the least, we have to husband these dollars; we have to expend them very carefully; and not have this huge bureaucratic framework or structure out there, studying these problems, writing reports, writing memos, saying we need a little more, et cetera, et cetera. I mean the time has come in my view, gentlemen, I mean to get down to the restoration process now -- you know. Where we make that cut, that will not be easy. But nonetheless, as the Governor would say, that's where I'm coming from and I have some very, very strong feelings about it, so if you will, maybe we can now pass on to another more pleasant subject. Thank you. Dr. Montaque, please.

DR. MONTAGUE: Thank you. As Charlie stated, my name is Jerome Montague and I'm the Director of the Oil Spill Assessment and Restoration Division for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and what I'd like to do is just bring the Council up to date on where we are in terms of damage assessment and restoration activities to date and what our 1992 work plan is.

And this is a process that's been going on since '89 and it's basically a continuation of '89-'90 and '91 process. And in order to get ready for the 1992 field season, our schedule for ending the annual reports and receiving the

ACE 6792582

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

proposals for the next year began as early as last August which was before the settlement, and in September, we asked the principal investigators to give us -- begin preparing their actual proposals as well as to prepare their annual reports, tell us what they found for that year.

And then in October when we had the settlement, we modified our request to the investigators somewhat to shift attention to bringing about an orderly closure to the damage assessment process, and which was pretty much as specified in the settlement. And proposals were received in November as well as the annual reports from probably something like 40 investigators, and a marathon series or a marathon meeting that lasted about 12 days at the first part of December, we listened to the reports of what all the investigators had found in the 1991 period and we listened to all their recommendations for continued damage assessment work and continued and/or new restoration activities.

assessment projects are listed there in your hand out, but I'll just go over them for those in the audience. Immediate injury was one criteria, meaning that was injury obvious or does it seem likely that injury would have occurred for a particular species or resource. The second criteria was long term alteration of populations. The third criteria was sub-lethal and latent effects. The fourth was ecosystem wide effects; the

ACE 6792583

R & R COURT REPORTERS

fifth was habitat degradation.

And in terms of deciding whether to close out a particular damage assessment project, the main criteria was has damage been at least minimally identified. As Charlie was saying, you can always identify it better, but was it at least minimally identified. And the criteria that we used for evaluating restoration science studies and I'd like to differentiate between a restoration science study and an implementation study, and for the most part, we are not entertaining much in the way of implementation proposals. The 1993 draft restoration plan is when an implementation — the major implementation efforts would begin. And by implementation, we would mean buying land, building fish ladders or something other than an information gathering project.

And anyway, criteria that we use for evaluating these information gathering projects is documentation of probable injury, meaning that the damage assessment studies have already indicated that there is a damage; an estimated time needed for natural recovery; a restoration activity or end point that result from the study; the need for the proposed study with respect to the ability to carry out future restoration activities; the technical feasibility and probability for success; the importance of conducting the study in 1992, meaning would a delay of a project have serious restoration

ACE 6792584

effects; that if we -- (indiscernible) -- the year of damage assessment or restoration activities, would restoration be hampered; and the last was the cost of the proposed activity relative to the degree of injury, what were the costs of the potential restoration outcome.

And in terms of damage assessment studies, we, for the most part, are recommending that they be brought to a conclusion and this is 75 percent of the projects that are either already completed or we intend to complete in the 1992 field season, and reports are either available for the Council now or at various times between now and June of next year. Well, June of 1993 actually.

And our estimate of what the damage assessment primarily close out for 1992 is about eight million dollars.

MR. COLE: I'm sorry, I missed that.

DR. MONTAGUE: Our estimate of the cost for closing out the damage assessment, and I say close out, but there is potential that some of those could continue even beyond 1992 or even new ones could be started.

MR. COLE: And that's eight million dollars for what?

DR. MONTAGUE: That's closing out all the damage assessment projects that we've had to ascertain the damage.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman.

DR. MONTAGUE: And in a few cases

MR. COLE: Mr. Barton has a comment, excuse me.

ACE 6792585

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BARTON: It's not clear to me, Dr. Montague, are there no studies done that are being recommended for continuation or if there are, are they within the eight million dollars?

DR. MONTAGUE: They're within the eight million dollars, and I think they comprise about 20 percent.

MR. BARTON: Of the dollars or the studies?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, of the -- of the studies.

MR. COLE: Please continue.

DR. MONTAGUE: Okay. And in terms of the restoration proposals, numerous proposals were received from investigators and the trustee agencies and a good many of these are logical extensions of damage assessment activities that were already ongoing, and these proposals fell under the restoration end point category such as improved management options, habitat protection, natural recovery monitoring, and enhancement. Additional consideration of these proposals for funding is contingent upon the Trustee Council's request for detailed study plans.

So, as a result, sometime during this meeting or beyond, we would need an approval to go back to the investigator to ask for detailed study plans and more detailed budgets and our estimate for the restoration science proposals are -- science isn't necessarily the best word, but information gathering proposals for restoration would be about 17 million

ACE 6792586

R.& R COURT REPORTERS

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

dollars for 1992, and this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Is that in addition to the eight million?

DR. MONTAGUE: That's in addition and that, as I said,
these are preliminary estimates and especially in the case of
the restoration ones, a good many of the proposals were
duplicative and going back, if we have your approval to go back
and ask for detailed proposals, many of these will be combined
into one project at considerably less expense. So, those
figures should be viewed as higher than actually will be
recommended and this is out of -- less than 24 million out of
the 90 million that was in this first year's payment.

MR. COLE: Well -- you know, let's see, of that first 90 million, 24 million, 500 has been paid to the federal treasury; 29 million has been paid to the State General Fund; so let's see, that's roughly 30 plus 25. We're about 55 million has gone to the two governments for reimbursement of expenses. That would leave what, 35 million? Is that about what you gentlemen's thoughts are? I'd say about 35 million -- (indiscernible). Have you finished or did you want

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, basically, yes. Ready to answer questions.

MR. COLE: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: On the restoration proposals, are there actually on the ground implementation activities?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, implementation being defined as

ACE 6792587

building something or buying land, there aren't any.

MR. BARTON: In other words, for 17 million dollars or whatever it ultimately ends up to be, we wouldn't be able to walk out on the Sound and say we did this.

DR. MONTAGUE: You'd be able to walk out into the Sound and say you did this, but you might not have a building to show for it.

MR. BARTON: Well, I'm not looking for a building, but I'm looking for restoration.

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, for instance, I kind of know what you're getting at, but a good many of the projects are monitoring of damages that have been found in the damage assessment studies and in some cases, the damages are getting worse and in most cases or in many cases, they're staying the same or getting better and a year's breach in monitoring that we feel would be detrimental to the restoration process. It's really implemented in a much larger scale in terms of the money spent in 1993 and beyond.

MR. BARTON: So some on these are then essentially a continuation of the damage assessment studies that are being renamed?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, monitoring components -- if any of the damage assessment studies had monitoring aspects, those would be the ones that would be continued.

MR. BARTON: Well, are we talking about natural

ACE 6792588

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	recovery monitoring?
2	DR. MONTAGUE: That's correct.
3	MR. BARTON: Okay.
4	MR. COLE: Commissioner Sandor, did you have questions?
5	MR. SANDOR: The damage assessment of eight million is
6	just for fiscal just for calendar year '92 or does it also
7	extend to the completion of all of the damage assessment
8	studies?
9	DR. MONTAGUE: Well, it covers the period March, '92 to
LO	the end of February, '93.
11	MR. SANDOR: And there might still be some damage
L2	assessment studies continuing?
L3	DR. MONTAGUE: Right, and 75 percent of 'em, 75 percent
L4	of the damage assessment studies will end for sure in that
15	period and 25 percent that we're asking to continue right now
L6	may or may not continue.
L7 !	MR. SANDOR: And the restoration science studies of 17
.8 !	million is from again March or February of '92 to March of '93,
9	the same period of time?
20	DR. MONTAGUE: Right, that's correct.
21	MR. SANDOR: And then is the planning, the restoration
2	planning costs another item?
23	DR. MONTAGUE: Yes.
4	MR. SANDOR: And what might that be?
5	DR. MONTAGUE: The administration, this is the cost of

ACE 6792589

R & R COURT REPORTERS

the project. Again, with -- I'd like to emphasize is on the
high side because of all these combined proposals, but
additional cost would be the administration of the projects and
the restoration framework and planning process.

MR. SANDOR: Which might total or add what?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, the administration would be
something on the order of 15 to 20 percent of the projects and
restoration planning would probably be -- depending on -- it's

something on the order of 15 to 20 percent of the projects and restoration planning would probably be -- depending on -- it's a hard one to pin right now because we don't know the expense of the public involvement process, but one to five million probably.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think we need to spend some time to -- on this particular aspect. This may not get or does it, Jerome, include the cost of the overhead management team itself? Is that one to five?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, that was what I was -- in the 15 to 20 percent of the projects, that would

MR. SANDOR: Okay. So it appears then we're talking in the range of at least 25 to 30 million dollars?

DR. MONTAGUE: That's correct.

MR. SANDOR: I guess I restate my concern.

MR. COLE: What is your concern?

MR. SANDOR: My concern is -- really is as stated by Mr. Barton earlier that we do definitely want to close the studies in a scientific manner and not lose that. Nobody is --

ACE 6792590

R & R COURT REPORTERS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I don't anyone is questioning that. I guess a concern is that we have before us the prospects in 1992 and ending in that February 28 or March 1, 1992 period, an expenditure of 25 to 30 ! million dollars and apparently very little restoration work itself done in 1992. And it'll be interesting to determine from our public advisory group and from other entities out in the various areas impacted by the oil spill of whether or not -- you know, and it's perceived that, in fact, this restoration work which must be out there can wait yet another year, and I guess, Mr. Chairman, the troublesome part of this thing is by March of 1993, we will have -- four years have passed after the actual incident occurred and we will have -- and I think we've spent what, something in the range of 40 million --(indiscernible) -- studies this past year and -- this current year, and I'm worried about the time in which we hold ourselves accountable and the public holds ourselves accountable to what restoration work we've done with the money that we've spent.

MR. COLE: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: We -- you know, we've spent I think over a hundred million dollars on the damage assessment process and that began very shortly after the spill. I'm really puzzled why there aren't some things, and I know this is probably a frustration we all feel including the public, I'm puzzled why there isn't -- why there aren't some things that we've learned in the course of the last three years that we can actually do

ACE 6792591

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to restore the resources of an impacted area. I know that it's 1 a complex issue and I'm not advocating that we go forward 2 without a good scientific base, but it just -- it is awful 3 4 frustrating not to be able to walk out there and put my hand on 5 something that we did restore. 6 DR. MONTAGUE: Could I 7 Did you want to make an observation, Doctor? MR. COLE: 8 DR. MONTAGUE: Yeah. The 9 Well, let me just say this -- you know. MR. COLE: Montague is not responsible for the hundred million. 10 11 haven't been involved in spending a nickel so I'm 12 I was going to clarify that, Mr. Chairman. MR. BARTON: I realize that Mr. Montague hasn't been -- isn't responsible, 13 14 but I can say that I've been in this thing since the first day and I had a big part in the hundred million. 15 16 MR. COLE: Mr. McVee. 17 Comment on a couple of questions. MR. McVEE: 18 remember right also, coming out of that 90 million is the cost 19 of any cleanup activities because if we've not closed out --20 not 21 MR. COLE: Exxon's 1991 cleanup set off, so to speak. 22 Yeah. I quess the couple of questions MR. MCVEE: 23 24 MR. COLE: Does that leave us with any money? 25 MR. McVEE: I'm not sure. I guess maybe the first

ACE 6792592

272-3022

COURT REPORTERS

question would be kind of what has to be done to close out the NERDA (ph) studies? Is there field work or is it a matter of writing out a summary report, a close out report? What do we get for the eight million dollars?

