| 1 | | |
|----|--|---------------------------------------|
| 2 | EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT | |
| 3 | Trustee Council Egan Civic & Conference Center Space 4 555 West Fifth Avenue Anchorage, Alaska February 5, 1992 11:00 o'clock a.m. | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | IN ATTENDANCE: | |
| 8 | State of Alaska | MR. CHARLES COLE Attorney General |
| 9 | | Council Meeting Chairman |
| .0 | State of Alaska Department of Environmental | Mr. JOHN BANDOR Commission |
| .1 | Conservation | Commission. |
| .2 | Alaska Department of Fish and Game | MR. CARL ROSIER Commissioner |
| .3 | USDA Forest Service | MR. MICHAEL BARTON |
| .4 | | MR. DAVE GIBBONS |
| .5 | | Regional Forester |
| .6 | National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration | MR. STEVEN PENNOYER Regional Director |
| .7 | United States Department of the Interior | MR. CURTIS MCVEE |
| 8 | | Special Assistant to the Secretary |
| 9 | •,• | |
| 0 | | |
| 1 | | ∕ ₩ |
| 2 | | |
| | • | |
| | | • |

R & R COURT REPORTERS

24

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. PENNOYER: I think we might as well go ahead and

PROCEEDINGS

get started with this the fifth -- fourth meeting of the Trustee Council of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement. ahead and briefly introduce the people at the table; I'm Steve Pennoyer, I'm the NOAA Representative, I'm with National Marine Fisheries Service in Juneau, Alaska. To my left is Charles Cole, Attorney General for the State of Alaska, to his left is Curt McVee, Special Assistant to Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior. To my right is Michael Barton, U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service in Juneau, Alaska; and to his left is -- right is John Sandor -- I'm sorry, I had one more, the table's longer in that direction than in this direction -- John Sandor, Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation, State of Alaska. To the far left is Carl Rosier, Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. To Mr. Sandor's right is Dave Gibbons, he's our acting Executive Director and Chairman of the RRSG, the Restoration Planning Team or I hear you have a new name, Dave.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, we hope to.

MR. PENNOYER: Do you want to introduce your folks at the table too, then, please,

> MR. GIBBONS: Sure.

.... on the Restoration Planning Team. MR. PENNOYER:

MR. GIBBONS: I'll start at the other end of the table. On the far end is Cordell Roy and Pamela Bergmann representing the Department of the Interior. To Pamela's right is Byron Morris representing NOAA, National Fishery Service. On my immediate right is Mark Brodersen representing the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. To Mark's right is Jerome Montague representing the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. To Jerome's right is Ken Rice representing the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. And to Ken's right is Marty Rutherford representing the Alaska Department of Natural Resources and the Department of law.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Dave. We also have Bob Bird (ph) here from the EPA who advises the Federal Trustees on administration matters. And, i think the purpose of the meeting today is to go over our plan for activities for the 1992 year and beyond. And, we've the Restoration -- I'll let you talk about your name change in a minute -- the Restoration Planning Team working hard on our instruction on the project budgets for the '92 season and the -- and support costs to cover it.

So, the purpose of today is to look at that package and decide what we need to send out to public review in time to get it back, re-review it and get something in-place for the 1992 Field Season. I think we're going to meet here for an hour or so, take a lunch break and go on, we're going to have a

R & R COURT REPORTERS

teleconference tonight starting at 6:15 p.m. Dave, is that
what we're scheduled for?

MR. GIBBONS: 5:00 o'clock.

MR. PENNOYER: 5:00 o'clock, sorry. I told you

(Off record comments)

forgot -- lost my glasses on the plane.

MR. PENNOYER: We'll be meeting all day tomorrow starting at 8:30 in the morning.

MR. COLE: Apparently, they're not hearing you out there, Steve.

MR. PENNOYER: Are those things working? Is this better?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can hear you (ph).

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. We'll be meeting here tomorrow starting at 8:30 in the morning; we'll again have the teleconference tomorrow night starting at 5:00 o'clock and take public comments at both those teleconference periods. There — I think what we'll do now, unless — first of all, do Trustee Council Members have copies of the Agenda? I believe — were copies of the Agenda made available, Dave, to the public as well?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, they were.

MR. PENNOYER: So, they're out on a table out there.

Does anybody have any changes or additions at this point to the

Agenda or should we start down through it and play it by ear?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 277-0572 OR 277-0573 277-8543 277-7515 272-3022 FAX 274-8982

Yes, Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any additions to the Agenda, I have two informational items that I can pass out if we're going to have an introductory statement of each of the Commissioners.

MR. PENNOYER: That's fine, why don't you go ahead.

MR. SANDOR: The first item, Mr. Chairman, is just a news release dated January 26th of 1992 of a French award of 204 million dollars in the spill case Amoco Corporation must pay the principal award of the 204 million dollars in an Appeals Court ruling that was issued that Friday prior to this news release date.

The point that I wanted to call to the attention of the Restoration Team and to the Trustee Council that this accident which occurred 14 years ago, and of course the subsequent award had been made and then appealed; 68 million gallons of oil were lost, this more than six times the nearly 11 million gallon Exxon Valdez Spill in 1989.

And the other point I want to make is that I suspect since this was a very important wildlife resource area that there may be scientific studies that had, you know, been generated in that area. And I am hopeful that we're communicating with scientists in other areas that are doing damage assessments and restoration work on other oil spills. And I think this is an interesting case. I think it's one we

ought to be following, and I think it's one in which we can put our award in perspective.

So that's an information item, the second item that I'd like to just introduce and pass onto the Restoration Group is a proposal to establish a settlement endowment fund. And both Governor Walter Hickel and Secretary of Interior Manuel Lujan had proposed that a substantial part of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Fund be placed in endowment of trust fund, and Mead Treadwell, the Deputy Commissioner of ADEC and my alternate to the Trustee Council, have developed three possible scenarios which are outlined here.

Mr. Chairman, all I'm doing is referring to this, as I have already by telefax yesterday to Dave Gibbons and his Staff, and just suggest that they look at these, look at other alternative proposals for an endowment fund and, perhaps, at the next meeting, refer -- place this on the Agenda and -- for our consideration and possible action.

That's all the comments I

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. SANDOR: have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Go.

MR. COLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Sandor, are copies of this available for those who are independents at this meeting?

MR. SANDOR: We'll make them available. I have some

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

but this crowd is larger than I've got.

MS. RUTHERFORD: There are six extra here.

MR. SANDOR: And, there's -- here's about six or ten more.

MR. COLE: I should say we should make arrangements to have copies of that available to anyone who would like to have one, so perhaps, after lunch or during the moon hour we can do that.

I would like to say also at some appropriate time, I would like to make a relatively short statement of my views of my -- our legal obligations as a Trustee sitting on this Council. And sometimes, I suspect that my approach to proposals which come before the Council are not understood in the light of my views of the legal obligations of a trustee. I will elaborate more on this subject, perhaps, when, Mr. Chairman, you think it appropriate.

But as I view our legal obligations, it's essentially that of a common law trustee in the classic trust sense. And, therefore, each decision which is made by a trustee must be formulated or arrived at with those legal principles in mind; and that's what I have tried to do. I come from, more or less, a legal background, and I feel comfortable in those general areas. And, perhaps, I should earlier have expressed publicly by views as to the approach we are, at least as I view myself, required to make.

So, if you would allow me that curtesy at some juncture when you think it appropriate. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Mr. Cole, if you want to do that, perhaps now would be a good time before we start taking decisions at this meeting. If you some views you wish to discuss, perhaps you should do it at this time.

MR. COLE: Well

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: That's okay.

MR. COLE: I thought I would duck that a little bit.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I'm willing to let you duck it if you want but

MR. COLE: And you put it right back into my lap.

Well, let me simply say this, I will endeavor to keep it short

but I requested the Department of Law to prepare a memorandum

of its views to see whether the legal research has confirmed by

visceral feelings based upon some sense of the law of trust.

And I think I'm generally pleased to say that they have.

I start with the proposition that trustees under the Clean Water Act or Circular (ph) Act are really -- are trustees in the common law sense. And that we are trustees of the natural resources which have been injured as a result of the spill, that we serve as trustees, that in general the corpus or the trust race is that of the recovery, the settlement funds, and that the beneficiary of this trust are the natural

resources of the Government's which have been injured as a result of the spill.

Then what are the obligations of us as trustees in administering this trust, which is the framework of, like I say, a standard common law trust. And those duties are bound not so much in statutes that we're dealing with here; you know, I think, however, when the statutes were enacted, it was generally presumed that the Trustees would act as trustees in the framework of a common law trust.

So, I just want to briefly touch upon what the common law has -- over the last two or 300 or more years has settled upon as duties of common law trustees. But supplementing that, I think we have a Memorandum of Agreement here between the State and the Federal Governments approved by Judge Holland which sets forth in a little more detail, but largely in the language of the statute, the responsibilities of the trustees.

And here's what I think they generally say. First, we have a duty to administer the Trust, that seems obvious and clear. Second, we have a duty to administer of the Trust solely in the interest of the beneficiary and for the benefit of the beneficiary; i.e., the damage to natural resources, the equivalence.

Some question I think exists as to the scope of our ability to delegate those duties. The historic common law view has been that these duties may not be delegated. That means,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

as I see it, that if that rule of law were applied literally, only the designated trustees could make the decisions.

There's been some deterioration of that strict common law rule that's developed in recent years, I think properly so. But as I sense our duties here, when you couple that legal responsibility with the very clear duty to exercise reasonable care and skill in administering the Trust and preserving the Trust property for the benefit of the beneficiary; i.e., the resources, et cetera; I think it's incumbent upon certainly me, I view it as my obligation, to personally satisfy myself that each of these expenditures are within the scope of the central purpose of the Trust, and that they're in furtherance of our obligation to restore the damaged resources or equivalent services, and not simply to accept what is presented to me as a trustee by our expert staff and advisors.

And it is for that reason that I asked questions of the Staff to satisfy myself that we are on track in carrying out the purposes of this trust and fulfilling our duties. And I say that because I have the sense that, you know, there is likely to be litigation claiming that we have not fulfilled our Trust duties and responsibilities in administering this Trust. And I want to be prepared to say that if such litigation arises, and I am deposed with respect to any singular expenditure or decision, that I can fully and to the extent of my abilities, ably respond to those questions comfortably

R & R COURT REPORTERS

saying this is why I voted the way I did, these are the reasons for it and this is why I think that I voted entirely within the scope of my obligations as a trustee. MR. WHITAKER: Excuse me. I'm a member of the public, and you've cut the testimony all the way back to 5:00 o'clock. When I'd just like to say at this time that while you're being apologetic for the vote where you're going to spend 90 million dollars and give no money to restoration, I really object to that. And, I'd also like to say that I think it's premature for you to be spending any of this money until the Legislature and, possibly, their litigation like you're talking about MR. PENNOYER: Sir, can we MR. WHITAKER: on that issue it revolves (ph). MR. PENNOYER: Can we wait for public testimony? Well, that's fine. MR. WHITAKER: We will take it. We're not going to MR. PENNOYER: make any MR. WHITAKER: But see, you've got a bunch of people up here in suits and you've got all this lined up to spend all this money and restoration is going to (indiscernible interrupted) Sir, nothing is lined -- .. MR. PENNOYER: No.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-0572 OR 277-0573 277-8543 FAX 274-8982

MR. WHITAKER:

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

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-7515

..... 90 million dollars.

MR. PENNOYER: Nothing is lined up to spend any money.

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-3022

I think what Attorney General Cole is trying to say is that our 1 2 decisions on this have to be reached after examination of the 3 projects, after receiving the input from the public on what 4 we're planning to do. 5 MR. WHITAKER: After you've done study after study after study to pay 6 7 MR. PENNOYER: 8 MR. WHITAKER: yourself \$42,000.00 a year. 9 mean, come on. 10 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Can we proceed to let Attorney General Cole 11 MR. COLE: Sir, would be good enough for the record to 12 furnish us with your name and address? 13 MR. WHITAKER: My name is Jedd Whitaker (ph), I'm on 14 record out there. I'm just saying I'm objecting to the 15 proceedings right now because of this. 16 17 MR. COLE: Thank you for your views, they're a matter of record. 18 But at any rate, I want to be entirely comfortable with 19 20 my decisions and, perhaps, with background and that explanation, maybe you will understand how, at least in any 21 event, I am proceeding in the course of these decisions which 22 we are about to make. Thank you. 23 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Cole. 24 I think it was

very appropriate you made that statement at this time. And

again, following up on what the gentleman said, if there's a perception that we are -- have made these decisions in some fashion, that's not true. And I think what Mr. Cole says is entirely correct; we've got to examine the proposals that have been put in front of us, see how they fit our trustee responsibilities. We instead to send them fully out to the public and get a full public comment before both of these hearings and in writing before we take any final action.

So, really, we have not made these decisions yet, and I think your remarks are entirely appropriate. Does anybody else wish to add to that or are there other comments before we start with the rest of the Agenda.

Okay. Perhaps, in the time left before lunch, we could deal with a few things, Dave, like the name change for the Resource Restoration Coordination Group; that sounds like a very significant item. Why don't you lead us down through that one.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we get there, I need to make a couple of announcements to the public so some of the handouts are understandable. I've got — I apologize to the public for not having these binders to every member of the public out there; it was physically impossible to get them to them. There's six copies back there that you — that the public can use and look at, and they're right there in a box. And I — like I say, again, I apologize for only having

R & R COURT REPORTERS

that number of copies, but it's a rather lengthy document and we finished it this last weekend or even Monday or Tuesday.

Not in that package is another staple handout out there, and it's four multi-agency projects that should go into that binder and should go into your package, your handouts out there. And it includes some subtitle, inter-title and some mussel bed work, and then also, some plan association GIS work. So that should go into your package of handouts.

The binders, just a quick statement, are recommendations, they're not decisions; they're recommendations to the Trustee Council by the Restoration Team. And they're suggestions, and so we're intending this to be an open process and to discuss these.

And with that statement I'll ask the Trustee Council to accept a new name for this group. We were initially called the Resource Restoration Coordination Group and that was quite a mouthful and we kept stumbling on it, and the suggestion to the Trustee Council to rename this as the Restoration Team; it's a simple name and the team concept.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I move acceptance of that name change.

MR. BARTON: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: Any objection? Any discussion or objection?

MR. COLE: No.

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. PENNOYER: No? 1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 2 No, sir. 3 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. It's all right. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 4 MR. GIBBONS: I'll move onto the next item. 5 I have to apologize again here, this is to Mr. O'Connor, I misspelled his 6 7 name on the Agenda; his name is O-R not E-R. And Craig gets to talk a little bit about the chief scientist contract. 8 MR. O'CONNOR: Thanks, Dave. 9 That's all right, it's a small problem. 10 MR. PENNOYER: 11 MR. O'CONNOR: The last time the Trustee Council entertained the concept of extending the contract of the chief 12 scientist. We had a contract that was entered into during the 13 litigation phase of the Exxon Valdez case, and there was a 14 desire to extend that contract to complete the work of the 15 chief scientists on the damage assessment and restoration 16 planning phase of the Exxon. 17 The issue that was presented was a mechanism for 18 19 extending that contract and the costs associated with it 20 and COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, sir, could you go over to 21 the microphone so I can pick you up. Thank you? 22 23 Is this better, can you hear me? MR. O'CONNOR: The issue was the mechanism for extending that 24

R & R COURT REPORTERS

contract, the potential financial obligations that would be

incurred by the Trustee Council in doing that. The principal issue had to do with potential termination costs because the structure for the contract at this point is an option contract, and to exercise the option, that option has to be fully funded through the Federal Government system. That funding was \$191,000.00 for an eight month period of time; that included both the costs of the chief scientist and his staff, and overhead and support, and his travel associated with performing work under the terms of the contract on behalf of the Trustee Council.

The Attorney General's Staff and I discussed the terms of the contract with Bob Spies, the chief scientist and reflected the concerns of the Trustee Council on (1) having — being required to fully utilize the provisions of the contract in the sense that if we commit to eight months, do we have to pay for eight months; are we committed to spend the entirety of the \$191,000.00.

The answer to that is no, we are not. We are able to utilize that contract to the extent that we deem it appropriate. And if it's not necessary to incur those costs for the full period of time, it's not necessary to do so. So, if your decision was that we need to retain the services of the chief scientist for a three-month period of time or until a certain event has occurred; i.e., the publication of the framework plan or some other event; his services then could be

R & R COURT REPORTERS

reduced and eliminated at that point.

The other issue is would there be significant termination costs associated with not fulfilling the total extent of that contract. And the answer to that is that there would not be. We have talked to Dr. Spies, he is aware of the fact that his services under that contract may be substantially truncated given the status of the process and the desires of the Trustees to move from the damage assessment focus to a restoration focus, and his services may not be necessary or may be necessary in a substantially reduced load. And he has indicated that he understands that, and that his willingness to accept the exercise of the option is understood to be that it may be limited, and that we would not be expecting him to create a situation where there (ph) were substantial termination cause. He should be phasing down his operation, unless he's otherwise advised by the Trustee Council.

The fact that the contract is an option contract has created a time problem for us; the option has got to be exercised by tomorrow. We have, in place, a mechanism that if the Trustee Council approves the exercise of that option, I am told we can go ahead and fund that contract with the understanding that at such time as the Trustee Council presents to the court a bill or a petition, if you will, for expenditures of for funds to be released from the Registry's Report (ph) with the understanding that NOAA would be

reimbursed for that contract expenditure, so we could go ahead and exercise the option if the Trustee Council deems it appropriate.

That is before you at this point.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Craig. Are there questions of Mr. O'Connor?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

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. PENNOYER: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Is there any period of notice we have to give to Dr. Spies in order to conclude the contract? I should think we would be required to just properly give him say 30 days notice, or 60 or some period of time so he could put in (ph) businesslike fashion and wind up his contract service.

MR. O'CONNOR: There is no minimum time requirement that I am aware of, but I think it would be appropriate, as you suggested. I think we have put him on notice already that the duration of this contract may be substantially less than the eight months.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. Yes. Mr. O'Connor, I guess one question, and maybe it's a matter of understanding kind of the payment process. If we were to, you know, draw down from the account -- joint account and then deposit or -- with NOAA the 191,000, would -- if that is not used, would it be reimbursable to the account? Is there some way we can be

reimbursed or is the proposition that you're talking about that 1 we would only pay that part that's used, we'd only be 2 reimbursing NOAA for that -- for the actual costs? 3 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, you would have to give us, at this 4 point, the full amount; to the extent that it was not utilized, 5 then we would reimburse it to the Trustee Council and into the 6 Registry account or wherever else it was directed to go. 7 MR. PENNOYER: Other questions? 8 9 MR. COLE: I have, Mr. Chairman. NOAA is, of course, prepared to put that in writing, I presume? 10 MR. O'CONNOR: You have my word on it, Mr. Attorney 11 12 General. MR. COLE: Well, you know, I have sometimes these views 13 that well, it wasn't authorized, you know, or something like that. I think we should get it -- you know, a signature of 15 16 Dr. Kanouse (ph) or whomever is the appropriate authorized representative of NOAA that that will be the case. Like I say, 17 we're acting as trustees. 18 MR. PENNOYER: I'm sure we can prepare the appropriate 19 20 memorandum. John. Just a question or affirmation. 21 MR. SANDOR: correct then to understand that this 191,000 is not to be 22 23 exceeded but could be substantially less? MR. O'CONNOR: That's correct. 24

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: And it's for an eight month period?

MR. O'CONNOR: That's correct.

MR. SANDOR: Up to an eight month period?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, sir.

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. PENNOYER: Perhaps, it would be appropriate for Dave to say a few things that they're doing in interacting with the chief scientist and peer review on the preparation of the restoration plan.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. The activities have been going on as we're trying to wrap up the damage assessment studies that were initiated in 1989, and Bob's an integral part of that, providing an unbiased scientific review of what's in there. And that he's -- through a synthesis process and with peer reviewers those -- that work is looked at in detail and scrutinized and will be eventually made available to the public. So, it's an independent scientific review.

MR. PENNOYER: We have discussed it in the past. And yeah, Mr. Barton. And I'd agreed on the need for it and the question was (1) how to do it and over what period of time. I think the proposal Mr. O'Connor has put in front of us -- can I have a motion of some kind?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the proposal as outlined by Mr. O'Connor for Dr. Spies' services. I think he has provided a very valuable service to us over the past two and a half years, and I think for the sake of continuity and an effort to bring the NERTA (ph) studies to

closure that this would be a very worthwhile investment.

MR. ROSIER: I'd second the proposal.

MR. PENNOYER: Moved and seconded. Is there further discussion? Is there any objection to the proposal? So passed. Thank you.

Dave, do you want to go onto Permanent Organization including Personnel & Budgets, perhaps, and then we could maybe look at that over lunch after your presentation?

MR. GIBBONS: Sure. Yeah. I'm the lead on this but this is really a Team activity; so, I'm sure that the Team — if I miss something, the Team will make sure and voice their opinions.

Up on the flip-chart we put an organization you can't read but you have in your package. When after I put it I realized you can't see it from back here. But it's really -- it's right after the Agenda in your package, it's our suggested organization to the Trustee Council. I'll briefly go through that, and then we can go through the personnel and the budgets associated with that.

The Trustee Council was approved at the first meeting on December 5th, and the six members were identified as well as the Restoration Team; the members were not identified at that time. It was suggested that an administrative director be established to act as a Chair for this group, and we've identified that person with some duties supporting the

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

development of a plan and the Restoration Team.

We've identified some subgroups. You'll notice the footnote on the bottom, it says that these will be formed and disbanded as needed. These are all not -- some of the groups were established before the Settlement and some of them have been established after. The ones before the Settlement were -- you'll see Arch on there, we have an Archeological Steering Group comprised of members from the Trustee agencies with expertise in archeology that review archeological injury and proposals.

We have a GIS Group that's been formed that reviews specific proposals for data and as well as maps. GIS sometimes people think of as maps, it's the data overlay also; so there's some data bases involved with that.

We've had a Restorat- -- before the Settlement, we had Restoration Planning Work Group. We propose to have a Restoration Planning Group that will provide the restoration framework next month and provide a restoration plan, or whatever the decision of the Trustee Council in regards to the activities of that subgroup.

We have a Public Participation Group headed up by Ernie Piper. If I can back up just a second. The Restoration Planning Group is co-chaired by Stan Senner from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game and Susan McMullen (ph) from the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Public Participation Group is chaired by Ernie
Piper from the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation.
And we'll get a presentation from Ernie a little bit later on what that group is doing, but they're in the middle of public scoping sessions right now. I understand they were, what,
Valdez and Tatitlek yesterday?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Um-hum.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: So we're in the middle of that. We have a 1992 Work Plan subgroup that prepared a lot of the material that's in the book here; that's co-chaired by Jerome Montague, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and Byron Morris from NOAA, Alaska Marine Fishery Service.

I mentioned the Archeological subgroup and the GIS subgroup; that the Archeological subgroup is chaired by the State Historic Preservation Office, and the GIS, we're in the process of reviewing that now.

The Budget Process Group is chaired by myself, and it involves laying out the processes for administrative records, budgets, structures, those types of things. In the interim, I will give an extreme amount of credit to Cordell Roy. In the crunch period we've been, Cordell has filled in as the chair of that group and done a great job.

We have a Habitat Protection Lands Group that we were directed last meeting to form. We have some proposals to the Trustee Council on that group. And the formation of that group

or the make-up of that group is presently undecided.

We have a Financial box to the side, our proposal here is to have several members from the agencies; perhaps, one from the Federal Government and one from the State Government; to provide oversight and coordination to manage these budgets. I expect, you know, these budgets will be extremely scrutinized to where the money's going and how it's spent and we need financial accountability, and so we formed a group there.

Does the Trustee Council have any comments on this before I get into the structure -- the specific structure and costs?

MR. PENNOYER: Any questions on the general organization? You are going to cover the specifics in some of these blocks in a little more detail?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, we will.

MR. McVEE: I'll get back to it at that time.

MR. PENNOYER: Go ahead.

MR. GIBBONS: If you'll flip to the next page, these are the detailed budgets; it's titled "Exxon Valdez Post-Settlement" dated 1/31/92. And what we've tried to do here is lay out total costs for the operation, and that's what these reflect.

Walking through the first item, the Trustee Council on the organization, we may be incorrect on some of these salaries, we didn't ask the Trustee Council how much they were

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

paid; we took some guesses. And we've identified them in here as salaries, per diem and travel for the meetings and the work that they do.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. How do you propose

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: How do you propose we proceed or are we going to look at these budget items by group, or as they've been spelled out in this document or should we go through the entire administrative proposed organizational budget and then come back to them individually?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, I thought in the time we had before lunch, we'd let them run through the whole package and have a chance to think about it over lunch, and then come back and go through them one at a time, if that's okay with the rest of the Council members.

MR. COLE: Well, my thought is that I mean it's really sort of pretty self-explanatory. I mean I've read this, I presume everyone else has read it. And we could save some time if we just -- you know, if no one has any questions about what's presented here, that's my only thought. And what do other members think -- Trustees think?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman. Yes. I think Charlie has hit on a good point here on this. I think that the way it's broken down, I think we ought to just charge right in and move

right through each one of these individually, get them out of the way.

MR. PENNOYER: Do any of the other Trustee Council members care to comment? That's fine. Let's do it that way then. We have the first one in front of us then that was presented to us on the Trustee Council. Are there comments or questions? Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I guess I have some questions in regard to the need for salaries for the Trustee Council themselves on this. And why should the Settlement monies actually go for salaries at the Trustee Council level when, basically, we're all salaried people operating — that were identified as part of the Settlement. But I really find it difficult to see us hitting the funds available for this program for salary money for this level, quite frankly.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'd like to direct a question on this to Mr. Gibbons. Was this proposal -- or did it contemplate a reimbursement to the various agencies of this type of salary or does it contemplate a direct payment to the Trustees of the salaries that are projected here?

MR. GIBBONS: What it would actually be would be an actual -- we would hope it'd be an actual cost to the salaries incurred.

MR. COLE: Reimbursement to the

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

MR. GIBBONS: Reimbursement. 1 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well to the agency. 3 MR. GIBBONS: To the agencies. MR. COLE: Well, I would like to say was that your 4 understanding? 5 Yes, that was my understanding. 6 MR. BARTON: 7 MR. COLE: Well, I would like to say the Department of 8 Law will not take any salary reimbursement, and will not take 9 any per diem for my per diem expenses and will not take any reimbursement for salaries. I don't want to go so far as to 10 say I would object to what other Trustee members might do or 11 want to do on the subject. But that's certainly the position 12 of the Department of Law which will be followed. 13 MR. PENNOYER: Does that cover travel, too? 14 15 MR. COLE: Yes. It covers everything. MR. PENNOYER: Does anybody else wish to comment? 16 Mr. Barton. 17 18 MR. BARTON: I, too, reflect Mr. Cole's philosophy on this, and the Department of Agriculture will forego any of 19 20 this. I would go so far as to move that we strike this item from the budget. 21 I would second that. 22 MR. SANDOR: MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee. 23 I ask that my comment that I know MR. McVEE: Yes. 24 that for the remaining of this fiscal year that Interior 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 277-0572 OR 277-0573 277-8543 277-7515 272-3022 FAX 274-8982

doesn't have any great problem in that there are appropriated funds, you know, to cover. I guess I can't predict what's going to happen from the Interior standpoint for the next fiscal year; hopefully, that, you know, we could take the same position as the other Council members in that respect. But it is a bit of an unknown quantity for my office at this point in time.

I think the thought behind it originally MR. PENNOYER: was that some work you might have been doing or some other things an agency might get done are not going to get done because of the amendment (ph) for either travel or per diem or I think that's the original reason it was included. salaries. If you strike it from the budget is the -- I think the implication is, Mr. McVee, that you're not going to -- we're going to all agree that we're not going to claim any travel or per diem or salaries. And I think in terms of tra- -- I guess the only concern I have and, Mr. Cole, is I agree with you on principle, is that if we are traveling and spending a lot of money doing something related to this that means I'm not going to Dutch Harbor, or I'm not going to a Council meeting or I'm not doing something else, there are other expenditures that are going to be taken away from them, you still have to do.

So, it again was a reimbursement type of thing more than -- I didn't expect the salaries to be paid either.

Mr. Sandor.

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

MR. SANDOR: Yes. I seconded it and speak in favor of the motion, Mr. Chairman, because the Commissioners' duties, as defined, encompasses a broad range of activities that enter into, you know, virtually a full spectrum of Government, State Government and interrelations with Federal Government.

Similarly, to travel to individual places also for multiple purposes, I believe it would be inappropriate for me to accept either reimbursement or an allowance for travel or per diem; and thus, speak in favor of the motion.

MR. PENNOYER: Any further comment? Yes, Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Maybe one further comment. I guess part of Interior's problem or part of my problem may be more associated with the period of time that we're considering here; this is a March 1 to February 28th budget basically, which doesn't fit within either the State or the Federal Government's fiscal year process.

And I agree, you know, it gives us a basis to look at costs of 12 months period, and then that we can prorate, you know, how that's going to effect on us on a fiscal year basis. But I think part of my problem is that, you know, I don't know where Interior will be in terms of appropriations for the '93 fiscal year.

I feel like I will support the motion on the basis that we will have appropriated funds. And if we don't, then the seat may be vacant I guess, but we'll see.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Well, I'd like to comment.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

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: Here's my view. I mean it's the State which, you know, is responsible for most of this travel expense; I mean this is largely here in Anchorage where the Department of the Interior is, Number 1, the State Trustees have to travel from Juneau. So, we are the ones that are having a large — bearing the brunt of the travel expense, Number 1. And Number 2 is if you look at the State budget for the, you know, coming year, it's going to be far less and far more difficult for the State to share or shoulder these burdens than it is for the Department of Interior.

And I'm just making a little suggestion that you keep that in mind.

MR. McVEE: I will.

MR. COLE: Thanks.

MR. PENNOYER: I think NOAA's going to support this as well. I think, in general, we're making — this is a good policy decision but it's a very small part of the overhead; so we're still going to get into a lot of overhead discussions. Again, like Mr. McVee, we'll have to see what budgets bring; but this is relatively, obviously, a small expenditure for each one of us in terms of total (ph); in principle, it's a good way to go.

So, is there any further discussion? Is there any

objection? Okay. This special item is struck.

Do you want to go ahead? Dave, you're on a roll, you might do yourself out of the whole package here if you keep it up.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Moving to a Public Advisory Group, this is still -- we're -- like I mentioned earlier, the Public Participation Group is out soliciting public input on the makeup of this group and their activities. And we're in the middle of that process, but we wanted to reflect some thoughts, perhaps, on the makeup or cost of this group for your information.

We thought it was necessary to have public advisory group coordinator liaison person to help with the information transfer, to attend the meetings; we know the public is busy as well as we are; to provide the information to the Public Advisory Group. We've got some excellent input, perhaps, we need more that one public advisory group; perhaps, they should be regionalized. That decision hasn't been reached yet. And then we've included some costs there for postage, and phones and some estimates that we see there.

We identified some community meeting costs. We expect that they would like to meet other than in Anchorage, they'll probably meet in Kodiak or Cordova or wherever, and we should identify those costs as costs that will be incurred into the process.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions of Mr. Gibbons? Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: I guess, Mr. Chairman, I'd raise a question of process, and specifically, what action we might be taking and whether it's a tentative action, interim action. Certainly, this is one I think we'd want the comments of the public on the adequacy of the public participation process and, in fact, the size and makeup of the whole Public Advisory Group and the public participation plan itself.

It's my personal opinion that what we probably should do on this particular item is give an endorsement or take an action that would endorse the process of forming a public advisory group, of funding it at some level, that the nature of it is to be defined and the final funding levels to be developed in the public participation process itself. Is that what's intended, Mr. Gibbons?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. We were trying to identify some costs that are really unknown at this time, and it was kind of tough to deal with it. But we were trying to provide with an entire cost estimate for the process. And we know these are — you know, we need the public input on the number of members, and how many meetings they want to have and the structure; if they want to have a coordinator or a liaison, all of these are up to the public. But we were trying to identify a placeholder number, perhaps, to identify some kind of a cost associated with this group or groups.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I assume that the 2,227 is your best estimate of given what we know now, and it's not merely a placeholder.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, it's what we have, you know

MS. RUTHERFORD: I think, Mr. Chairman, I might add something to that. This was our best estimate a week ago, before we were getting some of the input from the communities. The more meetings we attend, the more indication that there is that there may be a very strong desire for maybe regional public advisory groups, at least three.

So this is a very low estimate, it's a placeholder but I think it's somewhat low.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Dave, what -- in terms of the whole package, how do you view our action on this package in terms of making money available immediately; are we going to use this to go out and try and get some funds on the short-term? Is a part of what we're going to send out for more public review and make a later decision? What parts -- are you identifying the parts that you need answers on right away in terms of expenditures?

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. What we'd like to do -- and this is an unknown. We need some money to operate, and we'll identify those as we move through them. This is not a critical number, perhaps, until that gets formed. But the Agreement says we'll have a group, I think, identified in 90 days. So we

R & R COURT REPORTERS

were trying to get some kind of a number there that we could get this group rolling. And so we could -- whatever the format of this group, we have some money for them to get rolling and then come back with an exact budget of cost.

MR. PENNOYER: Mike.

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: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept this as presented, recognizing that it's in the very formative stages, and that the Restoration Team will need to bring it back to the Council after this round of public hearings and they've had an opportunity to develop the concept further and then get us a better budget estimate. But I recognize the need that they have to have some money to do this with, and that's what I see that we're doing by accepting this right now.

MR. PENNOYER: Is there a second to that motion?

MR. COLE: I'll second it.

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion on this item.

MR. COLE: Well, I have a comment.

MR. PENNOYER: I'm going to ask everybody to speak into the mikes if they can, two people are having trouble hearing in the back.

MR. COLE: I support the motion, but I think it would not be inappropriate to say that the budget of -- to say that the Restoration Group and the Administrative Director should bear in mind that the budget for this public advisory group will be fixed by the Trustee Council and will not be itself

determined by the Public Advisory Group.

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 just sort of got a gleaning or a glimmer of the thought that those decisions would be or might be up to the Public Advisory Group in that regard. And I don't think that's the sense of this Council. Am I in error in that?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: In my view, you're definitely not in error on that. I guess I have a question, though, in regards to the coordinator position and how this would, in fact, fit with the organizational structure that you have presented us with earlier on here. Do you see the Public Advisory Group as an entirely separate entity within this? What was the thought process that the group went through on this? Do you see this as part of a staffing pattern under the Administrative Director or what was the process that you went through on this, Dave?

MR. PENNOYER: Dave.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. The process here is the group reports -- well the group provides input to both the Trustee Council and the Restoration Team. And the liaison would be an ad hoc member to the Restoration Team, attend the meetings, get the updated information and provide information from the Public Advisory Group into this process and just provide -- that's our thinking on it. If -- Cordell.

MR. ROY: Dave, I might add, Mr. Rosier, that we feel the Public Advisory Group is likely to come in with a great

need to be brought up to speed in terms of information and issues. And we would see this person as providing those information services to them, to be essentially a short staff to the Public Advisory Group.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. Thank you.

MR. COLE: Well, why can't that be done by the Administrative Director and his staff? I mean why do we need another \$75,000.00 person to talk to this Public Advisory Group? We have a fairly significant staff on board now and it can save, you know, another hundred thousand by just eliminating that position. I think we have enough people around to do that.

And you know, it really troubles me a little bit, and I don't know if I speak with the sense of the Trustees, that I mean we're going to have this group here with its old structure, and then this group, the Trustee Council with its old structure, and then the sort of staff of the structure and pretty soon you get talking about real money.

MR. ROY: Mr. Cole, it's hard for me to argue with that observation. We don't know what the Public Advisory Group is doing to do; we don't have a charter for the group. We don't have a sense of the outcome from the public input and how the Council will react to that and what decisions you will come to on your analysis of that information and our presentation to you.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

We think that the organization we have proposed to you in this budget establishes or moves to establish an organization that's going to be quite busy. Now, in this particular position, the need for it is somewhat dependent on what kind of a public advisory group you're going to have, are you going to ultimately approve.

MR. PENNOYER: This is, of course, one of the problems with going through it one section at a time. When we get to the Executive Director's staff, maybe we could get some detail on what each person's going to do on that and the duties that they are going to have and why they can't fulfill this particular function.

MR. PIPER: Mr. Pennoyer, just if we could put off part of this discussion until the public participation item on the Agenda, I think it (A) might let us move along; and (B) I think I can present some of the arguments that the public has made for this staff member at that time, if that's the wish of the Trustee Council.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee, did you have a comment?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I guess, you know, we have a motion, I guess I was going to -- want to state that I was supportive of the motion with the qualifications I think that Mr. Barton made. As a part of the motion that we would have an opportunity to revisit this when we hear the specifics, and that when we determine what the duties and responsibilities

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1 -- or the duties of the advisors are going to be that's going 2 to dictate, I think, the number of meetings they will have and, 3 to a large extent, how they will function and the ultimate 4 costs. 5 So, you know, I think that we need -- we will have to 6 revisit this budget item, even if we do approve the motion as 7 is. Would it be appropriate to table this MR. PENNOYER: 8 motion until after Mr. Piper's presentation to us? 9 10 MR. SANDOR: Yes. MR. PENNOYER: Go on from there. Is there a problem 11 12 with doing that? Why don't we proceed in that fashion then. We have -- it's now five after 12:00, the next item is rather 13 14 long, do we want to take the lunch break and come back; we can do that or would you -- I think next we get into the whole 15 package of Administrative Director's support, or do you prefer 16 17 to go on through the Administrative Director and then break at 12:30? 18 I'd suggest breaking. 19 MR. COLE: MR. PENNOYER: 20 Okay. 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's break. I'll think we'll break. Can we be back MR. PENNOYER: 22 at 1:30? 23 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I hope so. MR. PENNOYER: We'll break until 1:30. 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 277-0572 OR 277-0573 FAX 274-8982 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-8543 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-3022 (Off record)

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

(On record)

MR. PENNOYER: get started, please, we've got a full Agenda for the afternoon. It turned out there's a fast place to get lunch here and we probably could have come back a little earlier, and we'll keep that in mind for tomorrow. But I think — does any Trustee Council member have something they want to bring up at this time before we go on with the Agenda? I think we're down to the office of Administrative Director's budget.

Okay. Perhaps, we can go into that then. Dave, do you want to start walking down through that budget.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

MR. PENNOYER: Why don't you take us all the way through, then we'll come back and talk about the pieces.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Displayed here you'll see is the proposed organization for the Administrative Director. I'll just briefly describe what the duties of each one of these positions are and work our way down through it.

The Administrative Director is responsible for budgetary matters, contract administration and liaison with the Trustee Council. It's also responsible for the supervision of an administrative staff and maintenance of administration record. This person coordinates and schedules workloads for the Trustee Council and the Restoration Team, is responsible

for interactions with the public, public officials and the Public Advisory Group, and also participates on the Restoration Team as a non-voting chair and except in cases of a tie.

The budget analyst position tracks expenditures by the Oil Spill Restoration Team and insures compliance with established fiscal record keeping procedures, prepares monthly financial reports, tracks contracts, maintenance agreements, lease agreements, payroll requirements and other financial matters and performs interest fund, petty cash and cashier; a general budget person for the staff.

The administrative -- okay. Within the clerical there's three positions; first is administrative assistant. Primary responsibility is for the maintenance of administrative record, providing the housing and the record keeping for that, schedules and supports all facility meetings, delegates, supervises and monitors special request for word processing, copying by the meeting participants and the Restoration Team, arranges all facility teleconferencing and other -- the famous line, other duties as assigned.

The clerical support, there's one person in the clerical support who assists in the maintenance of administrative record, organizes and maintains the docket for Federal Register notices, perform specific Restoration word processing and by supporting both the Restoration Team, the Restoration Planning Group and Administrative Director, and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

handles photocopying, fax transmissions, those types of duties.

And the last person built into this category is receptionist, answers and directs all phone calls, takes messages. I won't go into that one, everybody's pretty familiar with the receptionist.

We have the per diem and travel built in for the Administrative Director. These are guesses but it depends on who the permanent director -- Administrative Director is, it's kind of a tough one. We suggest that the Administrative Director be housed in Anchorage so that travel costs should be reduced some.

The next item on there is the Trustee Council public meeting costs; this includes teleconferencing to the various communities, transcripts, public notices, rooms. And we have a proposal that we'll get into a little bit later on where we suggest that these would be housed, suggesting the house in the present half of the first floor building that we're in now, and this will provide multi-services to the Public Advisory Group, to the Trustee Council, to the Restoration Team and various components.

Other staff travel, this figure is a ballpark figure for relocation costs, we don't know where this -- the permanent Administrative Director will be coming from; Anchorage, it's zero, Juneau it's cheaper, Seattle it's more. This is a placeholder number.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

And the next is a large item, we went through the costs of printing in the past, and we identified what future products we're going to print this year; it includes the 1992 Work Plan, the draft Restoration Framework, a draft for Restoration Plan, and 1993 Work Plan and response to public comments from the Oil Year 3 or 1991; they'll be known as a pink block (ph). And those are the five publications, generally, we've been 2,500 of these and mailing them out; we have a mailing list of about 1,500 or more.

And the last item on this, the Administrative
Director's budget, is a space cost; the reflects the present
space cost for the Simpson Building that we're in now at
645 "G" Street, it also includes utilities, phones, security
equipment, rental maintenance agreements and supplies. A
detail of this number is located in the back after the summary
of these budgets, and it's called Simpson Building Facilities
Cost Detail, it's dated 19- -- 1/19 -- 31. And it separates
all these detailed costs out and it does some comparisons; the
Simpson Building to the Federal Building to the Response -- DEC
Response Center to the Frontier Building. We've got some
examples of costs and that's all displayed there for
information; the square footage. Basically, that -- the
subtotal is the 776,000.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Dave. Trustee Council members, questions on individual items? Dave, I'll start one

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1 We're did you \$200.00 per day per diem, for the Administrative Directors? 2 MR. GIBBONS: Well that's a number that we threw around 3 It varies if the summer per diem is about 200 for --4 you know, for Anchorage. It depends on where that person is, 5 it's all contingent on that. Winter per diem, it's less than 6 7 that, it's roughly around 150. MR. STEELE: It also includes cab fare, vehicle rental. 8 9 MR. COLE: Sure, the whole thing. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. 10 11 MR. PENNOYER: Further questions on the various positions and expenditures outlined in here? Curt. 12 MR. MCVEE: Yeah. I guess maybe more of a comment. 13 But that if -- you know, if we have to move the operations from 14 the Simpson Building, you know, because it doesn't meet 15 16 standards -- the handicap standards or whatever, then, Dave, 17 we're probably looking at even additional costs here on the 18 fourth -- to the fourth floor (ph) space, plus moving costs I guess? 19 That's correct. We would probably -- we 20 MR. GIBBONS: would do it -- handle it a little differently, we'd still need 21 a meeting room and stuff but it would be increased costs for 22 23 the square footage.

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner.

MR. SANDOR: I guess I would raise the question that

R & R COURT REPORTERS

24

looks to not only this year but next year. I see in the workload activity of this office of the Administrative Director as being fairly large this year because of the activities. But it seems to me there's an opportunity to -- well, I think we need to make a commitment of phasing out and integrating into the regular agency programs as many of the activities as possible; and possibly, this is realistic more next year than this year. But -- and this, of course, is for this one year.

But I guess the day when you and the other members of the Team looked at this -- is this the concept that this is an extraordinarily expenditure this year and it will be substantially reduced next year, or is -- do you see this as being, perhaps, a perpetual level of planned expenses of this office in the future?

MR. GIBBONS: Well the Restoration Team didn't really discuss that. We were looking at a year -- for the one year, and we were trying to identify the products that we've got for this upcoming year. And we didn't look at some, perhaps, future costs. Maybe some of the other Restoration Team members might want to add to that.