DR. MONTAGUE: Okay, for the I could -- trying to give you more exact figures, but I would think that approximately half of that is for or less -- somewhat less than half of that is for actual field work in 1992. The remainder is for these final reports, then peer review, and a lot of the backlog on that is analysis of hydrocarbon samples, and that's a lot of the work that needs to be continued this year. It's not field work. It's the samples collected in previous years that haven't been analyzed and until those analyses are ended, the investigators, they can't prepare their final reports.

MR. McVEE: Okay, thank you. I guess the second question is that we've looked at -- or we looked at restoration proposals. Is there -- and there have been some -- you have had some criteria for selecting proposals, but is there any way to look at the impacted area in a kind of a comprehensive way so that -- you know, rather than address -- you know, to address the entire you might say impacted ecosystem, so that we could get some feel for what really -- you know, has priority because I think the studies, as I understand it, were more or less focused, an analysis more or less focused on species, the murries; the otters; the mussels; and so on, but is there some

ACE 6792593

<u>R & R COURT REPORTERS</u>

way that -- you know -- and I guess that I would feel more comfortable in dealing with the budget -- you know, when we get to that point, of a budget in an overall perspective if we've looked at the impacted area and we've identified what resources we really need to evaluate some more in order to -- you know, have the information we need to develop restoration programs.

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, your point about a lot of the projects being species specific I would grant that that's true, but I would say that our ecosystem wide picture of what's damaged and what these damages are affecting or how they're affecting the ecosystem, we do know quite well and if you need to know 'em better, it would cost even more. But I think that we can describe the damages to the ecosystem quite well.

MR. McVEE: I can see from that kind of a description - you know, we can develop as I say the kind of criteria that
would really be helpful to the Trustee Council in selecting
projects and selecting studies, and that would -- you know, get
us to the high priority which is what we want to take care of.

MR. MONTAGUE: I was going to comment to Mr. Barton, some of his questions, and your statement about this many years have gone by and we've spent this much money and what have we done for restoration and actually we've done a tremendous amount for restoration, particularly with species that are harvested species, commercial and sport fishes and huntable populations for subsistence and sport hunting. The results of

ACE 6792594

R & R COURT REPORTERS

these studies have made dramatic improvements in our ability to both allow these things to continue, yet protect the resource, and I would argue that a lot of the management activities are enhancing restoration at this moment and have been for ever since new information came in, and as far as bang for the buck, in many ways, the management actions taken on some of these species will restore 'em and in some ways, that's probably the cheapest expenditures. And for some of the species that have huge commercial harvests, many times without that information, it would have meant simply closing the harvests.

MR. COLE: Let's see, did we want to get Commissioner Rosier -- (indiscernible). Well, Mr. Pennoyer has been
All right, Mr. Barton, please, he wants to have a surrebuttal.

MR. BARTON: No, I don't want to rebut and I appreciate Dr. Montague's amplification and I did not mean to imply that Dr. Montague had any particular personal responsibility. As I pointed out, there's two in this group that have been in this since day one, and I'm one of those so if there's any arrows to be shot, I can -- I'm one of the targets.

MR. COLE: Let's see, Mr. Rosier, Commissioner?

MR. ROSIER: No, nothing.

MR. COLE: Mr. Pennoyer has the floor.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I guess I'll have to -- Mr. Barton made an oblique reference to the two of us and I'm the other one, I suppose, since I've been involved in the spill since

ACE 6792595

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about the second day after it occurred and in this research on it.

We have spent a lot of money on damage assessment and I think it is vitally important that we tie that together and describe what happened and describe what our answers are to what happened and that also serves as, I think, some guidelines and mileposts for anything that might happen in the future.

Be that as it may, I'm not sure how much that costs and I'm having trouble with this discussion because I have no projects in front of me; I have no description of what these items really mean and what the content is. All I hear is the total amount of money, and that makes it very difficult to really comment specifically on what is going to be accomplished with that money or how it relates to something else we're going to do with that money.

My presumption is that at some point here, you're going to come back to us with a rather detailed expose of what this means and why these expenditures in C.G.'s (ph) viewpoint are appropriate. I don't have that now. I mean I can obviously say it sounds like a lot of money and I can say if there are other opportunities we're missing, we probably shouldn't miss them. If there really are things that we can now evaluate and say they're the right thing to do, but I have no way of balancing those and at some point here, before we go out to public review or before this goes a whole lot farther, we need

to schedule a session where we spend some time and sit down and look at the details of what you really are discussing because I don't think you've presented us a final fait accompli (ph) of any kind. You've done some preliminary planning. We haven't signed off on it. We haven't sent it out for public review. We haven't evaluated it relative to other things we might want to do. So, I think we need, Mr. Chairman, to do that at some point fairly quickly, although like everybody else, it sounds like a lot of money and I think we're going to have to look very closely at what's proposed.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Thank you. I would like to say that at this point, at least to my knowledge, there's been no public input into the planning process here for the '92 field season. As I understand it, this is basically a continuation of the process that was in place up to settlement time on this.

Again, I think that we need some further detail in regards to the total dollars and what those dollars represent. I think as Dr. Montague indicated, these are maximum figures at this point in time, and as I understood the request here, they were interested in some indication from the Council here tonight as to whether or not they should, in fact, proceed with development of the specifics to support those figures and whether we should — at which time we, plus the public, would have an opportunity to participate in the evaluations of the

ACE 6792597

R & R COURT REPORTERS

projects.

So, it seems to me that we -- personally I think we need some further information on this before we get too far down the road. I would again echo my concern about the total dollars, and I would hope that in terms of those PI's out there, that they're dealing with pretty sharp pencils when they get the go ahead to come back to us with specifics.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Sandor, did you want to comment?

MR. SANDOR: I'd like to elaborate on Commissioner Rosier's last point. I think that as the pencils are sharpened and that management group and the sub-groups lay out something for us to really consider, I think this group, this Trustee Council should actually give some guidance in this effort, some very specific guidance, and -- you know, certainly from an organization and process, my recommendation is that it be kept simple and as lean as possible, and that the organizational structure itself be minimum in size and that the process cost be as tight as possible.

The second recommendation I would have, Mr. Chairman, is that we utilize existing agencies and organizations as much as possible, and I think to some degree, the group has done that in this public information process and that's a good example of that. In fact, that activity is going to be done by an existing agency using its own organization. I think we need

ACE 6792598

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to do more of that, and I think we want to utilize and involve, of course, the people who have been working on the spill cleanup and begin integrating those people into the regular organization.

These folks that have been doing the studies should have really a preferential opportunity to -- you know, become employed in the regular organization itself rather than perpetuating separate organizations. I think there's a time in which these studies that are ongoing actually achieve other objectives than those related to the spill itself or the restoration work. Indeed, I suspect that there may be some of this work that probably was requested from the general funds even prior to the spill because this stuff was -- this information was not available and was needed, and I don't fault that, but I say the process of integrating this should -should be kept in mind and the existing organizations that we represent need to cover some of these activities that are basic research and maybe only partly related to the spill, and the spill shouldn't -- funds should not -- you know, pay the whole bill and I -- this might be a time to again say that as you look at this, see if there aren't some actual restoration needs that have been prioritized to the extent that we ought to -- to begin work on -- begin work on.

It's troublesome that we have this restoration structure that's going to be done in March of 1992, a draft.

ACE 6792599

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The restoration plan is not going to be done until March of 1993 and I forget whether it was Mike Barton or Curt McVee or Mr. Pennoyer that said well, maybe we can use that restoration framework to begin doing some restoration work. I guess at least those four or five points I would give as guidance.

Whether or not you folks share those or have some others, but I think rather than just saying to this group hey, go back and be more specific about your needs, I think they deserve guidance from us and I think it comes loud and clear that at least from my position, this 25 to 30 million budget for 1992 is surprisingly large. It approaches the operating budgets of many units within the existing State government, and I believe we want to hear from the public to see if they -- you know, share that concern or not.

MR. COLE: I'd like to make some comments. First, Dr. Montague, I think your analysis is outstanding and I congratulate you on the work product you've presented to us here this evening.

I am somewhat stunned over the amount which is planned to be expended in 1992, and I come at it as Commissioner Sandor just alluded to. You know, I know what the budget is for the Department of Law just for one fiscal year. I mean I think I know, but I don't know it as well as I should. I know that. But I mean we have 500 employees and we engage in heavy litigation against -- you know, it seems like everybody in the

ACE 6792600

R & R COURT REPORTERS

world including -- you know, perhaps would say sure, yeah, you deserve to get sued for what you do all the time. I realize that. We'll let that go, but -- you know, I mean we have 500 employees, some of these briefs that these people write are magnificent work product, and maybe it's about 50 million dollars. Now -- you know, how come these studies in these oil spill areas cost -- you know, 6, 8, 10 -- you know, 20 million dollars, 25 million dollars? I mean it seems to me an ungodly amount to be paying for studies. I just can't fathom how these costs for these studies could reach that magnitude, 25 million dollars when you look at the budget for the Department of Law and 500 employees. Now -- you know, maybe -- you know, there's some intoxication in dealing with these monies. I don't know, but it strikes me as incredibly large sums to get some data about what the condition is out there in these oil spill affected areas. I have really a lot of trouble with that --There's no use talking any more. position is clear. Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Thank you, Mr. Cole. Yes, it seems to me like we probably do need some specifics. Steve, I guess, suggested that -- you know, on what is the -- what can be closed out, I guess we need to look at that. What needs -- what needs to be continued -- you know, what's essential and what are the justifications behind that in a public review fitting in there somewhere. And then, I guess -- you know, we

ACE 6792601

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

need to look at restoration proposals from other sources, too, it seems to me. That becomes part of the total package. I don't think we can -- the Council evaluate until we have -- we have that component. So, I think we need to see both government proposals as well as from other sources before we have a package for consideration plus these other elements before we can look at in total.

DR. MONTAGUE: Can I comment on that?

MR. COLE: Yes, please.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. MONTAGUE: As I'm sure you're aware, the list of these projects and all the background details are available and the reason they're not presented here is because of the litigation sensitivity of the damages that would be expressed in looking over those documents, and relative to public restoration proposals, it would have a hard time being meaningful if they didn't know the damages. So

MR. COLE: I'd like to comment on that. I think we're making great progress along that line and maybe in the next 30, 60 days, we'll have a lot of that behind us. Mr. Tillery, am I off base on that one?

MR. TILLERY: We're making great progress.

MR. COLE: Yeah, thank you. Any other comments at this time. Dr. Mon- -- let's see, Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, just, Mr. Chairman, I think we kind of need to bring this to closure somehow. I'm not sure

ACE 6792602

R & R COURT REPORTERS

what we're telling them we want them to do with this '92 work plan or what we'll want to look at or when we want to look at it relative to even approving it to be part of the public review package.

As I said before, I heard a dollar amount but I have no concept of what's really envisioned in that, any explanation as to concepts, but to evaluate it, some of those projects may be restoration studies but as Dr. Montague says, those restoration studies may lead to direct restoration through management or other actions that we wish to take. So I'm not clear that it's all just "studies" to be doing studies and I would hope it's not. I presume it's not.

So we need to somehow put a time frame on this and some decision as to how we can get this type of information, when we want to make the decision. I think we've made it clear we want sharp pencils and hard justifications for why things have to continue or why studies, monitoring studies are appropriate as opposed to some other activity.

We also at some point want to be able to entertain alternatives for restoration. If the group has ideas that based on what we've learned so far, there's some preliminary estimates of the types of things that we might do, we'd like to at least know those, and I don't think we've had that type of interaction. Restoration planning has been going on under the damage assessment process under litigation for quite a while,

ACE 6792603

and I presume we have some ideas, people have some thoughts, and I'm not hearing those yet. So, at some point, we're going to need that type of feedback, how ever it's going to occur. If we have a litigation problem, maybe we've got to do some of that in closed session, but some how I need that type of input. input.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: I'd suggest that we ask the RRCG to proceed to develop the detailed study plans given the good advice they're received from us tonight.

MR. COLE: Well, at least advice.

MR. BARTON: I would like to see a matrix of the damage assessment studies, those that are to be closed out and why, those that are to be continued and why, and approximate costs.