MR. MONTAGUE: I was just going to say whether it's agency or not, are the costs going to be any different and we think not.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I can guess, Mr. Chairman, that would concern me. Because as we look at many of the projects,

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

they have multi-facets related to them; some of them are totally as a result of the Exxon Valdez damage, some are mixed with other activities, and some of the studies and activities actually have multi-benefits to regular programs as well. And it seems to me that there's some merit in looking at as many of these activities as possible is integrated into DEC programs that are ongoing and as well as other agencies.

That certainly applies in the Department of
Environmental Conservation, I don't know that it applies to
other places. And I guess this is the place that I would point
out that, for example, in the assistant to the Secretary of the
Interior position and formally the Land Use Council (ph) would
play a coordinating role between agencies. I think there are
coordinating mechanisms already, and I think we ought to take
advantage of them.

I'm not too discomforted if this -- with this level of financing for this one year; in fact, it reflects what, you know, have to be done this year. I'm concerned, though, that this is -- if we're setting up, you know, a permanent organization of this level and have no plans of integrating into the regular programs.

The DEC and I think most of the agencies have a number of multi-functional programs and this is another activity. And you have a separate -- we're setting this up as a separate organization with separate -- different groups. And I think we

R & R COURT REPORTERS

may be overlooking opportunities for utilizing existing Federal and State organizations and, perhaps, duplicating them. So that's what prompts these comments.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, won't it be a little bit difficult to look at this from the long-term standpoint when we haven't yet decided what the program's going to look like? We have certain proposals in front of us we're going to consider for 1992, but I don't yet know what we're going to approve in the long-term. And I guess the idea of utilizing existing expertise or agency structure I think is good, but we still have some type of centralized responsibilities in Anchorage to this — to the restoration process to the (ph) Exxon Valdez.

So I don't know that you'll ever go to the point where you don't have to have a function where the Trustee Council can call on somebody to look at this program in aggregate rather than in separate pieces. But I don't know -- Dave, as you said, I don't know you have any feelings for how this would evolve in the long-term since we haven't given a long-term direction in the program.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I guess, Mr. Chairman, without belaboring this point, I think we do have to look beyond this one year. And we haven't yet, of course, gone through the programs. But I -- the position of this Trustee will be to try to utilize as much as possible the existing organizational structure of our department and not to set up a separate

E & R COURT REPORTERS

organization. I know we need a separate organization and probably will always be (ph).

But this -- the total budget of 30. million dollars is about twice of what I expected it to be, and I'm looking for opportunities to reduce that. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Other comment or question on the budget that has been outlined to us?

MR. COLE: I have a comment.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLE: What was by which the Administrative

Director's salary was set 95,000 annually? Specifically, did

we compare other salaries of government officials such as

Commissioner of Environmental Conservation?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair. I think it's important to point out that all these figures include benefit packages. And yes, we did try to analyze the responsibilities comparable to this job and try to compare the Federal and the State systems. But this -- these figures do include the benefit packages.

MR. COLE: Then that develops the question what benefits are accompanying the salary?

MS. RUTHERFORD: We were looking at it to either the Federal or the State would do the hiring, and that agency's benefit package would be applied, and that's to be decided by the Trustees as to what process is used and who eventually is hired.

MR. MONTAGUE: On the Federal side that's equivalent to a GS-15 grade level, I don't know with the State.

MR. GIBBONS: I think a Range 26 was used.

MR. ROSIER: Just a second (ph) -- Director

MS. RUTHERFORD: A Range 26 is a director of a division in the State.

MR. COLE: Is that -- all right. And, you know, with respect to \$200 per day per diem, for the benefit of the Daily News, if they're here, I take a hundred dollars a day per diem. And, you know, it avoids problems. But you know, when I see \$200.00 a day per diem, you know, things like that, it sort of makes me nervous about some of the other cost estimates in here. I don't know if anybody else has the same reservation. But I mean I think we should look at things like that.

MR. MONTAGUE: So should we make it a hundred then, is that a recommendation?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. COLE: I'm not -- excuse me. I'm not suggesting anything, but you know, I just say is that a little rich.

MS. RUTHERFORD: We don't disagree that -- with the fact that that may cause you concern because it does have -- like Tim had pointed out, it does have car rentals in it and it does have other things reflected, taxi fares. But I think it is important another (ph). We've been very concerned with these budget figures, and we have beat each other up over them.

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

r

And I know they are extremely high, but given the workload that 1 we've begun to identify, they are reflective of a fairly 2 conservative approach to the budget. And I think that that 3 truly is what we tried to do. 4 MR. COLE: Did you compare my workload with 5 MS. RUTHERFORD: Well we were just comparing what we 6 7 have identified as the workloads in the ag- -- in this process. 8 MR. MONTAGUE: But I think it is important to note 9 that 10 MR. PENNOYER: Could you please address the chair 11 before you -- so we can take it in order. Go ahead. 12 MR. MONTAGUE: Thank you. That in terms of the 13 workload since development of this year's Work Plan has started, many, many people, I would say, have been keeping 14 Commissioners hours on this. 15 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. I just would like to say that 16 17 I think it should be related to the Federal per diem rate, 18 which I don't know what it is and the State per diem rate; and whatever those are, I mean it's perfectly acceptable to me. 19 I got the impression from Dave that's 20 MR. PENNOYER: what you used, basically, is that correct? 21 MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. It varies with the time of year. 22 So we could actually -- I could go in and actually take an 23

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 277-0572 OR 277-0573 277-8543 277-7515 272-3022 FAX 274-8982

number of months and come down with it. It would be a number

average of the summer rate versus the winter rate and the

24

less than 200 but not much. But I could come up with -- we could come up with actual numbers.

MR. PENNOYER: Further questions. Does anyone have any comment on the Simpson Building, Fourth Floor? Curt.

MR. McVEE: I guess just observation in looking at the total package, all of the budgets; you know, the Fourth Floor is 5,708 square feet and there are other components in the budget — other staff in the budget which will occupy that space. So we aren't talking about, as I understand it, just that space being available for this staff; there are other people who will use that.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: With regard to the Simpson Building, I guess our present lease there runs to or through October?

MR. GIBBONS: To.

MR. SANDOR: To October. And I guess this is a good example, rather than commit ourselves, you know -- of course if we're not there, we're going to have to go somewhere else. But I think at every opportunity we ought to look at an alternative, and so we certainly do want to -- I would strongly support, you know, an organization that does it. But when there are opportunities as to the conclusion of that lease, and as you get up to that point you look at option of co-locating with, you know, existing Federal or State offices. That's just

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

-- that's a point I wanted to make on space.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And it should be noted that that's I guess our best priced space of all, we're paying, what, a \$1.10 or something like that and the Frontier Building is 3.00 or something. So we want to take advantage of that and we'd like to keep the expenditures as low as possible. That's all I have,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Yeah. I know I'm getting chronologically gifted, but I thought we had decided at the last meeting that we were going to stay in the Fourth Floor of the Simpson Building until October.

MR. SANDOR: Well yes.

MR. BARTON: Did we not do that? Okay.

MR. PENNOYER: I don't remember October here, but I believe we did make that decision.

MR. BARTON: And that we're going to piggyback on the Department of Justice's current contract to do that.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay.

MR. BARTON: Now, in terms of clerical and administrative support, is it possible to use the existing contract to provide that also until October?

MR. PENNOYER: Dave.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. It was the idea of the Restoration Team to get the approval of the Trustee Council to negotiate

1 with the Department of Justice and CACI to provide that service 2 up until October 1st. 3 MR. BARTON: In other words, we would keep the Fourth Floor package as it is? 4 MR. GIBBONS: Yes. And then that would give us enough 5 6 time to develop other options, locations, the question of 7 Federal versus State or contracting employees, all of those 8 factors. 9 MR. BARTON: Did we also decide that at the last meeting? 10 11 MR. GIBBONS: I'm not sure that was the decision. Then I move that we do that. 12 MR. BARTON: 13 MR. SANDOR: Second. MR. PENNOYER: Moved and seconded, we use the existing 14 contract and negotiate with CACI for the best deal we can get I 15 16 think was your MR. BARTON: That's what I meant to say if I didn't. 17 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Is there further discussion of 18 that option? Does anybody have an objection to doing that. 19 20 Curt. 21 MR. McVEE: What's the cost, I guess. What's the cost of the CACI operation versus development (ph)? 22 MR. PENNOYER: Dave. What costs are included in Mike's 23 motion, basically, I guess is what Curt's asking. 24 25 If I can ask Tim Steele, he might have MR. GIBBONS:

that detail.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. STEELE: The 195,000 space and utilities it figures in on a CACI cost. The labor for the CACI personnel are shown in parentheses, but if we used CACI people for those three clerical and one budget analyst position, those costs are shown there in parentheses. The CACI lease on the building runs currently to December with a two-year option on it, but that's all stuff we can negotiate with CACI and Justice.

So, the costs shown here, the 195 for space is the CACI cost.

MR. PENNOYER: Does that answer your question, Mr. McVee? Cordell.

MR. ROY: Mr. Pennoyer, I'm -- I think for the sake of the Council, perhaps Mr. Steele knows this. Are you aware that there is an overhead charge through that contracting procedure through the Justice contract.

MR. STEELE: Justice contract overhead charge?

MR. ROY: Or to their subcontractor?

MR. STEELE: In my discussions with Justice, they are not charging us an overhead charge currently, through this fiscal year anyway for their administration of the contract. These are details that hopefully when we sit down with CACI and Justice to iron out the details we can straighten all those things out.

MR. ROY: Okay.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 277-0572 OR 277-0573 FAX 274-8982 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-8543

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-7515

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-3022

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion on Mr. Barton's 1 2 motion? Is there any objection to this motion? Okay. Can we 3 proceed with the office of Administrative Director, then further comments on the budget as presented? 4 I had one other, Mr. Chairman. 5 MR. COLE: MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. 6 MR. COLE: Did we get you might say in the nature of a 7 quote on the relocation costs of the Administrative Director of 8 \$30,000.00 or was that just an estimate? 9 10 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons. Is this -- let me put it this way. 11 MR. COLE: understand that or do I understand it correctly that that will 12 be just the estimated -- the cost as required? It sounds, 13 14 frankly, a little high, 'cause I remember when I moved to Juneau; of course, I didn't have much stuff to move; but it was 15 considerably less than that. And I think there is a State 16 maximum, the amount which you will receive, isn't there, 17 Ms. Rutherford? 18 19 MS. RUTHERFORD: Yes, it's 10,000 pounds maximum and whatever the rate -- the cost associated with that is. 20 21 MR. GIBBONS: Plus travel. MS. RUTHERFORD: Plus travel. 22 23 MR. MONTAGUE: Plus temporary quarters. 24 MS. RUTHERFORD: For two weeks, that's correct. MR. ROY: I believe the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

1.

MR. COLE: The place 1 MR. ROY: Excuse me. 2 MR. COLE: 3 Go ahead. MR. ROY: I believe the Federal travel regulations for 5 change of station are somewhat more liberal than that. 6 remember my moving costs of five years ago up here with my 7 family was -- approached the \$40,000.00 mark; the total cost of the move, household goods, shipment of the family, relocation, 8 selling the house. 9 MR. COLE: Of course that leaves the question of where 10 11 you moved from. 12 MR. ROY: Miami, Florida, sir. If we hire someone in Anchorage, the costs are minimal. 13 MR. PENNOYER: Dave, did you want to comment? 14 15 MR. GIBBONS: No. 16 17

It basically -- we tried -- we heard all this conversation before, if the person's from Anchorage, it'll be zero; if the person's from -- you know, we tried to put a placeholder, a number in there that what we felt comfortable with and that's what we did.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARTON: Well I think the point is we'll tell you what those costs are and return any monies that are not expended. We have over \$30,000.00 so it's not as if we're spending 30,000 when we're actually going to pay what's billed.

MR. PENNOYER: Further comment on this -- the question?

COURT REPORTERS

Commissioner Sandor.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chair, I move adoption of this -approval of this in a tentative approval; that is to make these
downward adjustments we're talking about but to give the Group
the approval of the formation and funding of this office.

MR. BARTON: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: It's been moved and seconded to tentatively approve this budget and let the Group go ahead and start forming this office. Is there further discussion?

Commissioner Rosier.

MR. ROSIER: Yes. The Trustee from Agriculture, they are raising a question in my mind in regards to the budget figures as related to the fiscal year and the expenditure of funds at the end of the fiscal year. It seems to me that we get into some policy areas here in which we spend all of the dollars at the end of the year as frequently happens in organizations, or do we, in fact, expect that these dollars, in fact, come back to the Trust -- to the fund?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: I've been laboring under the impression that these are no year monies, and any monies that we budget in this fiscal year that are not expended just remain in the fund. I'd invite any legal advise on that issue, but I think that's the way we ought to operate.

MR. ROSIER: I would agree with that method of

operating, Mr. Chairman, is that actually the case?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. You're in a position where if you've got money left over, that money has to be utilized for the restoration process, whether you continue to plow it into administrative costs or you put it back into the pot until you reappropriate it for a project or what have you; it's not something that's going to disappear if it isn't spent. It sits in this fund.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. It's my understanding that - you know, that it wouldn't be a withdrawal, withdrawal
wouldn't be made of the entire amount, that we'd be speaking in
terms of a quarterly type withdrawal. And it seems like at
that point, that certainly we could make adjustments. And that
we will have continuous monitoring of the expenditures so that
there should be an ongoing process to make adjustments in the
budget as we see the actual expenditures.

MR. O'CONNOR: I think you're going to have this explained to you later. But periodically, you're going to be asked to sign a document certifying to the court to draw down on that fund for legitimate purposes which are recognized by the court in establishing that fund. So, each quarterly, six months, whatever, each of you are going to have to certify that this is how you believe the money needs to be spent consistent with your trust responsibilities.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: All right. Is there any objection to the proposal? The motion to adopt the budget as presented a tentative fashion with the caveats dealing with reductions (ph) that we're (indiscernible). Okay.

Dave, do you want to go ahead?

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. The next item is scientific support. We previously discussed the senior scientist and Mr. -- Dr. Bob Spies; I won't discuss that one again.

The next one, we want to make sure that it's understood that this is a placeholder number, it's an estimate. Bob put together a draft letter that has not been distributed to the public since it is in a draft form and it does have specific names on it. But this is — the Restoration Team feels that this number will come down, and so we have a hard time with putting a reduced number now but we'll make those negotiations with Dr. Spies and then come to you with a new number.

MR. PENNOYER: Dave, but the understanding is you're not spending anything on peer reviewers until we've reviewed and approved it, is that correct?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, that's the intent.

MR. PENNOYER: This is not permission to spend \$500,000.00 in a period (ph). What action do you wish to take here then if we're not actually going to approve an amount?

MR. GIBBONS: Well we

MR. PENNOYER: Just the understanding that

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. GIBBONS: Understanding that there is some costs there. We could have Dr. Spies explain where those came from at the present time if you wish or we can just come back to you at a later date and

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My question was, you know, how does this compare to past year's efforts where you have used the peer review process to review the study proposals?

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Last year's costs were 2.2 million.

MR. ROY: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's somewhat apples and oranges. We were paying, it seems to me -- I want to make eye contact with Bob Spies on this and make sure what I'm saying is right. We're paying maybe somewhat higher rates because we were working on short time frames and litigation related time tables. And now -- and we're working in a more routine sense with restoration planning or restoration wrap-up, those costs could reduce?

DR. SPIES: That's true, those would have to be renegotiated with the reviewers or other reviewers put into place and those who arranging on a subtotal (ph) -- (indiscernible - away from microphone). What I tried to do is reduce the total number of reviewers, and the amount of work and the amount of meetings. It's still a little bit on the

liberal side. Without having knowing what the program might be at this stage, it's pretty hard to formulate a specific figure.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: I move adoption of not to exceed 191K

MR. SANDOR: I move adoption of not to exceed 191K thing on the senior science and that segment and defer action on this peer review budget until the work plan is completed.

MR. BARTON: Second.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: It's been moved and seconded, is there discussion? Dave, does that fulfill your needs then for the time being?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. I discussed with Bob this morning. It's hard to project our needs on peer review since we don't have a '92 plan in the end. So we'll -- it's logical.

MR. PENNOYER: Is there further discussion on the motion. Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'm not sure I understand what we're doing here, maybe somebody could explain it just a little more. Is there any peer review process underway now? Can someone help me on that?

MR. SPIES: Yeah. There is peer review going on right at the present moment, both of the damage assessment course (ph) that were completed November of '91. And it is anticipated that the restoration proposals will -- once they've come in and their long form (ph) will be peer review as well.

And there are a few meetings going on, particularly in regard to trying to condense the coastal habitat program and its subtitled programs into a more cohesive and focused program.

The proposals that have been received in those particular areas are more than the Management Team wishes to have funded. So we try to encourage you to get together and look hard and objectively at what was being proposed and to get a more condensed, focused, official (ph) program.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

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. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman.

DR. SPIES: Those are the main activities.

MR. PENNOYER: Byron.

MR. MORRIS: Correct me if I'm wrong but the peer review that's going on now is under the 0 year (ph) 3 funding and anything that was done from March 1 on would require Trustee Council notification and approval. So these things that I think Bob Spies was talking about could grind to a halt on March 1 without any further approval.

MR. COLE: Well, that's -- Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Go ahead.

MR. COLE: That's the sort of thing I'm concerned about. Do we have to act on any of these now or can we just -- maybe we can ask Dr. Spies, do we have to act, give them some authority to continue to engage in the peer review process now or can we properly defer it to later? We wouldn't want to

bring the entire process, I don't think, to a halt by lack of some authority. Because I personally believe that -- and I hope the other members of the Council agree with me, that this is an essential ingredient of the entire question is for (ph) peer review. So that's the only question I have on that.

MR. PENNOYER: Dave, I guess the question is you've got \$500,000.00, I assume this is sort of a placeholder for year round cost. Do you have anything in the near term that you need to have approved at this time to keep you going until whenever we meet again?

DR. SPIES: I think there is a little bit of confusion on the part of the Department of Justice and the Department of

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, sir, the microphones are not picking you up.

DR. SPIES: Okay.

COURT REPORTER: You're going to have to come forward.

DR. SPIES: I don't think it's clear to the Department of Justice and the Department of Law when their obligations for peer review really ends and where it will be picked up by this process. And I don't really have insight, and perha--- I don't know if Sharon Saari is here or (indiscernible) -- could you make a few comments on that, Sharon, whether the Department of Justice through the current contract is, you know, going to continue for some time in the peer reviews? It's not clear to

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

me how long it's going to last.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SAARI: Do I have join in the (ph) microphone.

MR. PENNOYER: Ms. Saari.

I quess in answer to your previous MS. SAARI: question, we have an ongoing federal -- I can only speak to the Federal peer reviewers. When we've spent about 600,000 so far this year -- for a year on that, for a ballpark, in comparison to the 500K that's in there, we have slightly more than a hundred -- about 140,000 left which we can keep spending on those peer reviewers which will give you a little time to work on it. But it won't be at the rate that Bob would like to keep having meetings. So there is some left to support the Federal peer reviewers. And one of the State's people will have to speak to the State peer review budget. But there is some money left to support them for maybe through a little bit into March, it depends on how many meetings there are. But it's not a drop-dead date, March 1st; I mean everyone's gotten confused (ph)

MR. PENNOYER: No. But it still seems to me that

Mr. Cole's point is well-taken. We're not -- we can't sit and

not determine there's going to be peer review, there is. We're

going to run out of funds, we shouldn't have a drop-dead date

in the process. So what do we need to put in here for a

reasonable placeholder to allow expenditures to continue strong

(ph)?

1 MR. COLE: Does -- is the Department of Justice looking 2 for reimbursement of the money which you say it still has left? 3 MS. SAARI: No. The agencies have already 4 given --5 MR. COLE: All right. 6 MS. SAARI: given us that money, it's already in 7 the bank for this purpose. 8 MR. COLE: Okay. And the Department of Law, 9 Mr. Alex MR. SWIDERSKI: Are we looking for that money? 10 turn to you in that question. No, we're not. 11 But we are --12 13 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. MR. SWIDERSKI: we have advised -- do you want me to 14 approach the microphone? 15 16 COURT REPORTER: Yes, please. 17 MR. PENNOYER: Yes, please. 18 COURT REPORTER: I have to do a verbatim transcript of this so I need to hear you. 19 MR. SWIDERSKI: I'm Alex Swiderski from the Department 20 of Law. We had advised the Restoration Team that they could 21 22 expect that Law would decline to fund peer reviewers after approximately the 1st of March. I think that could probably be 23 revisited as far as budgetary considerations. We have not --24 25 we are in a position to fund them budgetary-wise into the --

certainly through the conclusion of this fiscal year, which would be June 30th.

Our concerns (1) that we have difficulty -- we can't justify funding them once we're out of the litigation process. We view that we are still in that process, but obviously, we're drawing that to -- that's drawing to conclusion.

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Well I think this problem can be, perhaps, rectified or dealt with with an amendment that the second could agree with is that, in fact, we approve this 191K as already stated and authorize the Director of the Response Team to continue with expenditures on peer reviews that are not covered by Federal or State funds. But the -- period. But that point of that is that I don't think we can make a rational decision on a level of funding for peer reviews until we've really looked at the Work Plan and -- but we want to authorize whatever peer reviews are necessary until that time.

So if you'd agree with that second, then we could authorize that.

MR. BARTON: I agree.

MR. PENNOYER: Does that cover us in terms of requesting up front funding to put in the K (ph) so to speak?