I'd like to see the same thing for the restoration studies.

Just -- not -- I know you can't get into any detail until you get the detailed study plans back, but some two or three liners about each of the proposals and what our best estimate of the cost is right now.

I would suggest that if we need to go into executive session because of the litigation to look at the damage assessment studies, that we do so. We have done that for the last three years and it's not anything unusual or mysterious.

MR. COLE: Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, let me just -- I think Dr.

ACE 6792604

R & R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Montague made the statement that it might be tough for the public to make suggestions for restoration. I don't think in all cases the restoration needs to be species specific the way we've been working so far on this, but there may, in fact, be ideas from the public out there for restoration projects that would, in fact, be worth considering at this point. I mean perhaps it is a fish ladder, a hatchery or a piece of real estate or something like that. I think those should be considered as part of the '92 work program itself.

MR. COLE: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: I have one last comment. I think in putting this in a context, I know that Stan Senner in the past has discussed these in previous times, but the restoration planning group that did exist had matrixes of damages and resources and all sorts of things. I think there's information out there for the Council to use in looking at this for deciding on the appropriateness of the package or actually the appropriateness of going forward with certain restoration. I think some of that does exist, and we have not had the opportunity; we haven't given ourselves the time to receive those type of presentations, and I think we have to do it.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Sandor, please.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I think we've seen this evening evidence of a high degree of professionalism that has been apparent in the spill or cleanup work that's been done, and I

ACE 6792605

R & R COURT REPORTERS

think we can take some substantial assurance and be reassured that, in fact, these pencils are going to be sharpened and these activities are going to be very closely scrutinized. I would reiterate to the point that in doing this, we really do have a test of examining whether or not the project that is being proposed is one that really is mostly -- not totally, but mostly related to the spill as opposed to a study that -- you know, might more reasonably be generated from the General Fund.

I thought this was really an excellent session, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier has -- (indiscernible).

MR. ROSIER: Thank you. I would like to compliment the group on their efforts. I think I heard somebody mention 12 days of evaluation that went into bringing the concepts forth here tonight on this and that had to be quite a session to get 12 days worth.

MR. COLE: I can't resist one last comment. On these studies, I personally would like to request that you look carefully at the cost of these studies. Is the cost of the study what it ought to be? Can the substance of the study material be realized for less money? You know, we don't have to study these things to the last decimal point, if you know what I'm saying. I mean -- you know, just please look carefully at the costs of these studies and beyond that, I, too, want to add my appreciation for the work that the group

ACE 6792606

R & R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

;	
1	has done. I don't want you to think that this outpouring of
2	Council this evening, if I can properly describe it as that,
3	with respect to the amount of the expenditures, has any
4	reflection on you or the group. It's just that I think it
5	shows a recognition of the Council that we're very concerned
6	about maximizing the restoration and the good which can be
7	achieved from this settlement. If there are no more comments,
8	thank you, Dr. Montague.
9	DR. MONTAGUE: Okay, so we have approval of the go
10	ahead for detailed plans at a bare bones effort?
11	MR. COLE: Well (indiscernible) your own good
12	judgment. Is that the consensus of the Council? Fine, thank
13	you, Doctor. Mr. Gibbons?

MR. GIBBONS: We're -- I told you we'd make it.

MR. COLE: We're rapidly approaching the witching hour.

MR. GIBBONS: I just looked up and saw -- one point of clarification. Did we get approval from the Trustee Council to development of the restoration frame work?

MR. COLE: Yes.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay, that's all I have.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible - away from microphone).

MR. COLE: You certainly have the floor. Please be seated and

MR. BORDERSON: I am Mark Borderson (ph), jack of all

ACE 6792607

R & R COURT REPORTERS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

trades for DEC. I'd like to point out to you on the restoration plan, the development of that plan would cost less than one percent of the total funds that are available here. That's the primary point I wanted to make.

Also, in

MR. COLE: You received sort of a stony response.

Nonetheless

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BORDERSON: Well, I was just trying to put that into perspective as to the cost of it. The set off for Exxon in the question that Mr. McVee came up with there, the Exxon set off comes in December of '92.

We also have the criminal restitution funds that we're not necessarily addressing here this evening that we should be considering for funding proposals from sources other than the agencies here for implementation in '92, as should proposals from the agencies for funding in '92. We want to make sure we don't forget those funds, and that's the extent of my chat.

MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: This, Mr. Chairman, it's not a question.

It's more a comment. We haven't talked about all of the funding sources, but maybe we have to talk amongst ourselves. I don't know how you want to handle that.

MR. COLE: Well, we can't have any meetings that are not open meetings. I can assure you of that.

ACE 6792608

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. ROSIER: I wasn't suggesting that.

MR. COLE: No, I know, I know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROSIER: I was suggesting that we may want to discuss this amongst us here at the table. I mean there are 70 funds that have been utilized in the past for funding on these. There has been General Fund dollars that have been spent in the past on this effort. There has been a lot of different sources, and so far, all we've talked about tonight is the 90 million as Mark said.

MR. COLE: Good thought. Any other parting comments? Well, the time

MR. PENNOYER: I'm sorry.

MR. COLE: I knew I shouldn't have asked that question.
Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: I'm sorry, sir, I have to raise the question administratively. I don't know when the next meeting is going to be, but Dave, how are we doing with the Spees (ph) contract? Do we have to make a decision on that tonight in terms of extension if we're going to or I'm sorry?

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, it expires February 8th.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, currently we're still engaged in the peer review process under Dr. Spees' direction in trying to get these damage assessment projects wrapped up and the evaluation of them, and I'm kind of unclear on this short a time how long we're going to need that

ACE 6792609

R. & R COURT REPORTERS

type of a service, but I would hate to see it just drop out of sight before the peer review process we're engaged in is completed, and I don't know, Dave, if you want to comment on that, but we've been sort of thinking about an extension for a time -- certain period of time until you think that the synthesis process is going to be done, so we do wrap that up, and then discuss anything further when we get to the science audit question.

MR. COLE: Preliminarily should we identify Dr. Spees?

I think maybe the people here would be able to follow the discussion here a little more if we were to give a little background about Dr. Spees' past participation.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, perhaps somebody on the management team could better detail what he's done than I could, but he is our scientist that has been under contract previously with the Department of -- I think the State maintained part of it and NOAA has at one stage and I think -- (indiscernible) -- did at one point, and he's been sort of the focal point for our science review in getting the peer reviewers brought to bear on the question of evaluation of their studies.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Mr. Gibbons.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, that's quite correct, and with -(indiscernible) -- like I mentioned, his contract expires on
February 8th. Until we get this damage assessment process
outlined and when the final reports are going to be -- you

ACE 6792610

R & R COURT REPORTERS

know, done and his involvement is wrapped up, we envision needing him more than February 8th, but we're not sure how long we need him into the future after that. So, one proposal we have would be to extend with an interim contract until we get this analysis done with your assistance and the public's assistance, and then wrap up the contract with him.

MR. COLE: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: I don't know how you negotiate contracts or how to do it, but aren't we going to have this time

MR. PENNOYER: I don't know how you negotiate contract or how to do it, but aren't we going to have this time specific. Is he going to do -- is he interested in just an open ended process or how do you have to do that?

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah

MR. COLE: Can I make an observation?

MR. GIBBONS: Sure.

MR. COLE: You may want to consider getting a series of three months options -- you know, with the option being held by the Trustee Council, this group, and just extend it in a series of three months, giving 60 days notice or something along those lines, see if that's acceptable. Yes, sir?

MR. ALEX: (Indiscernible - away from microphone). We really have two contracts. One that -- (indiscernible) -- separate contract with the Department of Law. It doesn't have a termination date.

MR. COLE: Could you work with Mr. Gibbons and you and Mr. Tillery on that and give 'em your input?

ACE 6792611

R & R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. ALEX: Mr. Tillery and I (indiscernible)
2	MR. COLE: Because maybe the Department of Law would
3	want to cancel it and put the expense over on this Council.
4	MR. BARTON: It's worked very well in the past.
5	MR. COLE: Is that
6	MR. GIBBONS: One additional item. It's kind of a
7	housekeeping item also. Would the Council like I'll call us
8	the group, to initiate identification process of a for the
9	recruitment and selection of a final administrative director
LO	for
L1	MR. COLE: Can we put that off till the next meeting?
L2	UNIDENTIFIED: I think we should.
L3	MR. COLE: By the way, how much does Dr. Spees get each
L4	month under this contract? I mean I
L5	MR. GIBBONS: Maybe I can have the Department of Law
L6 4	identify that, but it's kind of difficult. I don't have his
L7	contract right in front of me. Maybe Steve might have a better
L8	idea, but he has some assistants and some support and I'm not
۱9	exactly sure. I would be guessing 25 to 30,000 a month.
20	MR. COLE: A month?
21	MR. GIBBONS: No, that's too high, excuse me. That's
22	much too high.
23	MR. ALEX: I think with staff it's about and
24	expenses, it costs 25,000.
25	MR. COLE: A month? And how much

1 :	MR. ALEX: Actually that's the upper limit on
2	(indiscernible)
3	MR. COLE: And how many staff do we get for that 25
4	monthly grand?
5 i	MR. GIBBONS: He's got an assistant and some support
6	with his organization.
7 :	MR. PENNOYER: That's Mr. Chairman, that's travel
8	and the whole
9	MR. GIBBONS: Travel and per diem and
10	MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, there has been some
11	discussion about not being in a litigation mode and maybe some
12	negotiations was appropriate. I don't know if that's come up
13:	or not.
14	MR. COLE: Well, why don't you look at that, but bear
15	in mind the expressed views of the Council this evening. Yes,
16	Mr. McVee.
17	MR. McVEE: I think it's reasonable to look at some
18	term extension for the contract and that at least so we will
19	have that capability through this initial framework restoration
20	planning and in preparation of the '92 program, but I think
21	maybe three months or something like that is realistic.
22	There's another thing that I think we need to think about for -
23	- that I'd like to have for discussion in our next meeting on
24	the agenda would be because we have concern of the size of the
25	organization that we're creating here, some discussion on how

ACE 6792613

we go about you know, appointing committees, sub-committees,
membership and so on because I think indicative with the
philosophy that's been expressed here is that we need to keep
those committees lean; to limit the number of people that can
get the job done; and have the right be sure we have the
right expertise. But I think that we should do some review on
that.

Are you saying that that's -- are those the MR. COLE: series of decisions you think should be held by this Council?

MR. McVEE: I think we should have some discussion on that before we make those decisions.

All right. Any other comments? When is the MR. COLE: next meeting? Let's see if we can get that done before we hurry off to the citizen's comments. We should have one I think in January, and I think there's just a lot of work to be 16 done and we shouldn't postpone it.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, from my standpoint, any 18 | time in the first two weeks of January would be all right.

Representative Cabena (ph) has asked that MR. COLE: 20 | the Cordova Road Task Force be present in Cordova on the 9th and we have accepted his invitation. So, we'll be there on the I would say it should be after the 9th or that weekend 23 following the 9th.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm unavailable from the 25 | 13th to the end of the month.

ACE 6792614

COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

12

13

17

19

22

1	MR. COLE: Well, what day is the week of the 12th?
2	MR. BARTON: Sunday.
<u>.</u> 3	MR. COLE: And you won't be available on the 13th?
4	MR. BARTON: No.
5	MR. McVEE: I have a problem that week also.
6	UNIDENTIFIED: I'm not going to be available on the
7	12th. I've got to leave
8	MR. COLE: Well, what about on the 8th? The 8th? We
9	have to get over to Valdez to Cordova on the 9th.
10	MR. BARTON: How about the 7th? The 8th I'm supposed
11	to be in Portland.
12	MR. COLE: You're unavailable?
13	MR. ROSIER: Till the 8th. The 9th I'm with you in
14	Cordova.
15	(Off record conversation)
16	MR. COLE: Well, I gentlemen, I am going to rest up
17	before the legislative assault, so I will not be available I
18	think before the 7th.
19 !	MR. GIBBONS: Can I suggest the 10th which is a Friday?
2 0 i	Is that a
21	UNIDENTIFIED: The 10th would work.
22	MR. COLE: If we get out of Cordova alive, we could be
23	here on the 10th. It's tough over there, let me tell you; I've
24	been there. Why don't we make it the 10th, Friday the 10th?
25 i	It's a deal, and we'll give public notice of the time and place
:	

I think if that's generally acceptable. All right, we've run over by 14 minutes, but it's time for public comment. Mr. Groh, counsel.

(Off record for tape change)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GROH: Gentlemen, my name is Cliff Groh. I know some of you. I'm an attorney. I've lived in Anchorage for 38 years and practiced law for that period of time. I am here on behalf of the residents of Ella Mar which is the smallest, fastest growing village in all of Prince William Sound and somebody might ask where the heck is Ella Mar. I'm going to tell you. It's

MR. COLE: Tell us where they got the money to hire you, too, while you're at it.

MR. GROH: Well, let's make that clear.

MR. COLE: Getting disclosures here what's going on.

MR. GROH: Let's make that clear. I don't appear here on behalf of any of my clients or anybody else. I appear here on behalf of myself. Ella Mar is a town that is two miles north of Tatitlik, 22 miles from Valdez, 75 miles from Whittier, 45 miles from Cordova, and in 1778 when Capt. Cook came into Prince William Sound, he went into Snug Corner Cove at Port Fidalgo and the natives from Ella Mar went down and met him, and that's some indication of how long the town has been there. In the early 1900's, some miners came in there and developed a copper mine and patented the land, some 200 acres

ACE 6792616

And in the early 1900's, there were 800 people living of land. there and the steamships from the southland, their first port of call was Ella Mar and their second port of call was Latouch and the third one was Seward, and there was no Valdez and no Cordova at that time.

In 1920, the mine as Kennicott slowed down, and in 1940 there was a cannery there. In the early -- in the late 70's, I decided to acquire some land in Prince William Sound for purposes of development and so I acquired Ella Mar. now nine full time residents and eight -- add eight in the summertime or a total of 17 and nobody has consulted us about anything, but that's okay, because whether you consult us or don't consult us, the community is going to develop and there will be one or two lodges built there within the next two or three years and the cruise boats incidentally in the 20's, from reading the old Valdez newspapers, went from Valdez to look at Columbia Glacier and then they had dinner at Ella Mar. 18 | Stevens and all the people in Valdez think they invented this 19 process but, in fact, it's been in existence for 70 years.

I also -- and I speak only for myself and own another large parcel of property in Prince William Sound and that's at 22 Horseshoe Bay on Latouch Island, and I own a 315-acre parcel That's two miles south of the Latouch townsite. well over a million dollars invested in these properties, and Beyond the federal : 25 what you do here vitally affects my future.

ACE 6792617

COURT REPORTERS

1

5

6

7

8

12

13

15

20 i

government, the state government and the native groups, I'm the biggest single landowner in Prince William Sound, and I have some suggestions for you as to what you should do.

One, is you declare that the damage assessment is over. You've won the war, and that's how you win it. You just sav it's over, and save eight million dollars. And you start with the restoration, and I happen to be from the same school that Mr. Cole -- we both practiced law here about the same period of ! time, sometimes on the same side, sometimes on opposite sides, and he's a very good lawyer by the way. But in any event, if 11 you're going to preserve and restore the Sound, it becomes a question of who you're going to do it for. You ought to do it for the people so that they can enjoy it, and you can't leave it like ANWR. You know, everybody talks about preserving ANWR. We can't enjoy ANWR. The years I've lived here, I've never 16 been to ANWR, and I doubt that there over five people that have 17 ever been to ANWR or even close to it. You have to develop it 18 so that some people can see it and so that they can enjoy it.

For example, the legislature has authorized the 20 | feasibility study for a Tatitlik ferry terminal and it's a two 21 million dollar deal and that's the total cost of the project, 22 and what would this do for the people of Tatitlik. 23 allow them to have an ability to go back and forth to Valdez or 24 to Cordova and it would open up transportation in the Sound. 25 | respectfully suggest to you that that's a lot wiser than

3 1

4

5

6

14

another eight million in studies or at least to recommend to the legislature that it be done. Your purpose should be to enhance the uses of the Sound and make it available to the public, and I think you ought to work with the federal people, the state people, the native groups and the private developers to unlock the Sound.

Recently there have been publicity about the possibility of a road, a tunnel to Whittier. Insofar as the enjoyment of the Sound is concerned, that makes a great deal of sense. Now, these would be my suggestions to you. I hope I haven't used up more than my five minutes. I'll be happy to answer any questions, and thank you very much for listening to me.

MR. COLE: Well, we'll look forward to hearing from you in the future. We appreciate your comments and you'll be on the mailing list.

MR. GROH: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. GATES: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, my name is Chris Gates. I'm a resident of Seward. I am also honored by being the president of the Regional Citizens Advisory Council for Prince William Sound. The RCAC is an organization established under federal law under the OPA 90, the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, signed into law in 1990, signed by the President. Our RCAC was certified by President Bush a

ACE 6792619

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It appears to be that we will be recertified in this vear ago. coming month for another year.

As the designated Citizens Advisory Group for the Exxon | Valdez impact area, I'm here -- I heard your discussion with regard to wrestling with Citizens Advisory input. How to do it, the logistics, the mechanics of it. I want to tell you we're two and a half years into that process ourselves. spent roughly a million and a half dollars trying to do a good job to make sure that the people of the region are deeply involved with oil spill prevention and response, what's going on, how it will not happen again, why it will not happen again, and the citizens are very much involved with the effort of evaluating the science that's going on, evaluating the oil -the prevention efforts that are going on, and they're up to speed with the vocabulary which took about a year, and they're up to speed with some of the studies which are very complex as 17 | you say.

We have four operating sub-committees with now I would say trained people on them, trained citizens, housewives; port people like myself; citizens; Council members from various communities, but we're deeply involved in oil spill prevention response, and I guess the learning curve is something I would like to impress upon you. In your citizens advisory effort or your citizen input process, watch out for that learning curve. It is extremely long, and you might trip over it if you're not

3

4

5 |

6 |

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

aware of how long it takes ordinary people in the area to get up to speed on these subjects.

3 1 I bring up the RCAC as a mechanism, as a tool that you might want to use to provide citizen input. We have a staff. We have 16 representatives from all the communities in the Exxon Valdez impact area. They're appointed by City Councils in the aspect of cities, appointed by mayors. We have representatives from National Wildlife Federation, from Prince William Sound Aquaculture, from Cordova District Fishermen's United, from various groups, interest groups, such as those mentioned by Mr. Piper earlier in the evening. We are a functioning team. We try and deal by consensus. We don't do it all the time, but to organize 16, 18 people on a regular basis is not easy and we're doing a very good job at it. 14

Again, I offer the RCAC to you as a thought, as a way 16 to access the citizens of the region. I applaud your efforts 17 to go out to the citizens themselves and to see how they might 18 want to interact with the Trustees. I applaud your efforts to 19 do that, and the RCAC, the members of the RCAC, because they 20 are so involved with oil spill issues, I'm sure will have 21 comments in that regard.

I would offer the use of our team in the interim. 23 you want to do things with monies in the interim before you 24 establish a formal -- you call it a start afresh team, if you 25 will, feel free to call on our team maybe to give you a first

ACE 6792621

COURT REPORTERS

4

5

15

1 blush look at how you might want to spend monies. That might be a good way to use our team if you do want to start afresh. We are up and running. We have a staff here in Anchorage, and we have excellent communications with our people throughout the region.

I'm going to chop my comments off right there and just say that the citizens are vitally interested in the work that you're going to be doing. I am delighted to hear that the scientific studies are -- we're coming to some resolution on releasing the scientific studies. We all have been watching very carefully for when that might happen, and are looking forward to that. And you've got a good team of people out in the region. The RCAC itself is probably the best and the brightest of the region. We have been working as a team for two and a half years. I think we have over \$600,000.00 of in kind contribution of volunteer time, volunteer hours. huge investment of volunteer effort that I just invite you to take advantage of, and thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and for the time.

MR. COLE: Are there questions, Commissioner Rosier? MR. ROSIER: Question. What's the geographic area that you cover with this particular group?

MR. GATES: We cover the impact area of oil for the Exxon Valdez all the way from Kodiak. We have representatives in Kodiak, the Kodiak Island Borough, the City of Kodiak, and

ACE 5792622

COURT REPORTERS

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

17

20

21

23

Kodiak Native Chief. I'm not getting that name right, but
Kodiak Chief's Association, all the way up and through Cordova
with representatives in Cordova from the city, from Cordova
District Fishermen's United and from Prince William Sound
Aquaculture and in between, of course, the City of Valdez,
Alaska State Chamber of Commerce, City of Seward that I
represent, City of Whittier, Chugach Alaska Corporation and
their president is here tonight. We have, again, the region is
very well represented and the representation is established
under federal law to make sure that we are representative of
the region.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes, I was wondering if you could share or send -- have your staff send to Mr. Gibbons the list of interests that are represented on the group and also, what size of staff do you have?

MR. GATES: Okay, we've got seven full time staff now.

The -- our port operations team is operating in Valdez to look

at Alyeska shipping issues, tanker shipping issues. We have an

oil spill prevention response team operating in Anchorage and a

terminal operation, a terminal pollution team also operating

here in Anchorage. So, we have seven going right now. We have

about -- we have two million dollar a year budget. We have a

contract, a formal contract with Alyeska Pipeline Service

Company. We are a totally independent group that they fund at

ACE 6792623

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

15

17

20

22

24

that level each year.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Commissioner Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think we want to thank Mr. Gates for making that offer for our interim use of this group.

This is a proven entity that performs well, effectively, and we would do well to explore the opportunities for such use.

MR. COLE: Thank you, Mr. Gates. Mr. Toma. Oh, I'm sorry, was there a question? Anybody else? Thank you, Mr. Gates.

MR. TOMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll make my comments brief. I will preface by saying I don't think the settlement was in the State's best interest primarily because of the monetary terms and, of course, the litigation sensitivity has prevented the non-disclosure of economic damage information and the cutting loose of State citizens such as residents of native villages and commercial fishermen from litigation.

I had the opportunity in the last year, the last two years, to observe the settlement meetings and a number of the other meetings in Juneau having to do with the spill. I read all the 1990 and '91 damage assessment documents which were substantive and, of course, the restoration section and what I gleaned from all of that is the only restoration of any valuable use is the sowing of beach grass. I think it's a very valuable thing, but I think that's what it comes down to. We

ACE 5792624

aren't going to impact wildlife species; we aren't going to do
anything of any substantive manner in a natural way except the
sowing of beach grass, and I should point out that both DNR and
the U.S. Forest Service have spent tens of millions of dollars
in beach surveys to do precisely this, to find out those places
where beach grass should be sowed and I think those studies
should be brought to the forefront and that that restoration
should proceed.

I understand that there is over a hundred million
dollars available from criminal restitution in addition to the
monies should be used for the purchase of private land holdings
in spill affected areas and in the Lower 48 where migratory
species, especially bird species, use those areas and then come
to Alaska. I think it's a very, very valuable and a worthwhile
project that the federal government should get very actively
involved in to promote on this Council.

The State Trustees, as you know, have opposed this in
the past and I think it's just a very, very valuable
consideration that should be made. We have a lot of money
here, a lot of money that shouldn't be spent -- you know, after
the next year or so for any more studies. I think that we
should look very closely at what we have and look at some of
these areas down south that are being lost because of wetlands
loss and are very, very vital for migratory waterfowl that come

ACE 0792625

to Alaska.