MR. GIBBONS: We will want clar- -- we would revisit that after the '92 program was reviewed and come up with a number, is that -- placeholder number or

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. BARTON: You're authorized to spend what you need 1 2 to up until the '92 program is available for us to review, at 3 which time, we will then determine what more needs to be spent. Is that what we're saying. 4 5 MR. GIBBONS: That's what I think was said, yeah. MR. PENNOYER: Is the motion clearly understood? 6 7 there any discussion? Any further questions? MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chair. I'd like to answer 8 Mr. Cole's question. I think you'd asked would these expenses 9 10 that currently the Department of Law and Justice have for peer review would be reimbursed. And I understand that it would go 11 into the total cost for reimbursement. 12 13 MR. PENNOYER: But it doesn't need to be reimbursed ahead of time, so it's not an immediate expenditure question 14 we're facing in terms of getting the operation moving. 15 MR. MONTAGUE: That's correct. 16 17 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton. MR. BARTON: I think we're talking about two different 18 things here. Justice -- the money that Justice now has is 19 20 money that Justice has that was garnished from the Federal 21 agencies prior and that's in the bank. So, that does not need to be reimbursed. 22 MR. PENNOYER: I believe some of the previous 23 expenditures are going to be eligible for reimbursement at some 24

point, but maybe not this one.

MR. BARTON: Yeah. And again, maybe we're talking 1 about two different things. The agencies, in turn, will seek 2 reimbursement from the Joint Fund to replace those monies which 3 we borrowed from other funds in order to get this job done. There will be that reimbursement sought. Justice will not seek 5 reimbursement 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 7 From us. MR. BARTON: from us. They better not. 8 MR. PENNOYER: Is this motion understood? Is there 9 further discussion? Any objection to the -- Mr. Gibbons. 10 11 MR. GIBBONS: No objection to that, but I have one comment after. 12 MR. PENNOYER: Before we take the vote? 13 Yeah. I guess we'd like to request MR. GIBBONS: 14 15 authorization to investigate how to handle this contracting in 16 the future, after Justice and Law come out of the picture. I think that's understood. 17 MR. PENNOYER: MR. BARTON: (Indiscernible) 18 MR. PENNOYER: Any further discussion? 19 Does anybody object to the motion? All right. We're through with 20 21 Scientific Support. Do you want to go onto Public Outreach then? 22 23 MR. GIBBONS: The first line, Public Resource 24 Coordinators, I'd like to discuss that in regards to an Agenda 25 item that's coming up next, would be a Public Resource Center.

It's built in here because it's part of the Administrative Director's budget, but there were also built into the Public Resource Center.

The next item on that list would be Information

Specialists. We projected, in the near-term, a position and a half here; this is to help us conduct public scoping sessions, public meetings, responses to inquiries by the public, both letters and tracking those. So we expect there to be a big workload there.

The next item is an item that covers the First Floor of the Simpson Building, it's split in two. Again, I refer you to that detail in the back. Half of the first floor has only what they call OSPIC, Oil Spill Public Information Center, and in the other half is for its displays that types of activities. What we're proposing under our system would be to maintain the first half of the first floor for a public resource center, and then the second half — with some offices for the staff and the second half would be a centralized meeting facility for Trustee Council meetings, for Public Advisory Group meetings, for Restoration Team meetings and then some overflow of the people. But that's built into that part there.

The travel for the public meetings, that covers the travel of the Restoration Team and the Restoration Subgroup Team members and all that to the meetings that are going on right now; to Cordova, Kodiak, Tatitlek, Chenega. And we try

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to limit the number of people that are going there, generally it's three or four people; one representative from the Restoration Team, perhaps a representative from the Restoration Subgroup. Ernie might fill you in some more on that -- on the detail of that. But Ernie's made most of the meetings, I think; and then we have a person to -- note taker or that type of thing. So we want to eliminate that.

But that's what that travel for public meetings, 10 communities, we're expecting to do it three times; this is the first round, the second round starts when the Restoration Framework is complete, to go around to the communities again to ask them on input, to collect information on injuries, summaries. This is an estimate.

MR. PENNOYER: Dave, you skipped over that first item, Public Resource Coordinators rather quickly, you said it was somewhere else, but I'm not clear what you meant by that.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. I'm going to discuss those two positions on the next item on the Agenda, it's called Public Resource Center, the third item under the Organization; and that's where those two positions are identified. And we can -- I can brief you on that now, we can move into that, but I was hoping to discuss those two positions in regards to the Public Resource Center. That's what they -- those positions support.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Is the Public Resource Center also included? Here in the budget is an item for office space

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to them so

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

MR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

MR. PENNOYER: So most of the budget that you've listed here is actually in something you're going to discuss later?

MR. GIBBONS: Right. It's difficult, we tried to pare down the organization in that we have the Information Specialists and the Public Resource Coordinators supporting each other, so we don't have duplication of people down there. We can get away with a smaller staff, that was our intent.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess my point is, Dave, I don't know how we're going to discuss this budget unless you go into that detail since basically three-quarters of it is in something you're going to discuss in the next item of the Agenda unless we take up the Information Specialists and travel separately. The Public Resource Center item plus the Public Resource Coordinators is 300,000 out of the 474,000 in the budget.

MR. GIBBONS: We can move into that item and then come back and discuss at a later time the Restoration Team members and the rest of the administrative budget.

MR. BARTON: I suggest just the opposite, let's delay discussing the Public Outreach and continue on through the budget and then come back.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. He does have two items that are Information Specialist and travel for public meetings. I'm not sure

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. I can easily discuss the 1 Information Specialist in that regard, too. 2 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Well, then maybe Mr. Barton's 3 suggestion is appropriate; let's go through the rest of this, 4 come back and let you give us the Public Resource Center 5 discussion before we talk about this budget (ph). Is that okay 6 with everybody, can we go on? Okay. 7 Next is the Restoration Team. 8 That's -- the six members are MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. 9 identified here, the members that are sitting up on the table 10 11 here are identified with actual salaries, and travel and per diem. 12 MR. COLE: That's 623,000, Mr. Chairman? 13 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons. That's correct (ph). 14 15 (Pause) MR. PENNOYER: Any questions on the Restoration -- the 16 newly named RT? 17 18 MR. BARTON: Not if they include (indiscernible) MR. PENNOYER: Any further comment? Except for the 19 fact that I don't know how six people can possibly do it 20 21 but 22 MR. BARTON: I guess that's part of the bargain. MR. PENNOYER: Part of the bargain. And other people, 23 Do I hear a motion? 24 too, as needed (ph). 25 MR. BARTON: I move we accept this Restoration Team

budget.

MR. McVEE: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: Any further discussion? Any objection?

Approved. Can we go onto the Restoration funded (ph) subgroup?

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. Mr. Chairman and Trustee Council, this is identified here separately, this is a subgroup budget, 'cause we feel that this group is going to be working full-time for a year to get a Restoration Framework and a Restoration Plan out. There's a big job there, this is an estimate, but we feel that under the time frames we're working on that these people will be working full-time. So that's why we've identified this subgroup as a budget for a year.

It includes six full-time members, again, representing the Trustee agencies. It represents (ph) perhaps some contracting or whatever for technical support, natural resource specialists, computer graphics, writer/editors, those types of skills.

Contractual services for the development of Restoration Plan. What we have in mind here would be a natural recovery monitoring scheme that the Restoration Group would like to move forward with. They've done some progress on that to date, and then the travel and per diem for that group.

This fits under the category like I mentioned earlier, the subgroups are formed as needed and disbanded as needed, but we see this group working full-time for at least this year.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This year?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Question. Curt.

MR. McVEE: The six full-time, as I understand it, would be those people that were kind of basically assigned to this from the Trustee agencies at the present time. And then are the 4.25 -- 4-1/4 FTs, would that be new hires, basically, or temporary hires or (indiscernible - interrupted)

MR. GIBBONS: That would be using skills from within the agencies as well as contracting like a writer/editor, it might be the easiest to contract a writer/editor for several months rather than -- it's just -- yeah, that's what we had in mind.

MR. McVEE: I guess the other point, and I just bring it up to be sure that, you know, the signals haven't changed or that there is agreement among the Trustee Council members that previously we had -- Interior had asked about -- you know, having represented on the Restoration Planning Group both Park Service and Fish & Wildlife Service because of two major land management agencies that have a number of projects and as well as considerable jurisdiction with the oil spill area. And as I understand it when we talked about this before that was acceptable to the Council members.

MR. PENNOYER: So that would mean you might've upped to seven?

MR. McVEE: I guess that possibly could be but

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'd like to make my position clear. Under no circumstances will I vote for an appropriation of this magnitude for this purpose. It's a million dollars and I think it's excessive.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, would you care to elaborate before we take a vote on this. We are going to have to do a Restoration Plan, and we have -- you know, the workload the Restoration Planning Work Group has had to date has been very large. And I don't know, again, it's an ad hoc thing that we're not saying it's going to go on forever but at least until get a formal Restoration Plan done, which they will have to have the people to do it.

MR. COLE: We should be able to develop with all these resources that sit at this table on our staff, plus 623,000 for the Restoration Team itself, plus 700,000 for scientific support, et cetera, for less than a million bucks. Now, you know, it's just the way I see it, and I'm not going to change on that. It's too much to put together a Restoration Plan, a million dollars. We have nearly four million dollars here for an organizational budget this year, that's a whopping amount of money for an organization support and to put together the Restoration Plan.

| 1 | MR. PENNOYER: So, we would do the same job for 196,000 |
|----|---|
| 2 | leaving it there plus the additional functions we might do? |
| 3 | MS. RUTHERFORD: Yes. In point of fact, it's cheaper |
| 4 | to leave it there than it is to move it, that's what |
| 5 | we're |
| 6 | MR. PENNOYER: If, in fact, you buy off (ph) on using |
| 7 | the space, do your other space plans include having a library |
| 8 | then in |
| 9 | MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. The space reflections earlier |
| 10 | reflect the library there. But once said (ph) |
| 11 | MR. BARTON: Well not in the Public Outreach budget |
| 12 | you reflect it. |
| 13 | MR. GIBBONS: That's correct. |
| 14 | MR. BARTON: Yeah. So it is 196 plus 172? |
| 15 | MR. GIBBONS: No. The addition there was so we could |
| 16 | compare apples and apples in all these options. The 176 would |
| 17 | cover this Public Resource facility. |
| 18 | MR. BARTON: Well |
| 19 | MR. STEELE: Plus the 130, Dave. |
| 20 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, wait a minute. |
| 21 | MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. |
| 22 | MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, Mr. Cole. |
| 23 | MR. COLE: Could I request somebody go to the board |
| 24 | with a felt pen and just put the bottom number of each option |
| 25 | there so we know what we're doing. I'm lost in the business. |

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not for the move. 1 2 MR. McVEE: Yeah. That would be the BLM cost as I 3 understand it, personnel and equipment, support, whatever is 4 necessary to operate the added -- the Resource Library with the 5 added material. I'm just saying we'd have an item in our 6 MR. PENNOYER: 7 budget then ongoing of about \$230.000.00? MR. McVEE: Yes. 8 9 MR. COLE: Can I ask another question, Mr. Chairman? MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, go ahead. 10 I'm not sure that I understand that. 11 MR. COLE: Is this 226 in 3(A) the same 226 that's in here? 12 13 MR. McVEE: Yes, that's my understanding. 14 MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair. If I might note, that's 15 one of the reasons that the Restoration Team isn't recommending 16 either of these options, but rather we're recommending 3(B) 17 which does not have that ongoing cost. So the recommendation for the 18 MR. PENNOYER: 19 Restoration Team is that we just not do anything with the library then after the first -- you don't even include the 20 21 price of the move then in 3(B)? MR. GIBBONS: In 3(B) the material would be there and 22 the cost reflected there will maintain the material there. 23 MR. PENNOYER: 24 I see.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. This option reflects 226,000 to move the material to the Natural Resources Library, the BLM Natural Resources Library.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, I've got a copy of the State Director's letter back to us after the contact was made on what he visualized to be the cost of that effort and what would be included in it. I could hand those

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

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: In a nutshell, what does he say?

MR. McVEE: He says that the bottom line is a first year cost of 226,300 and the second year cost of 230,000. But that the kind of services that would be provided would be, you know, the library materials but also adding some collection — additional collection from all the other agencies, and collecting those into the Natural Resources Library. Actually, it would amount to, you know, further providing additional items in the OSPIC collection from the other agencies.

MR. PENNOYER: So, for the library we'd carry a first year cost of 226 for the move and the second year cost is 230,000 would appear (ph) in our budget then?

MR. McVEE: Yes. Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Well I guess what this implies is that we're going to carry an ongoing budget item in our budget of 226 the first year for our move and 230 the second year for just services?

additional staff listed down there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: Right. I'm talking, you know, the Public Resource staff requirements.

MR. PENNOYER: The additional staff is those Public Resource Coordinators mentioned previously under Public Outreach?

MR. GIBBONS: That's correct. What we're trying to do is combine this to a combined package that we have information specialists for public scoping meetings, and also, some people to deal with the li- -- the Exxon Valdez material and making it available to the public.

Option 3(A) is -- you should add 58,000 to that option making that 354.3. This suggests moving the Exxon Valdez public material to another library, maintaining some acquisition of material and no library network. This will not be a complete Exxon Valdez collection. If somebody wants to go to find out information about the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill and injuries, it will not be here. We'll provide -- it says limited public access, what is meant there is there will be no library network so the people will have to walk into the door to get the materials versus somebody from Cordova going to the public library and requesting it as the last option.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. McVEE: Dave is with the Resources library -- BLM Resource Library, this is the package?

MS. RUTHERFORD: 196.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: Excuse me, 196. What this does is that if you read the (indiscernible) -- it maintains the published material relative to the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill in one location, provides public access and reference document. It will bring together the response information there, and it provides a limited network so people can -- to access it from outlying areas, they can request it through their libraries and pick up material that way.

That's what's reflected in there, and it's reflected on two staff positions there at 130,000. Those staff positions are a Public Resource Coordinator who supervises the public information operation and Public Resource staffing, meeting coordination, those types of activities for that facility. That Public Resource Coordinator who does some of the basic coding of the material that comes in for the library networks, insures and tracks some responses and those types of activities. So that's where those other positions I mentioned earlier are reflected.

MR. PENNOYER: Excuse me? It's probably just me, but where are you at?

MR. GIBBONS: I'm at 3(B), Option 3(B).

MR. PENNOYER: 3(B), okay, I got that.

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah, I'm moving from the back forward.

MR. PENNOYER: I see, you're talking about the

and work our way forward, perhaps. And Option 4 is the existing OSPIC now. There's some corrections that need to be made to these, and I'll explain them as we go through them.

This first one here, we need to take out the first two lines out of it to make it comparing apples and apples to all of our options; so please line out the data processing manager and the executive officer.

MR. PENNOYER: Where are you?

MR. GIBBONS: Option 4. Line the first two items out because we reviewed this again on Monday or Tuesday of this week, and we're trying to make effort comparisons. So that's really \$310,000.00. Plus, if we want to compare all of the alternatives accurately, we estimate you should add 66,000 to that, which would be space, phones, library network, acquisition of materials and all that; making that total 376. That more accurately reflects the cost, we feel, this is the Restoration Team cost.

Moving to Item 3(B), I'm mousing my assistants up here by jumping around. But 3(B) is the option we recommend to the Trustee Council. And this is explained there. You have to add some costs to this one. You'll have to add \$53,000.00 to this one making a total of 196. And that reflects space costs, plans, Xeroxing, phones, those types of things -- not plans but phones. And so that total is 396. What this does is it maintain --

R & R COURT REPORTERS

be help if I give some introductory comments in general about how the group has approached public participation outside of the Public Advisory Group. Because really whatever numbers you see and what institutions you see in that budget are reflective of a certain idea. And it may be that you either like or don't like the idea, and if you don't like the idea then that makes if fairly easy to deal with all those institutions that appear.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Mr. Piper, we're going to have all of these sectors anyhow, I guess if that's appropriate before we get to Agency Program Support, then do you want to do the Public Outreach part now?

Okay. Let's -- why don't you proceed.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Flip a few pages back and there's a section on the Public Resource Center. What we've provided here is an alternative to the present OSPIC. OSPIC was established in 1990, I won't go into that. We've got four options here; inherent in each option is there a Public Outreach staff comprised of 1.5 people, which I mentioned earlier; and these are your information specialists. The scoping meeting people that deal — also deal with the public letters coming in and meet the public and those types of people.

And then what we've built here, in addition to that, is a Public Resource Center. And if you'll flip through there there's four alternatives, and maybe we can start at the back

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Outreach Program to develop the Restoration Plan?

MR. GIBBONS: No.

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: No. Okay. Somebody help me with that.

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes.

MR. RICE: The Public Outreach budget figure that is there is primarily those people that would be needed to put together a public program. It does not reflect the Restoration Team or the Restoration Subgroup involvement in that; those costs are reflected in their basic components.

MR. BARTON: And I'm not even dealing with costs right now, I'm trying to figure out the various purposes of these three activities and how they relate.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Maybe if I can move on to the Public Resource Center, this might add a little bit of light to this, because that's where it seems to be the fuzz. We've got the Restoration Team sitting up here, we have a Restoration Subgroup which is developing the plans, we have a Public Outreach is built in, in some regards, to the Public Resource Center and they are linked together. And that might help explain what we're proposing.

MR. PENNOYER: If you think it would clarify it, why don't you go ahead.

MR. PIPER: I think, Mr. Chairman, actually, if I could refer to that suggestion a little bit. If we would -- it might

the Restoration Planning Subgroup or the scientific peer review process.

So I guess to me it's pretty clear that there isn't much overlap, and I wonder what would make it much clearer?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

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: Well I can -- let me explain where I am having trouble distinguishing. The first area is the Public Outreach, and the relationship of that to the second area which is the Restoration Planning Subgroup and the relation then of that to the third area, and that's agency program support. Those are the three areas that are fuzzed up in my mind, and anything that can be done to clear that up in subsequent discussions will be appreciated.

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, Mr. Montague.

MR. MONTAGUE: The Public Outreach was -- and other Restoration Team members can address this in more detail. But this was basically how we approached the idea of allowing for meaningful public involvement above and beyond the Public Advisory Group. And it's basically a straw man (ph) direction of what might be considered the support for meaningful public involvement. And the public input for the Restoration Plan I assume can occur irregardless of whether we have a Public Outreach Program.

MR. BARTON: Well is not the purpose of the Public

Maybe Commissioner Sandor's idea is the best one, to put this one aside for the moment, look at the administrative costs and then come back to it. I think the next one is going to give us an equal amount of trouble because there's less detail in it than in is on the one that's in front of us now.

But does anybody else want to comment on this one or should we move on for the moment and come back to this after we hear from Ernie and look at the bulk of the rest of the administrative part of the budget?

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague.

MR. MONTAGUE: I'd like to address a little bit on the question about overlap. And first of all, the Restoration Team does the -- I guess the so-called grunt work of the Trustee Council. We don't do restoration planning, we're not developing the Restoration Plan. And that's purely a restoration subgroup or planning subgroup process with the only overlap being the direction we give them to go. And the scientific support has nothing to do with either, and that all their work is reviewing reports, primarily, and somewhat reviewing projects.

So, in those three categories, they clearly don't see any overlap. And in regards to the Public Advisory Group, that's a requested separate function that was required by the Settlement and cannot do the work of the Restoration Team or

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

fervently that I'm on the right course, and I don't want to be bullheaded about it, but I have some very convictions, even if I am.

MR. PENNOYER: Well I think we're on the horns of a dilemma, because in one case, I think we all recognize we want the most money to go into actual efforts of some kind that can possibly be put into it. On the other hand, it's a hugely complex program and consideration — I think we want to make sure that the money doesn't go into the wrong place, because once done, it's not going to come back. So somewhere between a good, adequate job of up front planning on what it costs and holding the money to spend on things we haven't determined yet.

I know I'm troubled by this budget we've got in front of us now because I don't have the Plan. I see nothing cohesively tieing this altogether as to where we're going to go. And I think if this planning is done right up front that maybe, in fact, the need goes away after the first year and we've got a blueprint. We can follow the blueprint, we can make sure the money goes into the most appropriate places.

And I agree with you but I don't want to turn around after three or four years and gee whiz, I wish we hadn't done that. And so it's some combination of the two. And I guess coming back to where -- the way we started, it's pretty apparent we're not going to be able to agree on this things individually until we see what the final package is.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

And obviously, you know, when I look at these documents and I see -- which may be 35 million dollars somebody tells me, I've only been able to read 30 -- but that's going to take all the money which we have net this year to use and it's just going to be gone; you know, it'll start again next year. And I want to see us get the maximum bang for the buck.

And I am approaching this with the view that we must be constrained on our administrative expense. I have no doubt but that these are all legitimate expenditures and legitimate planning. But for example, in the Department of Law, you know, we're able to squeeze (ph) lawyers here this afternoon and we're able to write briefs, and you know we can just somehow get into our budget and get it done without saying well the Department of Law really needs 250,000 or a half a million to support the legal aspects of business (ph). You won't see one nickel in here for the Department of Law. We work on this thing daily. That somehow, you know, we're going to get our job done without, you know, saying we have to have money, you know, out of this.

Because it's my belief (ph) that I want to see the money go into the restoration process. And that's, as the Governor would say, where I'm coming from. And that I know I want us to go one step farther, that's what the Governor has historically said he wants done, and then I think we're on — he was on the right course. And I believe, obviously,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Framework to the Trustee Council.

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

So the tasks all blend together into one continuous stream. The second concern is that if you just look at these slots as something you can shuffle people in and out of from the agencies, then we really suffer from a lack on continuity. And you know, the life of every organization historical memory or institutional memory is the real important thing. And that's especially true when you've condensed as much as we have into a two-year period. And so that continuity of people is real important to us.

Thank you.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Yeah. I would like to make a couple of remarks. First, I have no doubt that the Restoration Team people have worked very hard. I think they performed their assignment well. And I have no doubt but that they are working long hours and in very able fashion.

My concern is that I want to see the maximum amount of money left to perform restoration and to do the job out there that this whole settlement and the whole process envisioned we would do. And I am endeavoring to guard against, you know, the delusion of monies which would limit the amount of restoration and enhancement which we can do (ph). You see that is my central purpose here.

Advisory Group and the others that are interacting with it, it would seem that you really wouldn't need full-time equivalents running the full year. And hence, you know, at least from the process I'm thinking of, it would seem that these individuals could go back to their assignments, at least on a part-time basis, and we wouldn't be dealing with full-time equivalents.

But since this is so interrelated, Mr. Chairman, I'd suggest deferring approval of this until we get through this whole process and specifically the Public Advisory Group presentation by Piper and not act on this budget item at this time. So I would move to table action until that presentation — those other related presentations are completed.