2

3

5

6

7

8

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I also think that we ought to look at the redetermination of future resource uses in spill affected areas, specifically on Forest Service lands such as the Chugach Forest or Prince William Sound and parts of Afognak and Kodiak Islands. So, before these lands are logged, planned for logging or hunting lodges are established or fuel depots put in, I think the State Trustees should re-evaluate their strong position that they took last year not to purchase such lands for conservation and preservation purposes. I thank you for your time and any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

MR. COLE: Mr. Toma, I want to say this with respect to your recommendation or suggestion that some of this proceeds of the Exxon Valdez settlement be spent Outside. I was personally involved in the negotiations dealing with that subject back in Washington, D.C. and I made it very clear that so long as I was a State Trustee serving at the grace of Governor Hickel, I would never, never, never, never consent to spending one penny of that settlement money outside the State of Alaska.

MR. TOMA: Well, I guess I'd just have to ask why then, Mr. Cole? Why do you take such a strong stand on that?

MR. COLE: I will tell you why. The damage occurred to the natural resources in the State of Alaska and that's where the money to restore those damages should be sent, and I'm telling you, I'm never going to change my mind on that, thank

ACE 5792626

1	you very much.
2	MR. TOMA: I'm sure you won't. I can tell from your
3	tone, sir. I think you should look into fly ways though as
4	biological realities and
5	MR. COLE: Sure, I understand that, but
6	MR. TOMA: You do?
7	MR. COLE: I will never consent to that. I just
8	want you to know that. This money is to be spent in the State
9 !	of Alaska to restore the damaged resources injured in the state:
10	and frankly, I just don't think there's much dissent from that.
11	MR. TOMA: I don't think there is on the State
12	Trustees' side, no, sir. But if you're going to spend 500
13	million
14	MR. COLE: And we made it clear to the federal
15	officials that that's the way it was going to be, so
16	MR. TOMA: Well, that's why I disagree with this kind
17	of settlement if the State's going to take that hardline
18	position on natural resources.
19	MR. COLE: But maybe it's a good thing that there are
20	hardliners like me around so and maybe there isn't. Thank you
21	very much, Mr. Toma, for your comments. Yes, sir.
22	UNIDENTIFIED: I have two quick questions. Does Mr.
23	Gibbons have a phone number that we can use to contact him?
24	MR. COLE: Get the FAX number, too.

ACE 6792527

R & R COURT REPORTERS

278-8012.

25

MR. GIBBONS:

1	UNIDENTIFIED: Are you going to be getting to the rural
2	areas sometime soon?
3	MR. COLE: Yes.
4	UNIDENTIFIED: I have one more quick question.
5	MR. COLE: Yes, sir.
6	UNIDENTIFIED: I appreciated you saying that maybe in
7	30 or 60 days, the State data would possibly be available to
8	the public. Is that true with federal data as well or I assume
9	we're not going to get Exxon's data.
10	MR. COLE: Mr. Barton?
11	MR. BARTON: It's all both data. The holdup though is
12	because of some litigation that the State is now involved in.
13	UNIDENTIFIED: I understand that, but one problem is
14	the public is not going to be able to evaluate a restoration
15	effort as well until they see the data so they know what's been
16	damaged, what's been documented as damaged.
17	MR. BARTON: I agree with that. It's one body of data
18	is what I'm saying.
19	MR. COLE: Let me just say, I appreciate your concerns;
20	we're working on the problem; and maybe we're coming along with
21	the solution.
22	MR. GIBBONS: My FAX number if anybody wants it is 276-
23	7178.
24	MR. COLE: Yes, sir?
25	UNIDENTIFIED: I think something that might help this

group would be the definition of restoration be put on every agenda -- (indiscernible - away from microphone).

MR. COLE: All right. The more difficult definition is enhancement, by the way, but nonetheless we'll try to address both of those. Thank you. Yes?

> UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible - away from microphone).

MR. COLE: Sure. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible).

Pardon me? Oh, all right. Well, do we have MR. COLE: any other public comment here this evening? Yes, sir. you mind coming up here so the hinterlands can hear your comment?

MR. HAGENSTEIN: It's Randall Hagenstein and I've got just three comments. I want to reiterate that you can't have meaningful public participation without meaningful access to information. The point's been brought up and addressed. 17 | just want to hit on that one again.

Second, I quess I disagree with Commissioner Sandor on the point that we ought to be looking at existing agencies to take over a lot of these functions. I think that's a good way to spend a lot of money that will just get subsumed by existing ; bureaucracy and be used to increase the complexity of existing bureaucracy. I think we ought to be looking at fresh organizations that are outside of the existing framework.

And finally, I think we ought to be looking at

ACE 5792629

COURT REPORTERS

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

18 :

22 1

23

24

25

1 restoration money to restore the ecosystem and the ecosystem 2 | functions, not to enhance transportation or lodge opportunities or that sort of thing. Thank you. 3

MR. COLE: Thank you. More comments, please. We have no further comments at the meeting here in Anchorage. someone in the -- oh, Mr. Tillery?

MR. TILLERY: Yes, if I could just -- we received comments from the City of Cordova as long as you're moving to the rural areas

MR. COLE: All right.

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

21

22

23

..... and if I could just pass these out, MR. TILLERY: maybe you could -- (indiscernible).

MR. COLE: We received a copy of a resolution from the City of Cordova, number 91-92 and following the recitals, it says "Now, therefore, be it resolved as follows: Mayor and the City Council support the concept that the highest ! 17 priority use of Exxon settlement monies be the acquisition of 18 timber assets in and around Prince William Sound in order to conserve coastal forests for the public good and in the interest of oil spill restoration, and that the Trustees act immediately to secure lease option arrangements on these forests that would fairly compensate timber owners in the region in exchange for 2-3 year moratorium on all timber harvesting activities so that the Trustees can methodically 25 ∥ assess all acquisition options and integrate them into a

ACE 6792630

l:	systematic restoration plan without such options being
2	foreclosed. Passed and approved this 18th day of December,
3	1991. Mayor Charles K. Weaverly." Thank you.
4 i	Does anyone in Cordova wish to comment further on that
5	subject?
6	MAYOR WEAVERLY: This is Mayor Weaverly from Cordova.
7	Chairman Cole, can you hear me?
8	MR. COLE: Yes, sir.
9 i	MAYOR WEAVERLY: I'd like to thank you and the other
10	distinguished individuals around the august table for allowing
11	us this opportunity to speak.
12	MR. COLE: Yes, sir. Is there anyone there in
13	Cordova did you have further comments, Mr. Mayor?
14	MAYOR WEAVERLY: Just briefly, if I may. I'm pleased
15	to hear that the Governor's Task Force on the road will be
16	holding a meeting on the 9th of January in our community.
17	MR. COLE: Yeah, thanks. We've got Commissioner Rosier
18	straightened out, thank you. Would you like to continue,
19	please, sir?
20	MAYOR WEAVERLY: I would just like to state that kevlar
21	jackets and hats are not necessarily required attire in our
22	community.
23	MR. COLE: That's reassuring. Is there any further
24	comment in Cordova, please?
25	MAYOR WEAVERLY: That's it in Cordova.

ACE 5792631

MR. COLE: Thank you. Does any other station wish to 1 2 comment?

> MR. SMITH: This is Homer.

MR. COLE: Homer?

3

4

6

7

12

5 MR. SMITH: This is Larry Smith in Homer, and I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this and it's particularly good to be once again in the socratic presences of the sage of Southeastern, Mr. Toma, and Mr. Groh, the Baron of I have some preliminary thoughts on how to devise this program. I've been involved with a variety of advisory council activities in the state, and I must say that I think I 11 prefer what I took to be Mr. Cole's inclination to explore Mr. Piper's further -- I think that an advisory committee ought to 13 within policy limits be able to devise its own program, select its own officers and hire a director, have access to a legal 16 | staff of the Trustee's Council at times, to have a budget for 17 additional staff, for local clerical support, for advertising, 18 for public meetings, for monitoring the implementation of Trustee's policy decisions. I think it -- forest practices --20 | or a forest products, excuse me, industry representative would 21 be difficult to select and might have an undiluted economic 22 conflict of interest which would produce a lot of discord within the coterie of timber owners that would be interested. There might also be a modicum of conflict with aquaculture representatives, but the -- (indiscernible) -- is obviously

ACE 6792632

COURT REPORTERS

better there and regional aquaculture organizations are pretty likely to be in harmony on the important questions.

1

2

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

17

18

22

23

24

25

3 ! I would -- Mr. Gates offer was interesting and that the RCAC -- I happen to serve on that -- (indiscernible) -- form of RCAC that said these councils could be a source of some support to what I would rather see is an independent fresh and newly constructed advisory committee, and I made a chart while I was listening here and actually sort of selected who our representatives for the interest groups that you folks discussed from -- (indiscernible) -- keeping in mind that it's a lot easier for a nine member group to -- or a smaller group to work than a larger one, I started out with nine and found it impossible to accommodate the geographic interests as the --(indiscernible) -- of others identified. But I would be very happy to fax to Mr. Piper if we can have his fax number, how I would align these and perhaps he could distribute it to the Council. I won't take any more of your time, thank you.

MR. COLE: Thank you. I would like to say that Representative Gail Phillips there in Homer has been interested in this process and I -- so you may want to speak with her on some of your views because when she is in Juneau, she's very influential with respect to these matters on the state scene, and thank you. Any other comments from Cordova? Piper.

> Well, just excuse me, Larry requested our MR. PIPER:

> > ACE 5792633

COURT REPORTERS

fax number. It's 563-1325.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

14

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: I meant to say any other citizen's comments from Homer?

UNIDENTIFIED: Representative Gail Phillips was here for the first half of the meeting but she had to leave.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

MR. BECK: This is Carl Beck in Cordova.

MR. COLE: Yes, sir.

MR. BECK: Do I have the floor or is there someone else waiting? I

MR. COLE: No, no, you may have the floor.

MR. BECK: Thank you. All I wanted to say is just that I urge your deep consideration of the resolution issue and just a quick comment on -- a public comment. Maybe in the future, I realize that you're in the early stages of this process, but in the future, it would probably be helpful if you were to break your opening presentation some way, maybe mid-way through the presentation and allow some input or at least the audience in Anchorage and the teleconferees. It gives people a lot more faith that there is a connection there, and I guess that's basically all I wanted to say. Thank you.

MR. COLE: Thank you. I thought of that, but we'll think about that again later. Thank you. Commissioner Sandor, did you have a comment? Does anyone else have public comment?

MR. JENKINS: This is Valdez.

ACE 6792634

MR. COLE: Yes, sir, go ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JENKINS: This is Valdez. This is David Jenkins with the Prince William Sound Conservation Alliance, and I, like everyone else, I appreciate the input. I also very much appreciate the Trustee Council's concern with too big of a growing bureaucracy and the continuing studies, especially the Attorney General's concerns along those lines and also the concerns of Mr. Sandor for the problem that could develop with the State agencies doing normal work out of these monies. I very much appreciate that.

I wish to -- you know, emphasize that we can assess and ! study and gather information and build an -- (indiscernible) system and before you know it, the money will be gone and the Sound is being further impacted during all this time through the long term problems from the spill as well as the deforestation that's taking place and it's -- (indiscernible) -- further damage being done there. You know, I've got --(indiscernible) -- information and that is that damage was done there and is continuing and that didn't cost anything. wish to support the resolution from our neighbors in the City of Cordova and hope that all of you will realize that whatever we do, the main reason for it is to heal the environment of Prince William Sound, Kenai, Kodiak and all affected areas. look forward to Chenega and Tatitlik being involved in --I'm not sure if -- (indiscernible) -- or what (indiscernible).