MR. SENNER: Can I just respond briefly to that comment?

MR. PENNOYER: Sure.

MR. SENNER: And then deal with the Floor. In terms of the FTEs there, one of the things that happens is that when you look a year ahead at a series of documents that you have to produce, these aren't nice, neat, discreet tasks where you work for a period on one and then you do something else and then you pick up on another, they're all piling up on each other. We're already making plans for the content of the Restoration Plan even though we haven't even gotten a draft of the Restoration

R & R COURT REPORTERS

appearing repeatedly; so one individual wears multiple hats when it comes to these different entities.

And I view the Restoration Subgroup as kind of a poor (ph) planning team which is there for the benefit of the Restoration Team and the Trustees on -- you know, on a full-time basis. So I see us as being fully integrated with the rest of the structure that you've got in front of you.

But Dave, maybe you want to comment further?

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. In addition to that on these other subgroups, the Restoration Team members generally chair those, except for the Restoration Subgroup, chair those and are involved with that full-time. So, here we've got a bunch of groups working not full-time but a bunch of groups working hard. And those other groups are primarily made of agency people.

MR. PENNOYER: John -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: I think this is precisely an area where we really need to examine this closely. If the Restoration Plan draft is prepared say by the end of September and we have October, November, December, January, February, the roles, as you point out in the Public Advisory Group process, the Restoration Team itself, would have, it would seem, you know, interaction and be helping shape the final plan.

And if, indeed, this Restoration Planning Subgroup is made up of members of agencies who are on an ad hoc assignment

LAR COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- we're working on even as this meeting is in progress, is really the substantive way to kick off public participation. We've been having meetings here over the last few days that focus on the process of public participation. But the Framework gets to the substance of it.

And then from there, the public participation I think will have two focal points; one is this Restoration Plan which is a conceptual document for the decade; secondly, though, is whatever is done in the way of annual work plans -- which is really where the rubber meets the road in the sense of here is where the Trustees and the public will make decisions on specific actions which will occur in each year, and we're going to need to update that annually.

So those are the two thrusts for public participation.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess the other question that Mr. Cole raised is the interaction of these various parts. We have the Administrative Director and his staff and office, and we have Scientific Support, Public Outreach, the Restoration Team itself and the Restoration Planning Subgroup. And Dave or Stan, you know, is there overlap here? Are these things all addressing separate parts of the same need?

MR. GIBBONS: Go ahead, Stan.

MR. SENNER: Well one consideration there is that if you start looking at who we would anticipate to work on the different subgroups, you would start seeing the same names

R & R COURT REPORTERS

work hard and we think this is a minimal amount of resources to do a credible job in the time frame that you're asking for. If we spread the time frame out longer, we can use fewer people, you know, in that period of time. But we're looking for something that's credible and that will speak well for this whole process.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

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: Looking down the road, would you expect that this Restoration Plan will be the subject of some controversy?

MR. SENNER: Well I don't know about controversy. I suspect on any undertaking of this magnitude it's hard to do something that doesn't have its controversial aspects. But more than controversy, I do see it as something very significant because it will set a framework, parameters that will guide efforts for the next decade and should embody the conceptual and policy desires of the Trustee and the public, and that's a big deal.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Stan, is this kind of the major focus for the public involvement, public participation part of the program, the Restoration Program; is this serving that as a major focus?

MR. SENNER: Yes. The Restoration Framework which is -

So between September and the end of that oil year is preparation of that document and the public participation.

MR. PENNOYER: Stan, even more pertinent, would you care to try and respond to Mr. Cole's question about why we need this much effort and this many people based on the work you've done over the past year or two; can you give us a better feel as to why that level of staffing is appropriate?

MR. SENNER: Well we're working now and far in excess of the regular work week to produce the documents that we're producing and the planning that we're doing. We're trying identify the resources that will enable us to sustain our efforts and produce what is needed, that would be one point.

There are three major Restoration planning documents here, a framework and two versions of a plan. There are also the 199- -- what would be a 1993 work plan which will appear in draft and final form, which the Restoration Planning Subgroup would have a significant role in. All of those are documents. The Restoration Planning Subgroup has played a major role in developing the science studies for the year, both damage assessment and restoration. And we invest considerable energy in the liaison within our own agencies working with our own experts on what they envision is needed in the way of a restoration program.

So all of these components are in there, and I don't know what else I can say to persuade or justify except that we

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

September I think would actually require even more than what we've asked in here for. In reality, we'll be lucky to have it done in September. But once the Plan is done and is fully accepted, the disbanding of the Restoration Planning Group probably is possible.

MR. GIBBONS: I think it's planned (ph).

MR. PENNOYER: I would assume that we were going to some type of a different phase and we do some monitoring that's going to go on in our progress, but the actual planning process would be over with.

Stan Senner, do you want to say something about that?

Stan's been chairing -- co-chairing or chairing the Restoration

Planning Work Group, the old whip wagon (ph), he probably has

an insight into (indiscernible - interrupted)

MR. SENNER: Stan Senner, S-E-N-N-E-R. Just to respond to Mr. Sandor's question, we have the Restoration Framework in March and a draft of a Restoration Plan in September. We envision another round of public meetings and participation then followed by preparation of a final Restoration Plan. That's what ha- -- you asked what happened in that period between September and the end of the oil year. So it'd be preparation of that final document, which in some senses, endures for the next decade and is updated by the Annual Work Plan. But conceptually, that is the document that sort of is the guide from thereon.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 1 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. 2 3 MR. COLE: Yeah. Solely (ph) following up on your comment. We have an agency support program that totals an 4 additional 3.267 million, am I reading this correctly? 5 MR. PENNOYER: I guess you are. 6 7 MR. COLE: And that's in addition to the 3.834 million on the total on the preceding page, am I correct in that? 8 that's roughly seven million dollars that we're dealing here 9 10 with this organization for this year. Am I correct in my 11 reading of these (indiscernible) expense? MR. PENNOYER: Well I think the last page contains the 12 13 budget summary that has those outlined with the 3.8 for 14 organizational budget which we have cut some out of already and then 3.267 for agency program support. 15 MR. COLE: And then another 23 million for the Work 16 17 Program. MR. PENNOYER: The actual implementation 18 19 (indiscernible). 20 MR. COLE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. 21 MR. MONTAGUE: MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague. 22 23 MR. MONTAGUE: I'd like to address anything more about 24 the Restoration Planning Subgroup, and more specifically, 25 Commissioner Sandor's question. And getting a Plan done by

of the Restoration Team members or some of the Subgroup members might help me out here.

But these are estimates for when the drafts will be out; in March, I've identified some public scoping sessions with the Restoration Framework, those will take place. And we assume that those same things will happen with the draft Restoration Plan. And so, it takes time to get the communities to come back and prepare a final plan and then put together -- perhaps the other duties would be the next annual edition to that plan. The first it would -- you know, it'd be 1993's projects or whatever activities tiered under that 19- -- under the draft Restoration Plan.

MR. PENNOYER: I think I have an additional question as long as we're getting all of this out on the table. The next line says total organizational budget. We've formed a Lands Subgroup -- on the diagram you've got an Archeology Subgroup, you've got a GIS Subgroup, we've got a Budget Team we haven't talked about yet. Are all of this covered or does that appear somewhere else?

MR. GIBBONS: That's covered on the next page. We have a line item there called Agency Support. And this is an estimate of the cost to pull the various agency people out to perform these tasks. There's a lot of things in that project. We can -- we have a breakdown of that budget on the following pages, if the Trustee Council would like to look at those.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Now, you know, some -- I just obviously feel strongly about it. But maybe I can be convinced by reason that we don't need a million dollars for that, but it's going to take some hard sell I tell you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd hope the convincing would be by reason (ph).

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: A couple of questions that relate to this activity. When will the Restoration Framework be developed as far as when will the draft Plan be produced?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. The estimate right now for the Restoration Framework is in mid-March. And an estimate for the Restoration Plan is September. These are both drafts.

MR. SANDOR: Okay. If the -- Mr. Chairman. If the Restoration Plan is to be produced at least in draft form by September, I guess perhaps Mr. Gibbons could elaborate on the necessity of having this financed for the whole year. It appears to be financed for the whole year. What happens after September? This year runs from February -- March 1 to the end of February of '93, September, even at the end of that, you know, leaves five months and, you know, raises questions about the funding of that magnitude for that; if the Plan is, in fact, produced by that time.

And so maybe you could elaborate on that.

MR. GIBBONS: Sure. I can start it, then I think some

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PENNOYER: I guess one of the things that was lost 1 is that your Public Outreach budget was \$474,000.00, and it 2 contained some of the things that are here and it didn't 3 contain some others. Can you kind of separate those out for us so we can see what's in 3(B) versus what's in Public Outreach? 5 6 MR. GIBBONS: Let me go through first and give you the 7 totals for each option so we all have that to work from. 8 Option 1, the correct figure should be \$160,000.00. 9 MR. COLE: And what -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman. 10 MR. PENNOYER: Go ahead, Mr. Cole. 11 MR. COLE: What are the general parameters of Option 1? 12 Option 1 is to take the material and put MR. GIBBONS: into the archive files either in Anchorage or Juneau and 13 14 maintain them there. The public access is extremely limited, 15 and there would be no centralized area where people -- the public could go to get these; there's no active acquisitions to 16 17 build upon the program. It would be just an archival service. 18 MR. COLE: Thank you. And Mr. Gibbons then that costs how much 19 MR. PENNOYER: 20 for Option 1? 21 That would MR. GIBBONS: 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 160. 23 MR. PENNOYER: How did you get down from the 24 25 MR. GIBBONS: 160,000.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 277-0572 OR 277-0573 FAX 274-8982 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-8543

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-3022

How did you get down from 226 to 160? 1 MR. PENNOYER: Well the 226 reflects space, you know, 2 MR. GIBBONS: costs or whatever, and we're trying to get them -- there would 3 be a savings on space and Xeroxing, that's why we came up with 5 that number. 6 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Continue. 7 MR. GIBBONS: Option 2 is also 160. The difference 8 between Option 1 and 2 is we understand that the State or Federal archives will not accept active files, they want 9 complete files; and our files presently are active, we're still 10 building upon them and adding more information, doing quality 11 12 assurance and quality control. 13 And so Option 1 is -- when we looked at it, we said 14 well we've got to present it but it's -- we would have to maintain those files at the agencies until they're complete, 15 16 then move them from the agency over and not even have them come into OSPIC. 17 18 MR. PENNOYER: All right. 19 MR. GIBBONS: Option 3 -- go ahead. 20 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. 21 Two of us here did not understand the 22 MR. COLE: 23 difference. 24 MR. BARTON: I think in Option 1 they're moved from

R & R COURT REPORTERS

OSPIC to archive, in Option 2 they're moved from individual

agencies to archive without cycling through OSPIC; is that right? We have to maintain some of those data MR. GIBBONS: files until they're complete within the agencies and then move them to the archive. MR. BARTON: Directly. MR. PENNOYER: But you also move the present OSPIC items to the archives, some of the stuff's not in the agencies. Dave, in Option 2, you still have to move something from OSPIC, though, don't you? MR. GIBBONS: Right. They're essentially the same, the minor detail of the acceptance of the data. MR. BARTON: In Option 1 we declare them closed files and archive them? MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. And in Option 2 MR. BARTON: MR. GIBBONS: 2, you would maintain them until MR. BARTON: We wait MR. GIBBONS: they're complete and them move them over. MR. BARTON: and then move them. MR. GIBBONS: That's my understanding. MR. PENNOYER: Procedurally somewhat different than (indiscernible - interrupted) MR. GIBBONS: Same result.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | MR. PENNOYER: So part of the thing (ph) is the same, |
|----|---|
| 2 | there's no access for someone to look in the file |
| 3 | (indiscernible - interrupted) |
| 4 | MR. GIBBONS: There's no access, they're in an archive |
| 5 | file, the archives. |
| 6 | MR. PENNOYER: All right. |
| 7 | MR. GIBBONS: And they would be a box labelled a |
| 8 | subtitle or something in that. |
| 9 | MR. PENNOYER: And there would be no attempt as we go |
| 10 | along here building Restoration Plans and so forth to put any |
| 11 | of that in the access situation? |
| 12 | MR. GIBBONS: Well I think maybe Curt can speak to |
| 13 | this, but I think the plan we had in mind is that the future |
| 14 | final reports and stuff would go to some library function, and |
| 15 | that's the 226 there, the BLM. |
| 16 | MR. McVEE: Yeah. There'd be a continuing collection |
| 17 | of materials into the library system a library system. |
| 18 | MR. BARTON: And that's in option which? |
| 19 | MR. GIBBONS: That's in Option 1 and 2. |
| 20 | MR. PENNOYER: I guess I'm confused. If this is going |
| 21 | to an archive instead of to a different library, why do we have |
| 22 | a continual library function similar to it? |
| 23 | MR. STEELE: Published materials versus active files. |
| 24 | MR. McVEE: Yeah. |
| 25 | MR. STEELE: The published material would go to the |

| 1 | library, the active files would, in one option, be maintained |
|----|--|
| 2 | by the agencies, in the other option it would be maintained by |
| 3 | the agencies until it was complete and then given into the |
| 4 | archives. There are, potentially, some hidden costs there in |
| 5 | terms of coding, the archives won't accept the material unless |
| 6 | its coded properly and so on and so forth, but that's down the |
| 7 | line a ways. |
| 8 | Basically the difference between those two options is |
| 9 | the fact that agency would keep the material in one option and |
| 10 | it would go to the archives in the other option. |
| 11 | MR. PENNOYER: Well then what's the 226 you're talking |
| 12 | about, does that come in as a separate item? |
| 13 | MR. McVEE: The BLM, the Natural Resource |
| 14 | MR. PENNOYER: Well would that still be something that |
| 15 | had to be figured? Even if you go on Option 1, you would |
| 16 | still |
| 17 | MR. STEELE: Yes. |
| 18 | MR. PENNOYER: have the 226 charge |
| 19 | MR. STEELE: The public |
| 20 | MR. PENNOYER: off to the side for the library? |
| 21 | MR. STEELE: The published material would go to the |
| 22 | library is the theory. |
| 23 | MR. McVEE: But it would not cost us. It would not |
| 24 | cost |

R & R COURT REPORTERS

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, it wouldn't.

It would be with typical library materials. MR. McVEE: 1 2 (Indiscernible - simultaneous speech) MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 3 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. Is there anyone in the audience who can 5 MR. COLE: explain this succinctly? 6 7 MR. STEELE: It's tough. MR. COLE: There's a volunteer. 8 9 (Off record comments) 10 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. We have a volunteer. A succinct volunteer. 11 I'll try. I'm the Director for OSPIC. MS. McGEE: 12 I understand correctly, Option 1 and 2 mean you do not have the 13 facility as it is now that provides information to the public 14 in a combined collection of Exxon Valdez related material. 15 16 There are minor differences in 1 and 2, but basically, you do not have OSPIC as it is now, you have a public information 17 18 officer that provides services such establishing meetings we've had to date, providing handouts and providing the information 19 that the Trustee Council wishes to be distributed. 20 Is that what you think, Dave? 21 That's correct. MR. GIBBONS: 22 MS. McGEE: And Option 3 and 4 -- well 4 is as it is. 23 Option 3(A) and 3(B) maintain OSPIC, and I don't like to use 24 the word OSPIC because I understand that's not a word people 25

like to hear. But Option 3(A) means those materials are not 1 put on a network as they are now, so they're basically only 2 3 available within the library. 4 Option 3(B) maintains access to a network by providing 5 an additional person to put that information in an established library standard that can be accepted by those networks. 6 7 MR. BARTON: But for more access it would cost less? MR. PENNOYER: 8 I guess Option 3(A) that doesn't provide 9 a network costs 354,000 and Option 3(B) with the network only costs 196, it sounds like a bargain. 10 11 MS. McGEE: I'd have to go back and look at the 12 figures. 13 MR. STEELE: We're keeping the published material in 14 the current library rather than transferring a portion of that 15 material to another library and accepting those 226 16 MR. McVEE: I guess that's my point, though, that's going to cost 196,000 for us to transfer but we still have to 17 18 pay 226 in annual charges for maintenance. 19 That's actually not MR. STEELE: 20 MR. McVEE: So the total cost is still 21 MR. STEELE: That's actually not a moving cost, that 22 226 is not a moving cost, that's the first year cost for 23 maintaining -- for accepting that data. 24 But then it's an ongoing charge? MR. PENNOYER: MR. STEELE: That's correct. 25

1 MR. PENNOYER: So you haven't saved a lot of money. MR. STEELE: It's cheaper to keep it where it is than 2 to move it is the bottom line. 3 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee. 5 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, a couple of things in the BLM proposal, it says that the materials would go onto the National 6 7 Library Network and then they refer to three of the networks. But it seems to me like maybe the only difference between 3(A) 8 and 3(B) is the cost of space. Is that 9 10 MS. McGEE: It's personnel. 11 MR. McVEE: Personnel. It's an additional person that takes care 12 MS. McGEE: of the cataloging and processing of those materials for the 13 14 network. 15 MR. BARTON: Well MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton. 16 MR. BARTON: I'm still very confused. 17 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, if you can help Mr. Barton. 18 MR. COLE: Well I would say wouldn't it be well that we 19 20 have this written out in a little more detail for us by tomorrow so we don't have to spend quite so much time this 21 afternoon, unless you want to continue to invest it. Really I 22 have no objection, but I'm so utterly confused that I don't 23 think I could ever understand this.

25

MR. BARTON: I think, though, it would be more helpful

to have less detail rather than more.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: I was just going to say we've got a lot of detail here, it just is not necessarily comparable and

MS. McGEE: Could I add one more comment?

MR. PENNOYER: Sure.

MS. McGEE: And Mr. McVee, maybe you could tell me if this is correct. If I understand correctly from talking to the Resources Library librarian, the 226, the additional cost is that they would continue to provide those services that OSPIC is now presently providing, the reference and the cataloging that's presently done by OSPIC. Is that correct?

MR. McVEE: I think that's correct. It sounds like what they intended in their memo to us (indiscernible - voice lowers).

MR. PENNOYER: Well I guess sending people away to do something in a little more detail sounds good but I'm still not sure what they're doing. I guess if you just put the thrust down for each option as to what is going to happen or isn't going to happen. Option 1 and Option 2 provides nothing but archiving, and there's no library anywhere so we're not paying a hidden \$230,000.00 library charge. Fine. That's a decision we've got to make. That 3(A) provides no networking and 3(B) does provide networking, but does 3 -- why does 3(B) cost less than -- just what is in these options. And what are the policy decisions we have to make and what would it cost to make them?

1 Because it's just too much detail here to compare. MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair, I don't know if this will 2 But at the last meeting there was a lot of discussion 3 that there would be a savings associated with moving the 4 materials over to Bureau of Land Management's library. And, in 5 point of fact, what we found out is that there will be a 6 7 significant cost associated with that and it's an ongoing cost. 8 So to some degree, it just makes better sense to 9 continue with the services as they're currently being provided with -- slightly cut back. And that's what we're recommending 10 11 in 3(B). MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. 12 MR. PENNOYER: We're -- it's now 3:15, do you want to 13 take about a 10 minute break? 14 MR. BARTON: Could I ask one more. 15 MR. PENNOYER: Why don't you ask one more question 16 17 before we take a break. 18 MR. BARTON: Where is the \$172,000.00 for space considered in these options? Has 3(B) got it in there or not? 19 MR. GIBBONS: 3(B) has it in there. 20 21 MR. BARTON: So there's only \$20,000.00 for people in 3(B)? 22 23 MR. GIBBONS: No. MS. RUTHERFORD: No. 24

R & R COURT REPORTERS

It is very confusing.

25

MR. STEELE:

810 N STREET 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 277-0572 OR 277-0573 277-8543 277-7515 272-3022 FAX 274-8982

allocation of space. There was some continued (ph) in these numbers. It's confusing. We can -- I think we can do a much better job at clarifying this if you want to

MR. PENNOYER: Do you want to bring it back tomorrow or is this something you can do in a few minutes to clarify?

MR. BARTON: Why don't we bring it back and

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

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. PENNOYER: Okay. Let's bring it back tomorrow.

Mr. McVee, one last comment before we take a break.

MR. McVEE: I guess I had a suggestion is I thought we'd agreed that we would keep the collection together and that — but we would look at the options for location. And it seems to me like if — you know, if we agree that is a functioning collection keeping it together that we could drop all except the last three or maybe even 3(A) and 3(B); you know, we could do

MR. STEELE: The only one that keeps it together is the one that we recommend; otherwise, it's split up because the DOI (ph) Library will not accept the entire collection, they will accept only published material. The only option that keeps it together is the option recommended, and that's 3(B).

MR. BARTON: Well what about other libraries? Have we been through that drill before?