ACE 5792635

1	the problem was. When (indiscernible) they are and they
2	don't realize it, but again, thank you very much. I'm looking
3	forward to the next meeting.
4	MR. COLE: All right, sir, thank you very much for you
5	comments. Any other community on line?
6	MR. SPICER (ph): This is David Spicer in Homer. I'd
7	like to comment just briefly in I guess support of Attorney
8	General Cole's comments about the (indiscernible) about
9	spending a lot of the money on studies and not spending it on
10	actually enhancement and restoration of the spill damage. I
11	share those fears. I think that as he said, we could study
12	this for 15 years and still not be done studying it. So, I'd
13	like to encourage you to wrap up the studies that are ongoing
14	and then get on with identifying areas that need to be
15	protected and restored. Remembering extensive spill damage
16	that was caused on the outer coast of the Kenai Peninsula and
17	in Kachemak Bay State Wilderness Park, thank you.
18	MR. COLE: And thank you, sir, for your comments. Are
19	there further comments on line?
20	UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible).
21	MR. COLE: What did you say again, please?
22	UNIDENTIFIED: Kodiak.
23	MR. COLE: Yes, Kodiak. Come in, Kodiak.
24	MR. PATRICK: My name is Greg Patrick and I appreciate
25	the opportunity to comment. I also want to support the

ACE 6792636

resolution from Cordova and I feel that there should be some immediate effort on lease options on various -- lease options or conservation easements on areas that based on immediate threat in terms of habitat development, and these should -- I guess my main point would be -- (indiscernible) -- these options at this point.

And also, one issue that comes up, the issue of accountability and for anyone, a representative or a Trustee who's making decisions based on public comment, I would like to see all the public comment recorded and published and to see a system set up where there's ease of accessibility to this so that this will promote better understanding of what's happening in other communities and also, generally help the people have the feeling that there is some accountability.

MR. COLE: All right, sir. We have and are preparing, are we not, gentlemen, the verbatim transcript of all of these proceedings, so I want to assure you that that is available. I don't know where they are. Mr. Gibbons, where are they being

MR. GIBBONS: They're presently housed in the Public Information Center on 625 D Street.

MR. COLE: All right. Any further comments from Kodiak, please?

MR. PATRICK: I appreciate that and this should be expanded to include written comments, too. Okay?

ACE 6792637

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: Include what? Written comment. 1 Yes, sir. we will have those available at the same repository. 2 UNIDENTIFIED: We have one more person. 3 4 MR. COLE: All right. 5 MR. HOLM: Mr. Chairman, this is Oliver Holm in Kodiak. 6 Do you hear me okay? 7 MR. COLE: Yes. 8 MR. HOLM: Mr. Chairman, I'm the advisory board, the 9 local Fish and Game Advisory Board chairman and chairman of the board of directors of the Kodiak Regional Aquaculture 10 Association and a board member of the Herring --11 (indiscernible) -- Seiners Association. All three groups have 12 13 represented people that have been directly affected by the oil spill in the Kodiak area, and we want to be involved in restoration planning and in the other public process, and once 15 16 we're able to listen in to what you're planning here and I quess we'll await an opportunity to participate in the future. 17 18 MR. COLE: All right. Perhaps sometime we can hold one 19 of these meetings in Kodiak and Valdez, maybe even Cordova. 20 All right, any other comments from Kodiak? 21 No, thank you. UNIDENTIFIED: 22 Thank you very much. Any other station on MR. COLE: 23 line have anyone who wish to comment? (Indiscernible) -- from Cordova. 24 UNIDENTIFIED: 25 MR. COLE: What did -- (indiscernible)? Nothing more

ACE 5792638

from Cordova? Does that conclude all requests to comment from
the on line communities?

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

UNIDENTIFIED: There's one more here from Cordova.

MR. COLE: All right, one more from Cordova. Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: This is Bob Anderson. Amongst other things here in Cordova, I'm a Cordova City Councilman. there is a possibility of using RCAC as a conduit was discussed and I don't know that I feel comfortable with that. I know when I cast my ballot -- (indiscernible) -- representative for the City here at RCAC, we looked at places to represent us on spill cleanup and prevention. I would suspect maybe at least I would go back to my fellow Council members and possibly have to ask for a reconsideration of that. We feel that or I feel that we picked a good candidate to represent us in those two areas. We could envision them representing our community, our end of the Sound here on this particular issue. I certainly can't speak for the City, but that's how I feel and I think I could make a convincing argument to the people I serve the community with.

MR. COLE: Thank you. I think someone here on the Council this evening expressed the same thought. Any other comments from Cordova? Anyone else on line?

UNIDENTIFIED: This is Cordova clear and out.

MR. COLE: Thank you. I think that, ladies and

ACE 6792639

Thank you

gentlemen, concludes that -- did those comments prompt any other request from anyone here this evening to for attending. Good night. Merry Christmas. (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

& R COURT REPORTERS ACE 6792640

CERTIFICATE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) Ss.

STATE OF ALASKA

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I, Karen E. Squiers, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 124 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustee Council, taken electronically by Laurel Kehler, on the 10th day of December, 1991, at the hour of 6:30 o'clock, p.m. at the Alaska Public Utilities 1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 305, Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the Transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Donna Barrington and myself to the best of our knowledge and ability.

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 9th day of January, 1992.

> Notary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires:3/29/94

OFFICIAL SEAL STATE OF ALASKA KAREN E SQUIERS

BOOKERS CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR

NOTARY PUBLIC

ACE 5792641

4

AGENDA EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Alaska Public Utilities Commission 1016 West 6th Avenue Suite 305 Anchorage, Alaska December 19, 1991 6:30 p.m.

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS

Charles Cole, Attorney General State of Alaska

John Sandor, Commissioner
Department of Environmental
Conservation, State of Alaska

Carl Rosier, Commissioner Department of Fish and Game State of Alaska Michael Barton, Regional Forester USDA Forest Service

Steven Pennoyer, Regional Director National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration

Curtis McVee, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Alaska Department of the Interior

OPENING STATEMENTS

- 1 Organization
 - RRCG Member Identification
 - Sub-Groups
 - Operating Procedures
- 2 Public Participation
 - Public Advisory Group
 - Public Involvement Process
- 3 1992 Restoration/Damage Assessment Activities
 - Restoration Framework
 - Damage Assessment and Restoration Work Plan
- 4 Public Comment Period

PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP Draft interest list

- 1. Aquaculture
- 2. Commercial fishing
- 3. Commercial tourism
 - 4. Conservation
 - 5. Environment
 - 6. Forest products
 - 7. Local government
 - 8. Native landowners
 - 9. Recreational users
 - 10. Sport hunting and fishing
 - 11. Subsistence

. •

EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING DECEMBER 19, 1991

httendees (please print)

Affiliation/Address

Mailing List (√)

JERRY DRUSHER RUSHER'S SERVICES WasiNa, AK 99687
Oil Spill Public Information Leader
Carrie Holla 1645 GSt. And 99501
Borbara Iseah 645 GSt. Anch 99501
PANI GERTLER Andwago, AK 99503
Silsan Saupe UAF/IMS Fairbanks, Ar 99708 _ <
Ju Sallion ADFols Anchorage AK 99516
Diroll Totanit Village of Cheurge Bay Chause Ber 855 79 V
There Skilstad 8621 Fock Ave #6 Amhorage AK 9950
FayE SKU/stad 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11
Chiel To-feine If Box 60 Chedin Ban AK 893 74
Steve later the full ormation.
191-5 Gusiness Pork Blick Anch Ak Gaso 3
Anch Ak 44.503
David Bruce ADEC
Susan Pulda Networkonsovenus
Steve Plandos "1" 5-3 =5-3(0)
Dov. McDannold He 03 BUX4012 V
Chuck Curry He 03 Box 8012
STAR ROGSINS 3111 e ST, 99503
FRANKIE PILLIFANT 1960 WILDWOOD LN 1517
20 0 40358
RANDALL HAGENSTEIN Anchorage AK 49510-0358 Please add to list.
Ken Chalk 4311 Suystène Circle
Pan Miller The Wildeniers Society side 20 And 99501 -
Linda L. Benevell 11355 Frontage Road Suite 228 Kerri (1961)
· ·

EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING DECEMBER 19, 1991

EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING DECEMBER 19, 1991

tendees (please print)	Affiliation/Ad	ldress	Mailing List (√)
Carol Gorbic	s US Fi	sh & WIdlife Seru	/1 c
Dan Hamson	U.S. Wation	al Park Service - And	chorage
Sandy Robinswitch U.S.	Dept. of the Inter.	on 2525 Jembell 5. And	1.AE. 59503
Mary Mile a	Loile Pulli	Info Center Co:	45 6-St 99501
Gerst Briston	CACI 64	5 G. St. auch.	99501
Rebecca Williams	CACT 1045 GS	teet Anch 9950	
Anne Wieland	KBCC 1421	VSt Anch 99501	·
Jay Nelson	Rep Cliff Davi	dron State Capita	1 Junear AK 99801
1	P.C. 3 X 5	Employed ==	1
TOM STARR	Alpiska Kes	iden-ElOSISONSSL	1AS/ HAK 91681
Louenn Rank	ctr. for the Ewing	ormant / P.OB. 212309 A	nchorage 99521 (v)
Tohanna Munson	Sen. Curb Men	ard 165 E. Parks Hw	y Wasilla 99654(V)
GREG WINTER	ADEC/EVO	SRC 4241 "B" S	ST. ANCH, AK 99503
yaris 5	DEC /EVOSRC	4241 B-St, Soit	6304, Anch 99503
Jan Forrier	Attanney	2550 Dendi ST Sui	4604 Anch 99503
R.L. SLEATER		FED. BLG. , ANCHE	
RONALD B. MECOY	DOI/SO	1699 CST, "100	2. ANC. AK 99501
Clarg Clonno2	DOAN GC	1600 Sain Point-L	/ - 1 1
Jim Wolfe	USDA, Forest Se	rvia Juneau,	AK 99801
Bob Burd	US EPA	1200 6th Ave Seattle, U	1a, 9810!
			······································

TRUSTEE COUNCIL

Mike Barton Regional Forester U.S. Dept of Agriculture Forest Service P.O. Box 21628 709 W 9th Street, Rm 543 Juneau, AK 99802	(907)586-8863 (907)586-8856 - FAX
Charles Cole Attorney General Rm 412, Capitol Bldg P.O. Box K Juneau, AK 99811	(907)465-3600 (907)463-5295 - FAX
Steve Pennoyer Director U.S. Dept of Commerce NOAA P.O. Box 21668 Juneau, AK 99802-1668	(907)586-7221 (907)586-7131 - FAX (907)871-7221 - FTS
Carl Rosier Commissioner AK Dept of Fish and Game 1255 W 8th Street Juneau, AK 99802	(907)465-4100 (907)465-2332 - FAX
John Sandor Commissioner AK Dept of Environmental Conservation P.O. Box O Juneau, AK 99811	(907)465-2600 (907)465-2617 - FAX
Curt McVee Special Assistant to the Secretary United States Department of the Interior Office of the Secretary 1689 C Street, Suite 100 Anchorage, AK 99501-5151	(907) 271-5485 (907) 271-4102 - FAX

.

DRAFT

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL RESTORATION AND DAMAGE ASSESSMENT TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING PUBLIC UTILITIES HEARING ROOM **DECEMBER 19, 1991** 6:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES:

Affiliation Name

Jerry D. Rusher Rusher's Services

Carrie Holba OSPIC Barbara Iseah CACI Paul Gertler **USFWS** Susan Saupe UAF/IMS Joe Sullivan ADF&G

Darrell Totemoff Village of Chenaga Bay

Thor Skulstad Faye Skulstad

Chuck Totemoff Chenega Corporation Steve Rehnby The Eyak Corporation

David Bruce ADEC

Susan Ruddy Nature Conservancy

Steve Planchod Dori McDannold Chuck Curry

Stan Robbins Rep. Max Gruenberg

Frankie Pillifant Randall Hagenstein

Ken Chalk

Pam Miller The Wilderness Society

Linda Bonewell

Doug Miller National Wildlife Federation

Dan Saddler Anchorage Times

Bill Walker

City of Seward Chris Gates

Darryl Schnefermeyer

KENI Radio Brian Hart

Byron Morris NOAA

Cliff Groh Ellamar Property Ken Rice USDA Forest Service

Mark Fraker ADF&G

Pamela Brodie Sierra Club

Blaine Hollis USCG

Donald Kompkoff Sr.