MR. STEELE: We've been through that drill. There's going to be a cost. There's going to be a cost wherever you

| 1 | take it. And it just seems logical to us, anyway, after |
|----|---|
| 2 | beating our heads against the wall on this, is let's keep it |
| 3 | together. We need some of the space anyway, let's keep it |
| 4 | together, let's cut back the staff, let's cut back the meat, |
| 5 | let's have a synergistic approach to this, you know, Public |
| 6 | Outreach and go on. |
| 7 | MR. PENNOYER: As part of your discussions, can you |
| 8 | illustrate to us what you've cut back? |
| 9 | MR. STEELE: Personnel. |
| 10 | MR. PENNOYER: In terms well |
| 11 | MR. STEELE: There were five people that were library |
| 12 | personnel, we now identified two full-time people that are |
| 13 | basically library. You've got some other Public Outreach |
| 14 | people that are staff to the Executive Director. |
| 15 | MR. PENNOYER: Well I don't excuse me, Tim. I don't |
| 16 | see two library type people in Option 3(B); I see a public |
| 17 | information specialist and two Public Resource Coordinators. |
| 18 | I'm not sure, are those library folk or is that |
| 19 | MR. STEELE: Library. |
| 20 | MR. PENNOYER: this other |
| 21 | MR. STEELE: (Indiscernible - away from |
| 22 | microphone) |
| 23 | MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair. The one 1.5 full-time |
| 24 | equivalents are built into the Administrative Director's Public |
| 25 | Outreach budget, and those are the people that are being |

leveraged. The people -- the two full-time equivalents at 1 65,000 a piece are the ones that are dedicated totally to the 2 3 Resource Center. MR. PENNOYER: They would basically be library folks? 4 5 MS. RUTHERFORD: Yes, that's correct. Okay. Why don't we take a break and 6 MR. PENNOYER: 7 then come back and decide whether we want to take this up tomorrow. 8 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I move we break. (Off record comments) 10 (Off record) 11 12 (On record) 13 MR. PENNOYER: I'm still missing a couple of 14 Restoration Team members. Okay. At the break, we retreated to the hallway and tried to make sense out of the library and 15 16 Public Outreach, and I thought we had it but I'm informed that we really would really benefit by an overnight discussion 17 process and come back, and I'm assured we can have the whole 18 19 presentation in five minutes tomorrow. So we will defer 3(A), 20 3(B), 1 and 2. 21 22

And I'd ask you, Dave, we've deferred, as I read it, Public Outreach, we tabled the Public Advisory Group and now we've deferred the section on 3(A)/3(B). What do we have left in this thing that we can deal with in the administrative part today?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

23

24

MR. GIBBONS: That's it. I'd like to deal with the agency overhead and the activities of both the damage assessment and restoration tomorrow when we get into the detailed study because they all went together.

MR. PENNOYER: How about the public participation, do we need that now or do we wait until you are done (ph) to do that.

MR. PIPER: Mr. Chairman.

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. PENNOYER: Ernie Piper.

MR. PIPER: I would -- mine is a fairly straightforward examination of what's gone on at the public meetings. In view of the fact that there are a lot of things on this Agenda that are much more critical than my presentation, I would respectfully recommend that, perhaps, you deal with some other items and put mine off, and I'll be at your service any other time.

MR. PENNOYER: That's right, the reason we were taking yours was because it was germane to some of the budget decisions we're making. But I think we've tabled all of those or deferred them, so we probably don't need your (indiscernible) right now.

MR. PIPER: And since they're dealing with those tomorrow, it might be better to deal with everything that has public with a capital "P" on it first thing in the morning or whenever you choose tomorrow.

| 1 | MR. PENNOYER: That's fine. And maybe you could make |
|----|--|
| 2 | your presentation first, then we could come back and deal with |
| 3 | budget parts. |
| 4 | Okay. What's the next part then, Mr. Gibbons, on the |
| 5 | administrative section? |
| 6 | MR. GIBBONS: At the last meeting, the January 10th |
| 7 | meeting, the Restoration Team was directed to form a habitat |
| 8 | the name wasn't given to it but we're using Habitat |
| 9 | Protection/Lands Committee. And we have Ken Rice is going to |
| 10 | give you some status on what we've done in this arena. |
| 11 | MR. PENNOYER: Now is that a budget item? |
| 12 | MR. GIBBONS: No. I we don't have anything else on |
| 13 | the excuse me. |
| 14 | MR. PENNOYER: What about the section on Agency Program |
| 15 | Support, do we want to at least discuss that before we get off |
| 16 | of this topic; that's part of your organizational budget as |
| 17 | well? |
| 18 | MR. GIBBONS: That's related. The amounts in there are |
| 19 | related to which projects move forward and somewhat (ph) |
| 20 | MR. PENNOYER: So we should defer the Agency Program |
| 21 | Support part until we make the project decisions? |
| 22 | MR. GIBBONS: In some agencies, you know if 50% of |
| 23 | the program is cut, some of that overhead cost will come down. |
| 24 | emphasize some of it but |
| 25 | MR. PENNOYER: It is your recommendation then we leave |

that Agency Program Support part of the budget until we talk about the total package and the number of programs that are proposed to go out to public review? No?

MR. GIBBONS: We can tell you what's in there but the I feel the numbers are going to change.

MR. PENNOYER: Wishes of the Council; do you want to discuss the Agency Program Support in general or leave it until we get a permanent fix on the numbers? It's 3.267 million dollars.

MR. BARTON: How much of it is likely to change there?

MR. GIBBONS: Well, it's kind of hard. If you'll flip
briefly to the chart that's a horizontal chart and it's called

EVOS Recovery Agency Program Support. There's a line item
there for two types of personal services, both professional and
technical, some travel, contractual services, commodities and
equipment. These are an estimate right now of what our needs
will be to support the program by agency and by line item.

MR. PENNOYER: Can you tell me, Dave, what the double star item means, includes projects specific costs that are reflected in project costs for some agencies, does that mean you have a double -- some of it's here and some of it's in the project budgets or it's duplicate money?

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. What I understand from this is that some of the costs here should be moved over into the project costs.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PENNOYER: But right now they're here? 1 MR. GIBBONS: Right now they're here. 2 MR. PENNOYER: But it's not consistent between 3 agencies? 4 5 MR. GIBBONS: That's correct. 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So how meaningful is this? 7 MR. PENNOYER: Do you suggest we approach that, the 8 fact that apparently from a budget standpoint we haven't gone through it and made it consistent? Is there -- can we deal 9 with this here or is it something that's going to have to come 10 11 in another iteration at some other time? 12 MR. GIBBONS: Well we've been trying to deal with it 13 for a couple of week to be honest. We've had some miscommunications on where the costs go, and the agencies have 14 been accounting them differently. And I'm not sure how we deal 15 16 with this at this present time. Does the Restoration Team have 17 any suggestions? 18 MR. BRODERSEN: Mr. Chairman. 19 MR. PENNOYER: Yes. Mark. I think basically what we're going to 20 MR. BRODERSEN: have to do at this time is ask the Trustee Council for their 21 philosophical concurrence or disconcurrence, if you will, on the projects as they're outlined. And then the next step after 23 that is probably to have a detailed review of the budgets for 24

R & R COURT REPORTERS

each project; that's not yet been done. And as one is doing

that detailed budget review, you can see if the projects costs and this overhead cost -- or that can't then be reconciled some way.

We had anticipated being able to do a detailed budget review for you prior to this meeting and basically just ran out of time. I feel that that's still a critical element that needs to be done here before the Trustee Council has final buyoff on any of these projects and costs.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I think this budget issue should be deferred.

MR. PENNOYER: Anybody else? Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Would it be helpful if we had -- if the Council agreed to a set of guidelines for compiling this chart, would that be of some utility in pulling this thing together?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. I think it would. What we were dealing with was what happens if a project gets cut if you ha- -- if you don't have the overhead cost built into the project, you have to go back and submit a number and try to prorate that down of how much (ph). So what we were trying to do, and I think it's the best approach, is build the support for each one of the projects into the project component, and then build -- have this number stand as support to the program. These might be, like I mentioned earlier, support from the agencies through various subgroups and this type of thing.

MR. BARTON: Well would it be possible then for you to

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

present to us tomorrow a set of guidelines for developing this table that we could then consider and approve or modify?

MR. MONTAGUE: Well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah.

MR. MONTAGUE: Some guidance would help very simply being I guess some the agencies we felt that all overhead costs should be put in one item so that it's clear to everybody where the overhead is. But that does create a problem when you cut and add projects, that requires a redoing of all the figures. And so we need guidance whether that is the preferred approach or whether some overhead of the project should be into every project.

MR. BARTON: Well, how big a problem that is depends on whether we're financing work or financing an organization.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess it somewhat depends on what you're calling overhead. Are these charges for as Mr. Gibbons said, people that come in and work ad hoc on plans and things like that, that's not project overhead, that would presumably still be an agency support. But what type of things are you putting in project overhead; does it include your contracting officers and things like that or is it general support computer systems or

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, it would include both of those, personnel officer work, the scientific oversight of the projects that occurs below the Restoration Team level. Those

are the two, and then the third component which isn't project is the staff that would be needed whether we had projects or not. And some of the figures represent just what would be needed whether they have projects or not.

MR. SANDOR: It would be helpful, Mr. Chair, if the -there be consistency, and that is the same, essentially,
pattern of application of overhead or the costs and projects be
carried through across the board so we can have consistency,
and I gather that's not the case now.

MR. PENNOYER: We -- can the Management Team come back -- Restoration Team and tell us the type of things that we ought to be giving you guidance on as to whether that should be in projects or in agency support? There's some things that are project oriented and there are others that are probably more agency support -- general support oriented. Because you have a scientific support person, Fish & Game, that looks at all fisheries projects, if one project goes away, you probably can't take away two weeks of that person's time. On the other hand, if there are certain computer operational costs and demand (ph) on the amount of data that's put through the system, maybe that does go up and down with different projects.

So, if you can give us some categories of things that could be included in either place, we could probably sign off on where we think they ought to appear. And then our time giving you that guidance here without knowing what's in here.

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

If you could give us, by tomorrow, maybe a spread of what those things are, we can issue (ph) some guidance.

Mr. Cole.

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. Chairman. I think that we should defer this until the next meeting so that we can have a more defined analysis of what we are going to allow by way the so-called overhead. I think it's asking too much to come up with those parameters and criteria tomorrow.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

To some extent since, you know, MR. McVEE: Yes. projects will be accomplished by individual agencies, what we can pull out or what we can pull out as overhead, what we can identify as part of project costs probably will be dictated by the financial management systems that the individual agencies But it seems like that we could set a general parameter that, you know, we will try to cost everything that we can to - directly to a project, and that we will have as overhead only what I would call general program manager management type of activities, you know, within, say for example, Fish & Wildlife Service there'd be a number -- a limited number of people that would be oversight folks that would be managing the Fish & Wildlife Service Restoration Program, that would be overhead. And only that part, that everything else would be associated and directly costed towards a project, you know, including if

we could, through the financial management system if it would work, you know, the cost of putting together contracts or whatever. But try to maximize the direct costs into projects.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

1

2

3

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 agree that we need to defer this decision until a later meeting. But I do think that we need to provide the consistent guidelines in terms of the definition of overhead and the philosophical basis for attributing projects or not attributing the projects so we're all doing it the same way so that the poor Restoration Team is not faced with this same dilemma.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, see I agree that. I had in mind that we could maybe ask the Team to get some advice on that from the financial managers of these agencies or someone who has special skills and training in that area and try to — and outline for us the criteria or at least furnish us with their recommendations; that's all I had in mind. It may be the Management Team has — or the Restoration Team has those skills so that they could do it. I don't know. That was my only thought.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess I had thoughts that this
Restoration Team has been wrestling with this for the last
several months, they might have some questions that they could
ask us rather succinctly in terms of dealing with this process.

I know there's been -- Mr. O'Connor did you have a comment?

MR. O'CONNOR: Mr. Chairman, the

MR. PENNOYER: You better speak into the microphone.

MR. O'CONNOR: That's right. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that since we have certain responsibilities that NOAA has in this process that we ask for our gurus on financial management to get involved in this and to put together a program for the Trustee Council to use a common accounting system and a common monitoring system for financial expenditures.

Because right now if I were to have to step into a courtroom and defend the propriety of your decisions, I would have to spend a considerable amount of time trying to decipher exactly what is going on. If we had a cookbook put together I think it would make some sense, and I would volunteer our resources to do that. We could get somebody from the State to offer up a representative as well, it would be a good task to perform in the immediate future.

MR. PENNOYER: Well we -- one of the things that's on the diagram but not in this plan is financial management. And we have to, I think, cross that bridge while we're here in regards to who does it. We're going to have to decide how to approach it. And I guess can we be clear on what we're doing with this budget right now? I mean on all of these items, are we're not coming to a final decision, it's going to be

R & R COURT REPORTERS

just that, are we?

I mean in most of these cases we seem to be building something that -- certainly we're going out to public review with the whole plan, and I assume that includes of these administrative costs as well in terms of what the total program is going to look like.

We haven't had -- and I guess maybe that was the statement made earlier that we haven't gotten into even the Team had not done a detailed review of the budgets. And apparently, we haven't had any budget specialists look at the budgets and how they're put together, the consistency with the different rules we may have to follow on different agencies.

What we're doing here, for the most part, I think is signing off, as I think Mr. Brodersen said, philosophically on what we think ought to be included here; a general idea of costs. But I don't think we can reach a final limit on most of these costs today or tomorrow.

The second piece of that is that we probably are trying to decide on whether we have to go and ask for some start-up money are we not? And so we've got to make some sub-decisions here on which projects or which things would need to go and how we package and what do we with it for start-up costs is some of these programs. And I assume that includes agency program support. I'm not sure of that but I assume that today (ph). So we probably need to, at least, partially deal with this in

some fashion; maybe not sign-off on the total but partially deal with something that's part of this package to get us started.

I don't know how we do this, somebody's going to have to give us some guidance on how to approach that. But I'm not sure we can just defer this entirely. I think it may be important to the total package we're sending forward as interim basis (ph).

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. You know, I think here, you know, we're trying to develop, as I visualize it, a 12-month budget. And that we have to go, you know, to the public for public comment on that budget before it's finalized, it seems to me like, to conform to the decree and the public review -- the public process requirement. But it seems like the other component is, as you mentioned, is that we've got immediate needs and that's a separate exercise almost that we have to identify.

We have to come up with some numbers of what we need right now so that we can start the process to withdraw funds.

MR. PENNOYER: I had assumed that probably wasn't a totally separate exercise, that from this package and looking at it, we could say this part is to go how, we need some money here now and that type of thing somewhere in this process.

Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: As I visualize, in part, what we're doing is we're giving guidance to the Administrative Director and the Restoration Team as to what the organization will look like, and can he plan on putting in place these various positions. And I think we're giving them guidance in that area and then perhaps following this meeting they can — taking up on the guidance and the decisions made by the Council, they can formulate the structure which is a little greater assurance.

But what I wanted to say in addition is that with respect to this agency program support, harking back to my remarks at the beginning of today's session, we must be very, very careful that we pay over to the various agencies only those monies which can be linked directly with the restoration process. Because surely, waiting in the wings, are those who will say look the State and Federal Governments are ripping off from the Exxon Valdez Settlement funds monies to support the agencies. You just know that's going to -- will not maybe happen if we're very careful, but they certainly will consider that, and they will look at it very, very closely.

So, if we say let us get, you know, expert views as to what we can properly charge back, you know -- or pay back to the various agencies, then we can be secure that we can defend our decisions against legal attack, and that's one thing I'm very concerned about. The decisions we make with respect to,

you know, the public information officer and this and that, I mean those are largely within our good judgment and discretion and exercise of, you know, our duties as Trustees. But in this area where we reimburse agencies, we have to be very, very careful.

MR. MORRIS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Byron.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MORRIS: In that respect, Mr. Cole mentioned we could so some of these decisions at the next meeting, which I don't know when that's going to be, but at least in my agency's case, and I'm sure it's the case in some others, we aren't authorized to spend beyond March 1st. And we do have offices established that we maintain to support this program and staff in those offices, and that is a dilemma if we delay too long. And I would like to at least put in your mind at least some interim solution until we can get this sorted out before we, perhaps, adjourn tomorrow afternoon.

MR. PENNOYER: Did you have a suggestion?

MR. MORRIS: Well

MR. PENNOYER: Or are you just saying we're going to have to come up with one?

MR. MORRIS: I at least could suggest the amount I could use for the next month or two or three.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I guess that's sort of what is going to happen, because we have here 3.267 -- so far, again,

we have deferred or tabled four of six items here; dropped one, adopted one and deferred four others. And this item, I don't think I can much with this item the way it's outlined right now. There's no way to dig in there and decide what's appropriate and not appropriate. Is part of this going to be reimbursable, it may be hard to tell until you actually see what people want to claim for reimbursement.

But we right now have an item, and certainly some of it is going to require some addressing of interim funding. I don't think I'm ready to buy-off on what I see here because I don't see the detail, I don't know the price area (ph). I don't know it was derived. I don't know how much belongs here versus in projects.

So, two things, I thought we -- I thought the Team could ask the questions and see if Mr. McVee's outline of what should be in projects versus in the Agency Program Support was appropriate. If they think that's adequate guidance, then maybe they're okay or maybe they're going to ask us some questions around Mr. McVee's statement that would help us give them that type of guidance. Rather than take a long time, I thought they'd been thinking about for this for a couple of months, maybe they might have some succinct questions they could ask us.

And the second, is I don't know if we can totally defer this. We may have to come back and do some of these things

R&R COURT REPORTERS

because ongoing operations may be dependent on funding here in the near future. And I don't know how to sort those out because I don't know what they are. But again

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Sure. Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: You know, bearing in mind that we have personal liability probably if we transgress the line, I think we should have another meeting before the end of the month if it's just to deal with this discreet subject. I'm not prepared to make those decisions regardless of the necessity for agency fundings beyond March 1st. I just don't see how we can and do what's, you know, required of us.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Several things come to mind. I appreciate Mr. O'Connor's generous offer, but on behalf of Agriculture I decline. I think that -- I agree that needs doing, but I think it's best done here in Alaska, Number 1; Number 2, the monies will ultimately be spent by individual agencies so those individual accounting procedures have got to be built into the process.

The second thing is that I had thought Mr. Gibbons indicated that we might get some enlightenment tomorrow on this as we go through the individual projects. Is that right, Dave?

MR. GIBBONS: We could give some, yes.

MR. BARTON: You answered that question. Dave, again

though, what percent is liable to be affected by that, of this 3.267; half of it, a third, ten percent?

MR. GIBBONS: That's kind of hard to really determine because I don't know specifically what's detailed in all of these budgets, you know, by the various agencies. I don't -- you know, we know people but we don't know, you know, really names or all that detail that we need to really look at.

Another option might be we have a Budget Process Group, and we have representative -- a Budget representative from the State and a Budget representative from the Federal Government on that Team, and they might be able to give us excellent guidance on how to approach this. That's just a suggestion.

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton and then Mr. Montague.

MR. BARTON: I was not done.

MR. PENNOYER: I apologize.

MR. BARTON: I think we do need to establish some group, this Budget Process group perhaps, to bring some consistency to how we treat these matters and to develop some procedures for us to adopt in terms of how we're going to spend the money, how it's going to be allocated. And, I'd suggest that we build on the group that we have established, and -- by adding to that some people with some special knowledge in this from each of our agencies and get that group cranked up and moving. And, perhaps, that will address Craig's concern, well-

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

founded concern.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague.

MR. MONTAGUE: Yes. I would suggest that, perhaps, the Council may want to just agree on a very conservative overhead figures based upon the cost of the projects. And that would be a very simple and effective way of dealing with it, like 10%, 15% of whatever the project costs were could be assumed to be overhead or added for overhead, which by contracting standards is a very low percentage.

MR. BARTON: Well, and in fact, I believe we added up around 10% in the NERTA efforts of the prior two years if I'm not mistaken.

MR. MONTAGUE: For our projects, that is roughly adequate.

MR. BARTON: Yes. I know at some point, we also are going to have to figure out how to mesh the oil year with the Federal fiscal year with the State fiscal year too. And one way to do that is to go quarterly budgeting. And, perhaps, what we need to do is adopt a quarterly budget for this specific item. We can't make too bad a mistake, if we use that approach. And during that quarter, straighten this thing out.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: It's the allocation that troubles me. And I want to see the recommendations for an allocation above the

signature of someone we can point to in the event of litigation and say this is proper allocation under generally accepted accounting principles. And fine, I'll just say that's fine, I think, I hope, and that'll take care of it. But until we get that, I think, you know, we're entering into the zone of risk.

MR. BARTON: So you don't think we should even provide any conditional monies for this activity until we get that?

MR. COLE: It isn't so much the conditional money, because we can take care of it by means of, you know, you might say journal entries or reallocations of the money. It's just that before there is any overall allocation of the monies with finality to overhead or related things, that we must have, I think, you know, expert opinion. And that is likely available in addition within the State and in the agencies, and we don't necessarily have to go outside of the State and Federal governments. But I think we just need that prepared for us by people who have background and have special skills in that area.

MR. BARTON: And I agree with that. But each agency, I suspect, has a specific procedure for the allocation of overhead, they're probably not the same, yet they probably all may gap (ph).

MR. COLE: I sort of understood that you might not be prepared to accept notes.

MR. BARTON: No. I didn't say that. What I did not

R & R COURT REPORTERS

accept was NOAA's help in developing their guidance for my system. MR. COLE: I see. All right. That sort of makes my point. MR. BARTON: I see. MR. ROY: Mr. Chairman. MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. Cordell. MR. ROY: The more we talk, the more and more complex we're becoming with this exercise. As we waded through overhead processes to come up with this chart, we discovered there are significant administrative differences among the agencies, even within the governments. Is there any comfort on the Council at all with a flat percentage for overhead purposes? It seems to me that overheading by percentage is a common practice even in the governments, but certainly in industry. I think for overhead purposes the State Department Administration charges around -- is it six percent? Right. For the non-science, the true MR. MONTAGUE: administrative overhead is five to six percent. MR. ROY: Could there be any comfort is such an approach? I think that there is not a discomfort of MR. BARTON: setting a percentage in terms of budgeting for that, but as I

R & R COURT REPORTERS

understood Mr. Cole there, he's quite uncomfortable, as am I,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 2 | for. We could say 10% is overhead, but don't you know, if |
|----|---|
| 3 | you go spend on this, that's perfectly legitimate but if you |
| 4 | spend on that, then it's not. Is that |
| 5 | MR. PENNOYER: Is that 10% the agency support or is |
| 6 | that project overhead any overhead or something (ph)? |
| 7 | MR. BARTON: Well, I just pulled that out of the air. |
| 8 | MR. PENNOYER: So if you're dealing with a contractor |
| 9 | that charges 20 or 30 on a project, you just (indiscernible - |
| LO | interrupted) |
| 11 | MR. BARTON: No, that's projects. That part of the |
| 12 | projects not |
| 13 | MR. PENNOYER: So, this is non-project overhead? |
| L4 | MR. BARTON: This is the agency support overhead. |
| ۱5 | MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. |
| 16 | MR. PENNOYER: Is that overhead in the projects, too? |
| 17 | MR. BARTON: Yeah, certainly it is. And if you |
| 18 | contract with the University, you can't get around it we've |
| 19 | found out. |
| 20 | MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. |
| 21 | MR. COLE: What I'm getting at, as Mr. Barton points |
| 22 | out, then you get to the problem what can you include within |
| 23 | overhead and what don't you include in overhead. And that's |
| 24 | where we need to be very, very careful because some agencies or |
| 25 | departments may say well this is overhead but we need to get |

1 as to how that -- what that money then is actually expended

reimbursed for this. And we just need, you know, some guidelines that we can apply right straight across the board and everybody knows the rules, things should work smoothly.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. I'm real willing to defer this.

But I'd like to know to when and how to handle it because we have -- we are going to have to deal with some of this up front funding. We have to deal with something to send out for review, and my assumption is that's to include something on overhead; it should. When do we get this Budget Group together and how do we get back and make these decisions? It's now February whatever.

MR. COLE: But let me say as we talked about earlier, I don't think we have to make the allocation decisions immediately or with any limited period of time because we can make the adjusting entries and, you know, shuffle money back and forth when we reach, you know, the guidelines and the criteria.

I am perfectly prepared to say well, we should allocate monies to these projects now and get on with business. Just the allocation. And that's (indiscernible - voice lowers)

MR. PENNOYER: The actual spending of the money then that you're

MR. COLE: Yeah. Spending the money is all right, it's how we account for it that's most important. I don't mean to

R & R COURT REPORTERS

say it's all right but it's what we're driving at at the moment, that's the issue.

MR. PENNOYER: Curt.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a proposal and I could convert this to a motion I guess. But that

MR. PENNOYER: Do it.

MR. McVEE: Okay. I make it a motion that we divide or separate the budget process subgroup and -- because the process subgroup is basically administrative processes, and that we reorganize an interim, at least, budget committee composed of two State and two Federal. And I guess we'll have to decide how to do that, but budget financial management type people that would address all those issues that we have with maybe -- with their first attention directed towards a definition of this overhead item, the overhead cost. And do this before our next meeting so that we'd have a document that we could look at, maybe some options we can look at as far as a definition of that cost.

And it seems to me like that it'd be essential that this group would look at -- you know, to some extent at the various agencies budget processes and financial management process to do that. A terribly long motion wasn't it?

MR. PENNOYER: It was a great motion as long as I don't have to repeat it. Do I get a second for that?

MR. PENNOYER: Can we discuss it? 2 MR. COLE: I think we've discussed it. 3 Thank you. Is there obje- --4 MR. PENNOYER: 5 MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair. 6 MR. PENNOYER: Yes. 7 MS. RUTHERFORD: Could I ask a question? 8 MR. PENNOYER: Certainly. 9 MS. RUTHERFORD: Would these recommendations from this four people that are Federal and State, would they then come 10 11 back to the Restoration Team so that then we could, within the parameter -- before they bring them to you, so that then we 12 could apply the information we have from the projects and from 13 14 the operating budgets to these directions and so that we have a document available to you that breaks it out according to the 15 directions? 16 Mr. McVee, you didn't intend they work 17 MR. PENNOYER: 18 separate from the Restoration Team did you? I think like other subgroups, they all 19 MR. McVEE: No. 20 report through the Restoration Team. I think we need to do 21 that. MS. RUTHERFORD: So, it would be all right then to take 22 23 the draft that they have, take our budget figures, divide it up 24 like that and present it as a package to you then? 25 MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Second.

MR. BARTON: You're the risk that we'll love it. 1 2 MS. RUTHERFORD: Thank you. 3 MR. PENNOYER: Is there any further discussion, Is there any objection to the procedure motion from 5 Mr. McVee? Okay. It's adopted. 6 Now, having done that, where do we go next? Are we 7 going to just -- I guess we have a number of deferred opt- --8 items, including the Restoration Planning Subgroup, which I quess we'll defer until tomorrow. We have a couple of tabled 9 10 items and three deferred areas, which I think we can put off So, what's next on our Agenda then? 11 until tomorrow. MR. GIBBONS: Well we had next on the Agenda a brief 12 13 overview of the public meetings, but there's members of the 14 public, I have a suggestion that we, perhaps, the Habitat Protection Lands Committee up now. There's some members of the 15 16 public who'd like to hear that presentation. 17 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 18 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. 19 MR. COLE: We have, do we, a 5:00 o'clock or 5:15 20 teleconference? 21 MR. PENNOYER: 5:00 o'clock, that's right. 22 MR. COLE: 5:00 o'clock. I'm thinking about whether there are any people here in attendance today who would like to 23 24 be heard before the 5:00 o'clock teleconference begins. should allow an opportunity for people here to make comment as 25

well as those on the teleconferencing system, I think, but I leave that to your good judgment.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, don't you think the people on the teleconference may want to hear the other public testimony that takes place from here as well?

MR. COLE: Well, maybe some of them here don't want to

MR. COLE: Well, maybe some of them here don't want to stay until 6:30 tonight or 7:00, or you know, it get a little late I found out last time, didn't we?

MR. PENNOYER: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The last time we started at 6:30 though.

MR. PIPER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Piper.

MR. PIPER: Could I also make a suggestion which might allow you to deal with a few other Agenda items more quickly today, too. That judging from -- having gone around to the communities, the issue of habitat acquisition or protection, however we want to term it, is the primary issue on the plate of most of those communities at this time that we've gone to hear. It may be helpful if they heard the presentation about the Habitat and Lands Committee as well to allow them to then provide comment if they want to from that community.

MR. PENNOYER: During the teleconference?

MR. PIPER: Yes, sir. And this might allow you to then go through some other Agenda items that are on here now after

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

| 2 | MR. COLE: I don't know, maybe there's no people here - |
|-----|--|
| 3 | - anyone here want to comment before we talk to the others |
| 4 | (ph). |
| 5 | MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think people do. What's the |
| 6 | Group's desire, do you want to go to public testimony here at |
| 7 | about something like a quarter to and take the Lands |
| 8 | presentation during the teleconference period? |
| 9 | MR. COLE: Do it. |
| 10 | MR. PENNOYER: Are there any items other items on |
| 11 | here, Dave, you could do quickly? |
| 12 | MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. Ernie can give his public |
| 13 | participation very quickly. |
| 14- | MR. BARTON: I thought we'd do that in the morning. |
| 15 | MS. RUTHERFORD: No, we're going to do that tomorrow. |
| 16 | MR. GIBBONS: You're going to do that in the morning, |
| 17 | that's correct. |
| 18 | MR. PENNOYER: We're going to do that in the morning |
| 19 | along with the public participation. |
| 20 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. |
| 21 | MR. GIBBONS: Just the next item then would be a |
| 22 | process for finding a permanent Executive Director, and I just |
| 23 | need a little bit of guidance here from the Trustee Council. |
| 24 | MR. PENNOYER: Shall we go ahead and try to take one or |
| 25 | two items like that first and then sort of blend the |

that.

testimonies together?

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

Dave, go ahead.

MR. GIBBONS: I've been looking into ways to advertise for this position, and I've been hearing some things that the Trustee Council I think needs to hear. And that is we could advertise under the Federal system under our Demonstration Project, which would cover all Federal employees and the public in an advertisement. And we could go simultaneously with the State, target -- a State advertisement targeted at all State employees. Some of the problems of -- the pitfalls is if they're hired under each one of these systems, they cannot report to a Trustee Council, they have to report to one person is what I'm being told.

So my -- where I need some guidance is will the Trustee Council allow this person to report to one person on paper and, perhaps, report to the Trustee Council; or is there some other avenues that we can explore to solve this problem?

MR. PENNOYER: Comment?

MR. BARTON: Is this a personnel management problem?

MR. GIBBONS: It's a personnel management problem that I'm running into. I've had one person tell me to write a rider on a bill to get the personnel changed, the stipulation to that. And I'm just trying to -- it's a practical matter that I need to sort out or help sort out.

MR. BARTON: Is this a Federal problem or a Federal and

a State problem?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: The way I understand, it's both. That -what I was told is if they were a State employee, they -there's a technicality of having them work for three Federal
Trustee Council members and vice versa on the other side, it's
a Federal employee having them work for three State.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. GIBBONS: We've looked at the contracts too (ph).

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: It seems like we could solve that. That if that -- you know, if a Federal employee were selected that we could agree, you know, among ourselves and understand the -- I understand the regulation that requires that each employee have a supervisor, that's the person that does their annual performance rating, et cetera, et cetera. But it seems like we'd agree among ourselves on who would handle the -- you know, those aspects of the employment; if it were a State person, you know (indiscernible).

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I try invariably to hue to the line, to do things exactly the way they are. And I think that it's a form of misrepresentation to say to anybody well he really doesn't work for the Trustee Council, he works for X over here but he really works for the Trustee Council. I mean that just doesn't wash well, and I don't think the public understands that form

| 1 | of government; I don't understand it, and I think we should |
|----|---|
| 2 | just do it the way it is. Say it the way it is and accept the |
| 3 | consequences because I think you just get in difficulties |
| 4 | when you know, and you never see them coming and they always |
| 5 | usually come up in some collateral fashion that you you |
| 6 | know, when you don't things the way they really are, some |
| 7 | collateral, you know, thing rises up and, you know, nabs you. |
| 8 | I don't think we ought to do that. |
| 9 | MR. PENNOYER: I guess the question Mr. Gibbons has is |
| 10 | how do we get around it? |
| 11 | MR. COLE: Talk to the Department of Justice. |
| 12 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We want an answer this year. |
| 13 | MR. O'CONNOR: Well, I've got a suggestion as well. |
| 14 | MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Attorney. |
| 15 | MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. You guys have no independent |
| 16 | legal standing, you're not an entity that can contract with |
| 17 | anybody, right? I mean that's a given, State, you guys |
| 18 | really |
| 19 | MR. COLE: No. |
| 20 | MR. O'CONNOR: as a legal concept do not exist. |
| 21 | MR. COLE: I don't agree with that at all. |
| 22 | MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Then if this is a le |
| 23 | MR. COLE: I mean we're dealing (ph) with that all the |
| 24 | time. I mean I think we are. |
| 25 | MR. O'CONNOR: Does the Trustee Council have |

R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 277-0572 OR 277-0573 277-8543 277-7515 272-3022 FAX 274-8982

independent legal standing to enter into a contract with an individual? I think that question has to be answered, and I'm hearing that that has been answered in the negative, is that correct?

MR. BARTON: No. I think that's a different question that he's answered. I think we can contract. But the point is if we go to -- if we end up selecting an existing agency person, I suspect that individual would like to retain the tenure in whatever organization that he's currently employed -- he or she is currently employed in. But I don't think that we're barred from contracting with somebody if somebody wants to contract with us. No, I don't agree with you.

MR. O'CONNOR: The Trustee -- your perception is that the Trustee Council has an independent legal status that it can enter into a contract with

MR. BARTON: I think we could. I don't think we have the procedure by which to do that, and in all likelihood, we're going to proceed by using individual agency contracting authorities and procedures. But I think we could contract.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Well, I don't think there's any question but that we contract with people. I mean (indiscernible) telephones are they in -- you know, along the way and leases of this property from the Simpson Building. And I just think we

R & R COURT REPORTERS

do it routinely. And you know, if we can't contract with people, if we don't have independent existence, you know, I think we better call on

MR. O'CONNOR: Well today can

MR. COLE: a couple of (ph) attorneys to figure out what we are. I mean what sort of a body are we, just a bunch of people sitting around this table? It beats me.

MR. O'CONNOR: Well I would give you a little more stature than that. But I don't

MR. COLE: But not much.

MR. PENNOYER: Did you have anything else to say, Mr. O'Connor?

MR. O'CONNOR: I will give you the opinion which is subject to, certainly scrutiny by all of the other lawyers who work in this process. But my opinion is that there is not legal identity, separate and distinct, that's established by the Trustee Council to give you the authority to enter into contractual relationships. That's why all of the work to date has been done through the various agencies through the Department of Justice, through the Department of Law. All of the contracts that we have now are handled though an entity, an agency.

And the only way you individuals would have the opportunity to contract in your own right as a group would be to assume personal responsibility for those undertaking and

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

those contractual obligations. And as your lawyers, I suggest you not do that.

So what I'm suggesting you do is recognize the limitations and decide what agencies are going to be responsible for performing certain functions on behalf of the Trustee Council. That's why NOAA, at this point, is carrying the contract with the chief scientist; it's not a contract the Trustee Council has nor is it a contract that they had. The State Department of Law and the NOAA as the lead Federal Trustee assumed responsibilities for entering into those contracts.

I think you have the same limitations in postsettlement undertakings. So I'm giving you what my legal opinion is on behalf of the Federal Government on this issue.

MR. COLE: Well I'm giving my off-the-cuff legal opinion on behalf of the State of Alaska. And I am firmly of the view that we're an entity as a group of joint trustees which has the ability to contract and deal with these funds. I mean if we can't deal with these funds and make decisions with respect to income and disbursements in a joint capacity, I mean I think we better call a halt to this whole Council proceedings until that's thrashed out. I can't imagine that we're dealing here in individual capacities or that NOAA is, you know, is the contracting party or the State Department of Law is the contracting party, and that 10 years from now this same thing

R & R COURT REPORTERS

will be going on. I just don't conceive of that at all.

So I don't know how we're going to do this but we better get that resolved forthwith.

MR. PENNOYER: How?

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 I can suggest one thing that quickly occurs to me, we could seek an advisory opinion from Judge Holland, present the matter to him. I think there's method (indiscernible) settlement to that for that purpose, and that's one way we can get it from like I say, the man who makes the final decisions, he's retained jurisdiction over this cause you might say or the disbursement of these funds. I think we could go to him and seek counsel.

Furthermore, that's sort of a standard trust doctrine, you can see advisory opinions from courts in the matter of trust management, perhaps that's what we should o.

MR. PENNOYER: Any legal opinions from the rest of the Trustee Council

MR. COLE: Sure. Sure. You know what they say about legal opinions, they're about as good as -- worth as much as you pay for them, so keep in that mind as you evaluate my

MR. BARTON: Perhaps, there's some non-lawyers, which I am a non-lawyer. You know, we did contract through individual agencies prior to the Settlement, and at that time, I think that's the only way we could but we did that because we didn't have any other legal authority to do it, and we did it because

it was expedient to do so because we had -- each agency had these contracting mechanisms in place. This Council has no contracting mechanism in place and would have to develop that through a very public process if they're going to go that route.

But to me what distinguishes this era from the prior era is the fact of the Settlement and the recognition of this body in the Settlement documents and by the courts. That's basically what I rest my case on.

MR. PENNOYER: How do we resolve this, Mr. Gibbons asked for guidance?

MR. O'CONNOR: Well, I would ask for (indiscernible) from the Department of Justice their opinion on the subject which would be dispositive of the Federal position, and perhaps, the Attorney General can give us the same for the State to determine what the ultimate authority is. I'm giving you my opinion. I've addressed this issue in my own mind, and my concern for the Federal representatives on the Trustee Council. I don't believe that they have the individual authority (indiscernible) they approve (ph) to function on behalf of their trustees and bind the Federal Government individually.

I think the agency authority exists, the Federal procurement authority exists, the Federal personnel rules apply. But this is not a recognized Federal entity.

R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. O'CONNOR: It's separate and distinct from the individual agencies.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Well as I visualize it, you know, don't we have a memorandum of understanding that the State and Federal Trustees shall act as co-trustees in the management and execution of the Trust? I think so. That was my understanding, and I keep track of all these things. But — and I thought that Judge Holland approved that — you know, I know he approved it.

So, it was -- the way I visualized it when Judge Holland said that, that we are common law trustee, co-trustees, acting jointly as co-trustees in a basic common law trust concept, which is I said at the very beginning this morning. And, if somehow we don't have that legal framework, I mean I don't know what our legal framework is at all. And, you know, we can get maybe the Department of Justice's views. I know we can look it in the Department of Law, but as far as I'm concerned if there is a view either by the Department of Law or the Department of Justice that we are not legal trust -- an entity in the nature of trustees, then we should seek the advice and counsel and the opinion of Judge Holland. Because I don't think we can have this group of co-trustees going on for the next 10 years and not being able to enter into contracts

| 1 | with anyone of any kind or nature in the name of the Trustee |
|----|---|
| 2 | Council, which is really the title of the co-trustees acting |
| 3 | jointly. |
| 4 | MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chair, I move that the Council approve |
| 5 | that course of action. |
| 6 | MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Sander, which course of |
| 7 | action are you referring to? |
| 8 | MR. SANDOR: The one of going to Judge Holland and |
| 9 | seeking a resolution of this question after receiving the |
| 10 | opinions from Department of Justice and the Department of Law |
| 11 | and the State. |
| 12 | MR. PENNOYER: So, the initial action would be to ask |
| 13 | the Department of Justice and the Department of Law to give us |
| 14 | their opinions; based on those to go take them to Judge Holland |
| 15 | and ask for some reconciliation if they're different, is that |
| 16 | the direction you're proposing? |
| 17 | MR. SANDOR: That's the motion. |
| 18 | MR. PENNOYER: Not understanding what procedures are |
| 19 | really require to go to Judge Holland, is there any other |
| 20 | comment? |
| 21 | MR. McVEE: I guess |
| 22 | MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee. |
| 23 | MR. McVEE: Yes. I guess maybe my question for Craig |
| 24 | is that it is your interpretation that we would also not have |
| 25 | authority to enter into cooperative agreements or would your |

interpretation extend that far? 1 Who would the cooperative agreement be 2 MR. O'CONNOR: 3 with? MR. McVEE: You know, it might be a cooperative 4 5 agreement by the Council to one of the Trustee member -agencies, one of -- you know, to do certain things. 6 I think the representatives in each of 7 MR. O'CONNOR: 8 the agencies could enter into an agreement that would bind their agencies to function in a particular fashion, which is 9 exactly what we have here by way of a settlement. What I'm 10 suggesting is that you could not hire a person as its employer, 11 you are not a legal entity that can go out and hire a person or 12 contract and obligate independently of procurement contracting 13 for personnel authorities within the Federal system itself. 14 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, before we vote on this, I 15 need to consult with my Counsel. 16 17 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. We'll take -- I want to do that 18 before the hearing anyhow (ph). Do you want to take a 10 minute break and then that's it, then we'll go straight through 19 with the public hearing after that? 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's acceptable. 21 22

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. A 10 minute break.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. PENNOYER: I'd like to cover a little bit of ground

& R COURT REPORTERS

23

24

before we get into it. On the last issue that was before us, I 1 think Commissioner Sander, you've got a statement? 2 MR. SANDOR: Yes, Mr. Chair. I withdraw the motion and 3 defer the question to Attorney General Cole who's going to file 4 5 going to take -- the State will take action in requesting a motion of the Judge so I withdraw the motion. 6 7 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Cole, do you have 8 a MR. COLE: Yes. 9 10 MR. PENNOYER: you wish to make? 11 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, the State Trustees with 12 delivered speed with file an application before Judge Holland asking that he determine whether the Governments as co-trustees 13 have the power to contract. 14 15 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. We've -- we're going to be starting a teleconference here in a very few minutes. 16 I have 17 one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten locations on-line or will have on-line. I will determine 18 shortly how many people are in those locations. Could I have a 19 show of hands here as to how many people in the audience with 20 21 to testify tonight? 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Four. MR. PENNOYER: Four. 23 You too? Is the microphone on? I don't believe it is. 24 (Off record comments) 25

MR. PENNOYER: We have four here. We intend to go to 1 2 6:30 or 7:00 o'clock, and depending on how many people come on the line, I would appreciate it, folks, if you'll hold your 3 testimony to five -- ten minutes time. Our intent at the 4 moment is to have two items at the start of the teleconference; 5 one will be a brief review of what we've done today so far, 6 Dave Gibbons will give that he promises me in about five 7 minutes or less, and then we're going to get a brief review, 8 also, on the Habitat Protection Lands Committee from Ken Rice 9 before we proceed with the teleconference. 10 (Off record comments) 11 Is there anything we need to do in the 12 MR. PENNOYER: meantime? 13

MR. COLE: There may be someone can testify here.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, it was sort of thought they'd want to hear the presentation on Lands, too.

MR. BARTON: We could answer Mr. Gibbons question.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton, do you want to take a crack at answering Mr. Gibbons question?

MR. BARTON: I think Mr. Gibbons should proceed to advertise for a permanent director in both the State and the Federal system. In the meantime, we'll resolve this problem.

MR. PENNOYER: Is everybody in accord with that recommendation?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. (Off record comments - teleconference) 2 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 3 4 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole. 5 MR. COLE: I would suggest that if there's anyone here who wishes to testify at this time, before we get everybody on 6 7 line and before the Habitat presentation, that we hear them now. 8 Is there anybody here that wishes to 9 MR. PENNOYER: testify before the Habitat presentation? Yes, sir. 10 ahead and take these two gentlemen. 11 MR. WINCHESTER: I'll keep my remarks brief. 12 13 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. I'm James Winchester, I'm the general 14 MR. WINCHESTER: 15 manager of a public radio station in Valdez; we also broadcast in Cordova and Whittier. 16 17 18 19 20 the past year, our ability to carry that load has been 21

From the first day of the Spill on, Public Broadcasting has been intimately involved in the public process of public education. Unfortunately, due to some changes in funding over drastically reduced I should say over the two, three -- no, six months to a year. Our news department in Valdez has gone from three people to one. And, I would like to see or have the Trustees consider as part of your Public Outreach Program or another program similar to the Public Information & Education

R & R COURT REPORTERS

22

23

24

Program Number (ph) 118 that some funds for public broadcasting be included in this budget.

There's some very large numbers bandied about here today, this is an enormous amount of money; it will be expended overly a goodly period of time. And most of these projects are specific to Prince William Sounds, that's our area, that's our principal area of concern as well.

A lot of these -- a lot of the projects, a lot of the process here -- this isn't a glamorous story but it's one that folks there are really, really interested in; it's important to their lives. And we're going to have a difficult time staying up with it. We're having a difficult time now. We should have a reporter here today, we don't. So, that's my message, we could use a little help. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Any questions? Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Well, I would suggest that we refer those comments to our Public Outreach section subgroup for their consideration and recommendation.