Rita Miraglia

Jayne Soutag PWS Economic Development Council State of AK, Dept. of Commerce Dan Golden Neil Anderson Chugach Alaska Corporation

Chenega Bay, Alaska Philip Totemoff

Gregg Erickson Erickson and Associates Mike Barker

John McMullen PWSAC

Ted Raynor

Alan Phipps A.C.E.

Jill Parker U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Carol Gorbics " '

Dan Hamson U.S. National Park Service

Sandy Rabinowitch DOI
Mary McGee OSPIC
Terri Bristow CACI
Rebecca Williams CACI
Anne Wieland KBCC

Jay Nelson Representative Cliff Davidson

Theresa Day

Tom Starr Alaska resident

Louann Rank Center for the Environment, Mat-Su Valley

Johanna Munson Senator Curt Menard

Greg Winter ADEC
L.J. Evans " "
Jan Fortier Attor

Jan Fortier Attorney

R.L. Sleater DOI Ronald B. McCoy DOI Craig O'Connor NOAA

Jim Wolfe USDA, Forest Service

Bob Burd U.S. EPA

Trustee Council

Charles Cole AK Attorney General John Sandor Commissioner, DEC Steven Pennoyer Reg. Director, NOAA

Carl Rosier Commissioner, AK Fish and Game

Curtis McVee Special Assistant, Dept. of Interior Michael Barton Reg. Forester, USDA Forest Service

The agenda was distributed

Cole - he introduced the members of Trustee Council and also introduced Administrator Reilly's representative, Robert Burke; at the last meeting each Trustee member was afforded the right to name one member to the Restoration Resource Coordination Group (RRCG); Dave Gibbons, the executive director, was introduced; the following designees were announced: Jerome Montague, Stan Senner, Marty Rutherford, and Ernie Piper; Cole asked for opening statements

McVee - he recognized the interior member on RRCG as Pam Bergmann with Cordell Roy as her substitute

Pennoyer - Byron Morris is the NOAA representative on the RRCG

Cole - trustee members on the federal side were asked to give

opening statements; none were given

Cole - he requested statements from the RRCG; none were given

Cole - presentation of subgroups was requested from Dave Gibbons

Gibbons - the trustee council requested initiation of tasks including public advisory groups and a draft restoration plan; four small interim sub-groups were established using existing staff:

- 1. Restoration Framework Group prepare draft restoration framework in March, 1992 and initiate draft restoration plan for March 1993
- 2. NRDA/Restoration 1992 Work Plan prepare draft 1992 work plan for damage assessment activities in March, 1992
- 3. Public Participation Group develop an interim public participation plan
- 4. Budget and Process Group develop recommendations regarding such items as specific budgets

approval was requested to continue groups

Pennoyer - how many members are in each group?

Gibbons - the number is not determined at this time

Pennoyer - he might be able to comment on adequacy and composition later in meeting

Cole - will these people be members of the RRCG?

Gibbons - there are members of RRCG in these group with additional personnel; approval was requested to continue with process until final organization is completed

Cole - there were no objections; it was so authorized

Gibbons - approval was requested to start some operational procedures; he would like to initiate some activities

Cole - Mr. Tillery has done some work on operating procedures; are there any objections to the request?

McVee - he had some comments on Tillery's product; it was a good effort and will work; one area of concern is the appointment of a designee in case of failure of a council member to attend a meeting; the council might want to broaden this out other than illness or vagrancy; there needs to be a clear understanding that the designee would carry the same vote and be able to conduct business

Pennoyer - an additional factor is that you don't want different people at the table each time; designees should be identified for purposes of consistency

Cole - are there any other comments?

Pennoyer - regarding the concept of quorums, it might be alright for certain purposes

Cole - a quorum is not equivalent to the vote of all six; we will proceed in accordance with the MOA

Rosier - regarding meeting notices and agendas, the list should be expanded to other communities for public notice

Pennoyer - regarding item 14, he is not sure a decision has been made regarding cost

Cole - his position regarding notice is we should see how much notice we can give and how far in advance; steps should be taken to put notices on Alaska public radio; also publishing the agenda should be considered

Barton - he thinks the agenda should be published

Cole - it was requested that Dave Gibbons follow through on this

Gibbons - Mark Brodersen was identified

Gibbons - some thoughts regarding meaningful public participation were discussed and Ernie Piper will share this information

Piper - he is the on-scene coordinator; he requested four authorizations for administrative housekeeping issues; diagram shows how the public can participate but is not intended to be specific; authorization was requested to make this a part of a package for the public; the following opportunities for meaningful public involvement were discussed:

Level	<u>Opportunities</u>
Information Availability	<pre>-public access resource center -public outreach (news releases) -mailings (agendas and minutes) -educational programs</pre>
Planning Process	-community meetings -PAG staff participation on RRCG -review and comment-draft products
Decision Making Process	<pre>-open Trustee Council meetings -public advisory group input</pre>

he would like to establish an interim public information organ and discussed the following options:

- 1. delegate to the oil spill response center
- 2. could use CACI
- 3. could locate an oil spill specialist

his personal recommendation is the oil spill response center; authorization was requested to conduct a public comment period; the existing mailing list could be used to ask people for written comment; information could be collected and revised to make a good strong draft proposal for public participation; the pro is that this is a good way to talk with people; the con is the time frame and getting to everybody

public advisory group - should provide meaningful oversight; it should be pointed out that the mission of the group has a direct effect on the composition of the group; the following ways the group would participate were discussed:

- general oversight policy make sure that policy choices reflect the wishes of the public
- 2. advice to trustees
- fiscal oversight

are we seeking a consensus? is the goal access? the public needs access to someone they trust; we are seeking guidance on the types of things expected of the public advisory group; the following public advisory group draft interest list was provided:

agricultural
commercial fishing
commercial tourism
conservation
environment
forest products
local government
native landowners
recreational users
sport hunting and fishing
subsistence

Cole - general comments were requested

Piper - his personal recommendation is to get together the best options and put them together as a package; mailings should be used to get to the principals

McVee - he is concerned with the issue of going out with a written inquiry; he is a proponent of going out with a summary of injuries and the information of the advisory group and asking people early on to give comments in meetings; a stronger perception of what we want will get the maximum input from the public and should be conveyed; it would be very positive followed up with a draft and another set of public meetings

Rosier - regarding the planning process, the issue should be addressed if there would be a separate staff for the public advisory group

Sandor - he endorses the use of the existing public information center; it would be well advised to continue that effort; he has some concern about the public advisory group and feels some alternatives should be looked at

Pennoyer - a suggestion was made that items be reviewed one at a time

Cole - he prefers listening to oral views as he thinks that people have the belief that they don't write well and are hesitant to express views in writing and agrees with McVee that the council needs to get out to the bush and let people express themselves fully

Pennoyer - he thinks the more often the council can do that, the better off we will be; a preliminary round of public hearings should be conducted and then a plan developed; after this a second round of public hearings should be held

Piper - a series of meetings were held like this last year and we managed to get everywhere; this is not a problem; we are experienced and prepared to go

Cole - each item should be gone over

Piper - his diagram lists some options being considered and would like to bring this out for public comment

McVee - the resource center could be used as a focal point for public inquiry

Piper - it would be involved in collecting public comment and should be located within DEC as a funnel for public inquiry; this is within his budget

McVee - there would need to be a linkage with the RRCG regarding policy or fiscal response

Piper - this has taken care of the request to conduct hearings or meetings regarding proposals

Cole - we should try to limit the use of acronyms to alleviate confusion

Piper - under letter f (public advisory group), principal interests could be used as a discussion point; a request was made to make this part of the comment package

Sandor - he has concerns regarding the definition of the group and alternative mechanisms; a letter was received suggesting utilizing community leadership such as mayors and city councils; there may be other established groups that might represent the community also; has this possibility been considered in public participation?

Piper - under letter e, if we are looking for consensus, you would want a very small group; if the point is access, you can expand; in terms of using existing institutions, this may or may not be desirable; one problem in using community leadership is they may not always be able to hone in on the issues

Sandor - the extensive knowledge that has been built up with respect to cleanup work should be used and this expertise taken advantage of; he would like to see a bridging of knowledge between cleanup and restoration efforts; a member should be designated on the public advisory group; we should regularly interface with those in the group

Barton - Sandor raised an excellent point and we should look at how to use existing institutions

McVee - does the federal advisory act apply; it requires a cross section of all interest groups represented

Piper - he is in the process of looking at that; if the act does apply, identification of principal interests becomes very important

Cole - he received from Representative Kubina a recommendation of the broad use of elected community leaders; he disagrees with this and thinks that it is vital with respect to policy decisions that we have a broad range of views by the interest groups in the oil spill area; the views of a broad spectrum of the groups out there are needed and it is a mistake to try to utilize groups which were formed for some other purpose; we should start afresh

Rosier - he thinks that there is a pretty good balance in the groups identified so far; this is a good list to go out to the public with; regarding consensus, from the size of the issues dealt with, we do want specific information and some consensus from the public; the consensus type structure appeals to him

Cole - it is a big mistake not to listen closely to the interest

groups; if you don't listen, they will find some mechanism to make their voice heard

Pennoyer - he doesn't see how this group relates to other public access; is this group a funnel? he is not sure about consensus versus access

McVee - he suggested that to start to get some focus on how the advisory body would function, we should develop some type of charter for the public to look at

Cole - does this give some consensus to start with?

Piper - we do need to have a charter and the guidance received will allow us to do that

Cole - what is expected from this group of diverse interest? what will be asked of them - obviously a lot of scientific studies; he envisions them helping in making policy cuts

McVee - input into criteria used for selecting further monitoring efforts should be used for selecting restoration projects and is very essential; background will have to be provided; advisory groups and the public might reach some conclusions on this important area

Sandor - he agrees with McVee; this organization will be in operation for some time and thinks the group will be very helpful regarding policy; other entities should be looked at as well; this will have to be cultivated and it should be very clear that we are willing to listen to everyone

Cole - are there comments on section d (fiscal oversight)? - what do you foresee as the oversight group's role in this?

Piper - this covers whether it appears that importance is being placed in one area and money is put into backing it up

Cole - what about scientific oversight?

Piper - this entails understanding and coming to clear judgements about whether it is good science and is being put in the proper areas; we need some technical guidance

Pennoyer - the peer review process will be needed; he envisions looking at statistical procedures

Piper - this does not mean scientific auditing

Sandor - how much time is needed to organize a charter?

Piper - we will spend February devising a charter

Rosier - regarding the recruiting process, have you given any thought to this?

Piper - whatever the interests are, it is imperative that the nominations come from within the communities rather than leaving open the possibility of someone being handpicked

Cole - we will look at this closely and give thoughts at the next meeting; this is a very important area, and we could get into a lot of trouble in this area; how late does the council wish to go? he would like to reserve time for public comment; there were some concisive comments made at the last meeting and 30 minutes should be reserved for public comment

Rosier - we should go until 9:00 and have public comment from 9:00 to 9:30

Cliff Breaux - he would like five minutes of the council's time

Gibbons - he thinks we can meet this schedule; everyone was directed to the signup sheet at the door and those on teleconference were advised to send a signup sheet to him for mailing lists; Stan Senner will discuss the restoration framework group

Senner - the approval item for consideration is whether to proceed with the draft restoration framework document; the contents were addressed; framework is a way to brief the public with two documents - Volume I and Volume II; these documents would come out simultaneously and would be ready for distribution in March of 1992; Dr. Montague will discuss damage assessment; we might look to various mechanisms to facilitate public comment; the heart of the document would summarize restoration planning activities and highlights of what we have learned; it would include a summary of injury (18-page summary) and all the damage results which have been completed and peer reviewed; these sections represent a mix of what has been learned and would propose to the public the criteria to select options and narrow lists down to those which are relevant to restoration of the injured species; these are based on the eight scoping meetings; the last section would describe the structure being set up and a tentative program for public participation; it should be noted that the framework will capsulize where we stand based on additional comment; we should have a solid basis for drafting a restoration plan; the target date is March of 1993, a year after the framework document has been released; framework is a preliminary statement to invite public comment; the draft of the restoration plan evolves from this framework and is much more detailed; the final restoration plan would be supplemented by annual work plans; this is no small undertaking and there are numerous policy questions that need the council's input; there are a number of factors that fit in:

- 1. staff resources dedicated to task
- 2. how quickly able to complete and synthesize results
- 3. what are the steps necessary to complete with the national environmental policy act
- 4. what is the level of detail and credibility

McVee - this would meet the requirements; policy should be to close out NRDA studies so information will be available to the public; there is a sequency dilemma; there is critical work to do, and data needs to be collected; a structure needs to be developed as rapidly as possible; everyone has to have an equal opportunity

Sandor - when is completion of the draft plan anticipated?

Senner - draft restoration plan targeted for March of 1993 with framework completed in March 1992

Sandor - will it be possible to identify projects of high priority to be done in 1992?

Stan - there are a number of policy components; do we want to proceed with implementation or limit activities to further studies?

Barton - he has the same concerns as Sandor

Cole - he has a lot of reservations about this proposal and sees a big bureaucratic machine starting to formulate with stacks of paper; he is concerned about the process we are getting into and wants to be sure that we husband these resources very carefully and concentrate on spending for the restoration of the sound

Barton - he feels very strongly that we get a maximum amount of money into restoration activities; we can't spend the bulk of money on studies and bureaucracy; the framework with some modifications might serve the purpose of a more comprehensive plan

Rosier - he hopes we are striving for a balance between research work and actually doing the work; information is needed to make decisions

Pennoyer - we are faced with a dilemma; we want to make sure we do the right thing so that we don't repair something that is not broken; we shouldn't wait forever but we have to look at the information to make sure we are making the right choices

Sandor - it might be advisable to listen to Mr. Montague to give a projected fiscal note on what will be expended in 1992 with regard to long range plans and studies; there is concern about bureaucracy and how much funding will be committed to this plan of action

Rosier - he would like some feel for the total dollars expended

Cole - how much money is in the bank?

Senner - he would have to defer to Mr. Gibbons on this

Cole - there comes a time when the time for study is passing us by; his belief is that we have to husband these dollars and spend them very carefully and not have a huge framework writing reports; the time has come to get down to the restoration process

Dr. Montague - he would like to bring council up to date on where we are regarding damage assessment, restoration and continuation of the 1989 process; the principal investigators were asked to prepare their proposals and annual reports; proposals were received in November and evaluated at a two-week meeting in December; we are not entertaining implementation proposals presently; the following criteria were used for information gathering projects:

- 1. documentation of probable injury
- estimated time needed for natural recovery
- restoration activity or endpoint that may result from this study
- 4. need for the proposed study with respect to the ability to carry out future restoration activities
- 5. technical feasibility of the proposed study and the prospect for success
- 6. importance of conducting the study in 1992 (i.e., Would delay beyond 1992 result in a lost opportunity?)
- 7. the cost of a proposed study relative to the degree of injury or to the value of the potential restoration outcome

he recommends that damage assessment studies be brought to a conclusion; reports are available between now and June of 1993; our estimate of cost to close out damage assessment is 8 million dollars; numerous restoration proposals were received which are extensions of damage assessment studies presently going on; many of which are contingent upon receipt of detailed study plans and detailed budgets; estimates for information gathering proposals for restoration would be 17 million for 1992, in addition to the 8 million; approval was requested to ask for detailed proposals

Cole - of the first 90 million, 24 million went to the federal treasury and 29 million to the state fund for reimbursement of expenses; this leaves 35 million

Montague - a good many of the projects are monitoring damage, and in some cases the damages are getting worse

Barton - some of these are continuations of the damage assessment

studies; are we talking about natural recovery monitoring?

Montague - that is correct

Sandor - is this for calendar year 1992?

Montague - it covers the period March 1992 to February 1993; 75% of the damage assessment studies will end for sure; 25% may or may not

Sandor - is the restoration planning cost another item?

Montague - yes; administration cost is 15% to 20% of projects, and the restoration framework planning process would be 1 to 5 million

Sandor - we need to spend some time on this particular aspect; does this include overhead of the management team? we are talking about 25 to 30 million dollars; he is concerned that we definitely want to close studies in a scientific manner; there appears to be very little restoration work for 1992; the troublesome part is that four years will have passed between spill and restoration; he is worried about being accountable regarding what restoration work is done

Barton - spent over 100 million dollars on damage assessment which began very shortly after the spill; he is puzzled why there aren't some things that we have learned in the last three years regarding what we can do to restore the impacted areas; he realizes this is a complex issue

McVee - also coming out of the 90 million is the cost of any cleanup activities; what has to be done to close out the various studies?

Montague - approximately half of that or somewhat less is for actual field work and the remainder is the reports and samples that haven't been analyzed

McVee - is there any way to look at the impacted area in a comprehensive way so we could get some feel for what has priority? we need to identify what resources we need to evaluate some more

Montague - projects are species-specific; damages to the ecosystem can be described quite well; regarding what have we done for restoration, we have done a tremendous amount; the results of studies have made dramatic improvement in protecting the resources; in many ways the management actions taken will restore them; in some ways that is probably the cheapest expenditure; without information some harvests might have been closed

Pennoyer - we have spent a lot of money on damage assessment; we need to tie it together and describe what happened; it is very difficult to comment with no projects in front of us; it is presumed you will come back with what the expenditures mean; we should not miss any opportunities; a session needs to be scheduled to discuss the details fairly quickly

Rosier - there has been no public input into the process for the 1992 field season; some further detail is needed in regard to total dollars; Mr. Montague is interested regarding whether to proceed with specifics

Sandor - he would like to elaborate on Rosier's point; council should give some guidance; he recommends that it be kept as simple and lean as possible; organization should be minimum in size and process cost as tight as possible; existing agencies should be utilized; we should involve the people who worked on the spill cleanup and begin integrating them; the process of integrating should be kept in mind; the spill fund should not pay the whole bill; the restoration framework might be used to begin some restoration work; this group deserves guidance from the council

Cole - he thinks the analysis is outstanding and congratulations are in order on the work product presented; he is stunned over the amount expended for 1992; how come studies cost so much? he can't fathom how costs could reach 25 million

McVee - some specifics are needed; what can be closed out and what needs to be continued? we need to look at other restoration sources

Montague - a list of projects and background are available, but due to litigation sensitivity they are not made public

Cole - we are making progress along those lines

Pennoyer - we need to bring this to closure; he is not sure what we are telling them to do with the 1992 work plan and has no concept to evaluate; a timeframe is needed on this to make a decision; we want to be able to entertain alternatives for restoration

Barton - he suggests that the RRCG be asked to proceed to develop a detailed study plan and would like to see a matrix of the damage assessment studies outlining what will be closed out and why and those that will continue and why and what our best estimate of cost is? the council needs to go into executive session due to litigation sensitivity

Rosier - Mr. Montague stated it might be tough for the public to make suggestions for restoration; he doesn't think it needs to be

species-specific

Pennoyer - the restoration planning group has made progress regarding certain restoration; time is needed for presentation of this information

Sandor - a high degree of professionalism has been observed; we can be reassured that pencils will be sharpened and these activities will be very closely scrutinized; he felt this was an excellent session

Rosier - he wished to compliment the group on their twelve-day session of reviewing studies

Cole - can the substance of studies be realized for less money? we should look carefully at the cost; he expressed appreciation for the work the group has done; the council is very concerned about maximizing the restoration

Montague - is there approval to go ahead with the plan?

Cole - yes

Gibbons - is there approval to go ahead with the restoration framework?

Cole - yes

Brodersen - would like to point out that development of the plan would cost less than 1%; Exxon setoff comes in December of 1992; criminal restitution should be considered also

Rosier - we have not talked about all the funding sources; we have only talked about the 90 million

Pennoyer - regarding the Spies contract, do we have to make a decision regarding extension?

Gibbons - yes

Pennoyer - are we thinking about extension

Cole - Dr. Spies should be identified

Pennoyer - he is our chief scientist under contract and has been the focal point for science reviews

Gibbons - that is quite correct; his contract expires on February 8; we are not sure how long we will need him but he should be extended an interim contract until later

Cole - we may want to get a series of three month options and give 60 days notice

Alex Swiderski - he currently has two contracts - one with NOAA and one with the Department of Law

Cole - would you work with Mr. Tillery regarding this issue?

Swiderski - yes

Cole - how much does Dr. Spies receive?

Swiderski - about \$25,000 per month with staff expenses

McVee - it is reasonable to look at some extension; how we appoint subcommittees should be discussed

Cole - when is the next meeting? we should have one in January; the next meeting is scheduled for January 10th; it is now time for public comment

Cliff Breaux - he is here on behalf of the residents of Ellamar; he acquired Ellamar which has nine full time residents; nobody has consulted them; he has over a million dollars invested in these properties and is the biggest single owner in PWS; who will the Sound be preserved for? the purpose should be to enhance the use of the Sound by the public

Cole - we will look forward to hearing from you in the future and you will be on the mailing list

Chris Gates - he is a resident of Seward and president of the regional citizens council; it is an organization established under federal law; it appears it will be recertified for another year; the citizens are very much involved with evaluating the science that is going on and have learned the vocabulary; the council should watch out for the learning curve of how long it takes to bring ordinary people up to speed; there are 16 representatives from the impacted areas; they are a functioning team; he offers his group as a way to access the citizens; his group is being offered in the interim before the start afresh approach is begun; the citizens are vitally interested; there is a huge investment of volunteer effort

Rosier - what is the geographic area?

Gates - it covers the impacted areas; the region is very well-represented

McVee - could your staff send a list of interests represented on the group? what is the size of the staff? Gates - there is a staff of seven right now with a 2 million dollar budget

Sandor - he thanked Mr. Gates for his interim offer

Toma - he had the opportunity to observe the settlement meetings; nothing of any substantive amount will be done naturally; thinks bulk of money should be used for private land holdings; federal government should actively promote this and should look at the redetermination of future uses; trustees should reevaluate their position not to purchase land outside Alaska

Cole - he was involved in negotiations dealing with this subject and would never consent to spending one penny of that settlement money outside the state of Alaska; the damage resources occurred in the state of Alaska

Audience - what is the phone number for Dave Gibbons?

Gibbons - phone number is 278-8012; fax number is 276-7178

Audience - it might help if the definition of restoration was placed on agendas

Randall Hagenstein - you can't have meaningful public participation without meaningful access; he disagrees that we should use existing agencies and should look at fresh organizations outside the framework; money to enhance ecosystems should be looked at

Tillery - he distributed comments to the council members received from Cordova

Cole - a resolution regarding access of timber rights was read; comments from Cordova were requested; the mayor expressed that he was happy the council members would be there in January

Larry Smith of Homer - an advisory committee ought to be able devise its own program; he thought Mr. Gates' offer was interesting and feels they could be a source of some support; what is Mr. Piper's fax number?

Piper - fax number is 563-1325

Carl Bagger in Cordova - he urged deep consideration of the resolution that was read; in the future it would be helpful to break the opening presentation midway to allow some input from audience and teleconference

Cole - he had thought of that

David Jenkins in Valdez - he appreciates concern over too big of a bureaucracy; damage was done and is continuing; the main reason

for doing anything is to heal the affected areas

David Stitzer in Homer - regarding spending a lot of the money on studies, he shares those fears; we could study this for 15 years; he encourages the wrap up of studies and that we get on with restoration

Greg Patrick in Kodiak - he supports the resolution from Cordova; there should be some immediate action toward lease options; main point is not to lose options at this point; on the issue of accountability, he would like all public comment recorded and published to promote better understanding of what is happening in other communities

Cole - verbatim comments are being prepared and will be available

Gibbons - they are available at 645 G Street

Oliver Holman - he would like to be involved in restoration planning and awaits some opportunity to participate in the future

Cole - perhaps in the future we can hold meetings there

Bob Anderson in Cordova - he doesn't feel comfortable with using RCAC; they picked a candidate for prevention and not these issues

Cole - meeting was adjourned at 9:55