MR. PENNOYER: Further questions or comments? Did the other gentleman wish to testify now?

MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yeah. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Panel. I was somewhat humored by the first article when this Panel which created Panel (ph) voted themselves into

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

existence. Congratulations. This is a real problem.

MR. PENNOYER: Sir, would you mind giving your name?

MR. CALLAHAN: Michael Callahan's my name. I'm representing myself. It says in our Constitution, both in the State Constitution and the Federal Constitution, that Congress shall pass all laws. No law has created this body, no Federal law, no State law. No common agreement between these entities can supersede these law making abilities. You're not an independent entity, you don't exist.

Now, how to resolve this is an interesting question. The way to resolve this is not really simple but somewhat simple; you need to be created by an act of law, Federally and State. Now, when you look at the State Constitution, all bills of expenditure shall originate in the House, the same thing is true with the Federal Constitution. Funds cannot be dispensed under a State entity unless it has been passed through the House of the Legislature, constitution.

The Constitution -- the Federal Constitution and the State Constitution have been usurped (ph) by Exxon, and a Federal Judge, and this is not a legal entity. You need to go to your legislative bodies, get them to pass a law to create this entity.

The State of Alaska gets 50 million dollars out of this Settlement, we don't get anything. You guys got the money.

Where does the money go to. You guys decide where the money

R & R COURT REPORTERS

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

goes. This isn't a State body, this isn't a Federal body, this nobody. This is -- you know, check the laws. You know, as you said you want to do things the way they are. Well, the way they are was very clearly established in this state, that's the way things should be done.

And I would appreciate it if you gentlemen would respect the laws of the State of Alaska and the United States. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, do you want share a comment (ph).

MR. COLE: No, sir.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Any other questions or comments. Thank you. I think everybody else has indicated they wish to wait until the Lands presentation or Bob, do you want to

BOB: I'll wait.

MR. PENNOYER: Are we on-line in the teleconference?

Okay. We have already taken testimony from two individuals who did not want to wait for the presentation we're going to do shortly here. I understand we have the various communities on the line at this time. We're going to have a brief presentation from our Management Restoration Team in terms of some of the items that have been covered today so everybody on line is aware of what we've done so far today. And then, we're also going to get a brief presentation from Ken Rice from Habitat Protection & Lands Committee on what that group has

been doing since our last meeting.

We thought the public interest we've seen in our various public meetings on that particular item was such that everybody would benefit from some discussion of where we are before we go on with the public hearing. So, at this time, I'll ask Mr. Gibbons to give a brief overview of some of the items that have been covered today, then Mr. Rice will talk about the Habitat Protection Lands Committee's activities.

Mr. Gibbons.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you, Mr. Pennoyer. If I interpret these wrongly, I'm sure the Trustee Council will correct me.

I'm going to try to summarize briefly, in less than five minutes, what has occurred today.

ANCHORAGE BRIDGE: This is the Anchorage Bridge and we're standing by for this afternoon's teleconference with Juneau, Soldotna, Tatitlek, Cordova, the Egan Convention Center, Homer, Whittier, Seward and Fairbanks now on-line.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. I don't know if you picked up what I said before. This is the meeting of the Trustee Council, we have been in session since 11:00 o'clock this morning dealing with various administrative matters.

We're going to go ahead and have the Restoration Team quickly run through some of the items we have gone through today so the public that's on the line in the remote sites is aware of the actions we've taken so far. And then we're going to get a

presentation from our Habitat Protection Lands Committee of 1 2 their activities since the last meeting. So, before we take anymore public testimony, I'll ask Mr. Gibbons to go on with the description of what we've done so 5 far. The meeting started out prior to MR. GIBBONS: Yes. the Agenda with two activities that took place. Mr. John 8 Sander, Commission of Environmental Conservation, passed out a proposal for an endowment fund for further consideration by the 9 10 Group. Mr. Cole stated each decision -- in the statement that each decision must be formulated with the legal principles in 11 The Department of Law was requested to prepare a 12 memorandum regarding the law of trust, the duties of common law 13 trustees supplemented by the Memorandum of Agreement are as 14 administer trust solely in the interest of the 15 beneficiary and preserve trust property. The 16

TELECONFERENCE BRIDGE: Valdez (ph) is getting a lot of breaking up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can't hear what the gentleman is saying.

> Is this better? MR. GIBBONS:

MR. PENNOYER: Speak more directly into the microphone.

TELECONFERENCE BRIDGE: (Indiscernible) we're just catching a little bit of bleed from the Egan side, nothing's started yet.

COURT REPORTERS

3

4

6

7

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | (Off record comments) |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. PENNOYER: If you'll speak very directly into the |
| 3 | microphone and go ahead and give your statement about the |
| 4 | activities already accomplished today or discussed today. |
| 5 | MR. PIPER: Mr. Chairman, one other point about the |
| 6 | teleconference. When all the microphones are open, if there |
| 7 | are rustling papers by microphones and that kind of thing, it |
| 8 | will tend to cut our the speaker. So, everybody who has an |
| 9 | open microphone could rest calmly. |
| 10 | MR. PENNOYER: Very will. |
| 11 | ANCHORAGE BRIDGE: Anchorage Bridge and we're standing |
| 12 | by. |
| 13 | MR. GIBBONS: Is this clearer to the teleconference? |
| 14 | Can the teleconferencing sites here me? |
| 15 | ANCHORAGE BRIDGE: You're not coming through too well. |
| 16 | TELECONFERENCE BRIDGE: But you are much better than a |
| 17 | few minutes ago. |
| 18 | MR. PENNOYER: A little bit closer, Dave. |
| 19 | (Off record comments) |
| 20 | MR. GIBBONS: Is this better? |
| 21 | TELECONFERENCE BRIDGE: Much better. |
| 22 | MR. GIBBONS: Okay. I'm going to try to give a brief |
| 23 | summary of what occurred today from the meeting commencing at |
| 24 | 11:00 a.m. this morning and just terminating. |

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Before the Agenda was started, there were two

activities that occurred. Mr. John Sandor, Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, passed out a proposal for an endowment fund for further consideration. And, Mr. Cole, Attorney General of the State, stated each decision reached by this Group must be formulated with legal principles in mind. The Department of Law was requested to prepare a memorandum regarding the law of trust, the duties of common law trustees and supplemented by the Memorandum of Agreement, and are as follows: Administer the trust solely in the interests of a beneficiary, reserve trust property.

We next moved onto the Agenda. The Trustee Council accepted the recommendation of the former Resource Restoration Coordination Group to change its name to the Restoration Team.

We next moved onto a discussion of the role of the contract of the chief scientist. And the Trustee Council approved the contract through NOAA of a chief scientist with a maximum amount of \$191,000.00, and that's for an eight month period.

Discussions of the organization next -- can you still hear me out there? Organization next took place. The first item was the budget for the Trustee Council. The Trustee Council moved to strike any costs associated with the Trustee Council from the administrative budget.

The next item of discussion was the Public Advisory

Group, and this item was table until after a public

R & R COURT REPORTERS

participation discussion which will take place tomorrow.

The space for the Administrative Director and the support staff, the Trustee Council moved to use the existing contract in-place through the Department of Justice with CACI through September 30th, 1992.

The peer review discussions, the Trustee Council moved to expend the existing accounts held in -- for peer review in the respective Department of Law and Department of Justice budgets.

The budget for the Restoration Team was approved.

The budget for the Restoration Planning Subgroup was deferred until the end of the day tomorrow for further discussion.

A Public Resource Center discussion occurred. We will revisit that discussion again tomorrow in a five minute presentation; a very streamlined presentation I'll add.

On the idea of overhead by the various agencies, a motion was passed to separate the budget and process subgroup into two groups. On the Budget Subgroup, it would have two State and two Federal members from -- budget expertise from the various agencies. And the first task would be to provide guidelines for overhead to the various Trustee Councils and agencies.

The next item was the action concerning the selection or the advertisement and process for finding a permanent

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

executive director. The Trustee Council approved that the interim administrative director proceed with advertising for this position both within the State, Federal and private sectors.

And the last item was the Department of Law will petition the court, Judge Holland, on the authorities for the Trustee Council to have contract authority.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Gibbons. That was Dave Gibbons as our interim Executive Director and Chair of the Restoration Team to the Trustee Council. We're going to proceed now to a presentation by Ken Rice on the Habitat Protection Lands Committee activities since the last Trustee Council meeting. Mr. Rice.

MR. RICE: Mr. Chairman. What I want to do is start out by backing up a little bit and give you a background as to where we've come from with this Lands Protection program.

In 1991, the Trustees published a draft Restoration

Program in a March 1 Federal Register Notice. And in that

Federal Register Notice, it identified a Lands Habitat

Protection Program. The objective of that project, and I'm

quoting from the Federal Register Notice, is to identify and

protect strategic wildlife and fisheries habitats in recreation

sites and to prevent further potential environmental impacts to

resources injured by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill.

The whole program was premised on a willing buyer,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

willing seller basis, and there would be no condemnation or other negotiations that weren't from a willing seller.

The project set out five steps which was the basis for the program that would go forward, and those five steps were identified: key upland habitats linked to injured resources or services. The second step would be to characterize and evaluate potential impacts, evaluate recovery strategies not involving acquisition and assess protection afforded by existing law and regulations. The third step would be to evaluate cost effective strategies to achieve restoration objectives. The fourth being willing seller, willing buyer negotiations with private landowners for property rights. And the last step was to incorporate the acquired property rights into public management.

During the summer of 1991, the Restoration Planning
Work Group began working with the Nature Conservancy to
identify various ways to identify and protect fish and wildlife
habitats in recreation sites. In December of 1991, the Nature
Conservancy produced a handbook which I have here, and I think
copies have been made available to most of the Trustee Council
members; and that handbook is entitled "Options for Identifying
and Protecting Strategic Fish & Wildlife Habitats in Recreation
Sites".

It set out several steps that they felt was important in going into any protection mechanism, and those steps

R & R COURT REPORTERS

parallel very closely what was in the Federal Register Notice. They said, one, you need to develop conservation objectives that will guide the protection process. This has been somewhat accomplished through the project objectives outlined in the Federal Register Notice; however, we feel that we need to further refine these objectives and allow for protection strategies other than fee simple acquisition.

The second step they identified was to identify and rank strategic fish and wildlife habitats in recreation sites. Key features being to develop evaluation criteria, create an inventory of lands suitable for protection and perform an initial threat analysis and then determine the optimum area for protection.

In 1992, this process will largely be based on landowner proposals and public nominations. In the long term, we are proposing to conduct a more systematic process. We have several restoration projects aimed at providing information linked to habitats to injured species, and this would provide the scientific basis for linking any habitat protection to those upland resources. Those -- some of those projects include a marble mural (ph) restoration project, stream habitat assessment, Harlequin (ph) duck restoration study and identification of habitats relevant to injured species. These are all projects we'll be looking at tomorrow as part of the detailed budget.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

3

5

6 7

8

10

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 277-0572 OR 277-0573 FAX 274-8982 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-8543

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-7515

The third step that the Nature Conservancy outlined in

The last step, develop a management plan very similar

their handbook was to develop a protection plan, and this

involves working very closely developing a close working

relationship with the landowner and determining the most

again to what the Federal Register Notice said, this would

include developing management plans as they -- any of those

On January 28th of this year, members of the

Restoration Team -- Restoration Planning Subgroup and agency

specialists met with the Nature Conservancy to review the

recommending that a Lands subgroup primarily -- or at least

identifying objectives, time lines, process criteria and

technical experts. And that a second subgroup or a second

group, which would be an ad hoc group, made up primarily of

called in on a case by case basis as negotiations proceeded.

the Restoration Team, might include biologists, attorneys,

appraisals, realty experts, key contact negotiators, risk

Some of the technical experts that we would need to

include, which go beyond the scope of what we have available in

agency or possibly contract specialists would be used and

initially made up of the Restoration Team quide the project by

- as a result of that meeting, the Restoration Team is

rights move into public ownership.

handbook and close out on that project.

effective -- cost effective methods for protecting those lands.

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-3022

The Restoration Team -

assessment -- or risk management specialists and resource economists.

We've developed a tentative time line which we think is achievable this year if the Trustee Council wants to move forward with the program that would deal with some of the proposals that we are receiving now. And what that would entail doing is that by the 21st of February the Restoration Team would circulate draft objectives and criteria for evaluating proposals to the Trustee Council; these would be revised and sent out to the public by the 2nd of March where the public would have a comment to look at these draft criteria.

On -- by the 27th of March we would -- okay. On the 2nd of March, we would also announce our willingness to accept nominations and proposals from the landowners and also from the public, and we would develop sort of a two-tiered list; one list would include those lands that were identified by willing sellers, the second list might include lands that the public has identified. Realizing that only those -- the -- we would only deal with those lands were there were willing sellers.

We would publish a master list by the 27th of March of those lands that we had received nominations on, and then by the 30th of April, we would begin to start negotiations with various landowners and review and evaluate the proposals that we had come forward with.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

What I would suggest is that we have two basic questions to go to the Trustee Council with at this time. The first question being does the Trustee Council want to proceed using the concepts developed in the Federal Register Notice as the basis for a land protection acquisition program. And the second question is does the Trustee Council want to adopt a short-term time line that would basically become part of the '92 Work Plan to deal with some of the proposals that we are receiving now and the perception, at least, of imminent threat to some of these lands or do they want a longer term program that links some of the studies more closely to any projects that we move forward with.

MR. PENNOYER: Is that -- your presentation, Mr. Rice,

MR. RICE: That concludes

MR. PENNOYER: then is complete?

MR. RICE: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: I think we're going to have to discuss this in some detail, but we have only limited time for the teleconference. So my suggestion will be that -- unless you have a question for clarification right now, that we proceed with the public testimony and we'll have to complete this discussion tomorrow; we'll again be taking public testimony tomorrow evening, so we'll be starting at 5:00 o'clock I believe, testimony (ph) 5:00 to 6:30 tomorrow night.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, are there questions of clarification for Mr. Rice right now? I think we'll proceed on with the public testimony part of the Agenda, and we started here in Anchorage, I believe we've got a few more people here that held their hand up. Could we take the Anchorage folks first? And again, we've got quite a few stations on line, so if you could limit your time

Who's next from Anchorage? Yes, sir. (Pause)

to five or ten minutes I would appreciate it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Chairman, Trustees. My name is Jim Carmichael, I'm the manager of (indiscernible) Afognak, Joint Venture in Kodiak. The Afognak Joint Venture is a partnership created by ANILCA and owns approximately 180,000 acres of land on Afognak Island. Two major partners in the Afognak Joint Venture are Afognak Native Corporation and Koniag (ph), Inc.; there are also several minor partners.

The Federal Government owns approximately 50,000 acres in the northwest portion of the island and part of the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. Several small islands offshore are a part of the National Maritime Wildlife Refuge. The State of Alaska has one small holding on the east side of the island, and the State has more substantial holdings on other islands immediately adjacent to Afognak.

Afognak was originally set aside by the Federal

Government as a forest and fish culture reserve in the year

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

23

24

1892. Until 1980, it was part of the Chugach National Forest. Extensive selections by village corporations on the southern portions of the island began pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. And the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA, transferred remaining Native selections from the Alaska Peninsula over to most of the remaining portion of Afognak Island and brought about creation of the Afognak (ph) Joint Venture.

While much of the southern portion of Afognak Island has been roaded and logged, most of the Joint Venture's holdings east and southwest of the Federal land that's on the island do remain undeveloped. These holdings contain outstanding fish and wildlife resources, including large herds of elk, Kodiak bear and many of the species that were injured in the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. Afognak was within the Spill zone and some of its shores were oiled.

It had been the Joint Venture's intention to extend its logging operations into holdings that we are now proposing and to explore other income producing options for some of the non-timbered lands that are on the island. Those would be cabins, lodges and developments along the shores of the higher lakes. As a corporate entity, we owe it to our partners and their shareholders to use the land to be able to return them dividends.

For the past years, however, we have explored ideas

R & R COURT REPORTERS

which would lead to the sale of some or most of our Joint Venture holdings to the Federal and State land managing agencies. If successful, such an arrangement could enable our corporation to create a permanent fund and diversify our business operations; Afognak Native Corporation is actively involved in the logging/timber business, successful at it.

Of course, we would continue to develop those lands which are not sold. In that effort, we advocated passage by Congress of a special study of Afognak and Prince William Sound inholdings. Such a directive was passed last year in Congress. We are currently cooperating with the Fish & Wildlife Service as it studies our lands. We are also supporting State legislation introduced by Kodiak Representative Cliff Davidson and Senator Curt Menard (ph) which would provide for State purchase of lands in the Pauls Lake and lower Melina Lake regions of the island.

It is our hope that these efforts will lead to a stage acquisition process coordinated with both the State and Federal governments to acquire a substantial portion of the Afognak Joint Venture's lands up to approximately 125,000 acres stretching from the Pauls Lake lower lake area on the northeast to the Melina peninsula on the southwest, including land and timber rights on approximately six offshore islands.

We are confident that Afognak's natural resource values will fare well in comparison to other areas within the Spill

R & R COURT REPORTERS

zone. We are also hopeful that the presence of sizable tracts contiguous to the large Federal holding and a cooperative seller will be attractive to the Trustees.

We have -- or if we have a disadvantage on Afognak it is that our resources are not as well known as some other areas. We hope an objective investigation of the resources will overcome that disadvantage.

Having laid out what the Afognak Joint Venture offers, let me outline some conditions necessary for us to meet our obligations to our partners and shareholders. First, we are interested in sale of lands and not development rights. If we are unable to sell most of the lands, we want to see sales of relatively compact parcels so we are not left with discontiguous tracts of lands encumbered by easements or holdings otherwise made difficult to develop.

The second, we are interested in selling a mix of timbered and non-timbered lands. To give up ownership of land, we must demonstrate to our partners in the Joint Venture that we are receiving a fair price and that the sale of lands is an attractive alternative to timber development and logging. We will not engage in a series of sales which leaves us holding lands with no revenue potential and no hope of further sales.

Third, we have already voluntarily withheld logging on many of our holdings while we have explored these land sales.

We have engaged substantial expense in our efforts to work with

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Congress and in anticipation of working with the Trustees. We would not wish to be penalized for our cooperative efforts either by receiving bids lower than those offered to hostile sellers or seeing sales of our lands delayed while uncooperative sellers are treated more expeditiously. We have been open and cooperative, and we expect fair play in return.

In conclusion, we believe that land acquisition is an important use of the Settlement funds. We believe that land sales can help our shareholders and those of our other corporations in the State. We believe that maintaining the best hunting, fishing and recreational resources is good for the region's economy, and we will work cooperatively with you to achieve those ends.

Thank you. Are there any questions?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Carmichael, if you have a written copy of your testimony, if you could provide that to our Secretary, a copy of your testimony?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, I certainly will.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions of Mr. Carmichael? Thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you.

MR. COLE: I have a question.

MR. PENNOYER: Sure. Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Mr. Carmichael, to get a sense of the funds involved in your proposal, could you tell us about -- just about, you know, how much an acre for the timber and the non-

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

timbered lands we're talking about? I think it's helpful to 1 get a sense of these various proposals. 2 3 MR. CARMICHAEL: Certainly. I understand the reason for your question. It would be premature to attempt to 4 5 memorialize anything in that there's probably a process that would have to be gone through and public scrutiny, and we 6 7 appreciate that. If one were to look at say the Katchemak acquisition there, in a rough average, some of those lands went 8 for \$917.00 an acre. That treats acres as fungible (ph). 9 You'd still have to address the issue of timbered and 10 11 untimbered quality of the timbering and we are prepared to do that. 12 But in general, it'd be not unfair to say 13 MR. COLE: we're looking at about a thousand dollars an acre for 14 That's correct. 15 MR. CARMICHAEL: timbered lands? 16 MR. COLE: 17 MR. CARMICHAEL: Timbered and non-timbered lands if we were to treat acres as fungible on an average. 18 19 MR. COLE: Thank you. 20 MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chair. 21 MR. PENNOYER: Yes. 22 MR. SANDOR: Just one quick question. Did Afognak 23 Joint Venture consider or would it consider exchange of the 24 lands? 25 MR. CARMICHAEL: We have not considered, and the reason

we haven't is that in looking at other folks that preceded us with these types of exercises have never been able to find lands that worked out. I don't know that we would not but we don't see anything out there that would fit.

MR. SANDOR: 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

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Carmichael. Anybody else here in Anchorage. Yes, sir.

MR. PHIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Allen Phipps, I'm speaking on behalf of the Alaska Center for the Environment, which is an Alaska based regional environmental organization based in Anchorage with approximately 1,500 members, and our primary area of focus is South Central Alaska.

I will touch on a variety of topics and follow up with a written letter so that I can flesh some of these ideas out. In anticipation of the meeting next week in Anchorage regarding public process, I would like to say that staff for the Public Advisory Group is extremely important. And we believe that at least two staff members is important because the Public Advisory Group will have a great deal of work to do, and those staff members should be hired by the Public Advisory Group.

I will be providing our formal proposal for the Public Advisory Group by the meeting next week. I will just say that is consists of 13 members, each member representing a particular interest group. And it is very important for us, we

believe, that each interest group gets to select the member of the Public Advisory Group that represents them.

We also believe it's appropriate that the Trustee

Council do as -- or proceed with doing what the Trustees of the

Shell Oil Spill Settlement of California did, which was to

place two non-voting members selected by the Public Advisory

Group on the Trustee Council.

Our primary -- our priority for expenditure of these funds is acquisition of fish and wildlife habitat and recreation sites. And we support that both as a fee simple acquisition proposition but also we encourage the Trustee Council to pursue where appropriate other types of cooperative management agreements with willing sellers such as -- other options such as conservation easements and acquisition of development rights. We believe that fully 80% of the trust of the Restoration funds should be made available for these sorts of habitat acquisitions.

I think you'll find that land trades are not a very feasible option since it's our understanding that in the past where that's been tried, essentially most of the best timber lands have already been selected by the ANCSA corporations, and there are not other comparable lands available for trade.

We're concerned about the amount of money in the proposal that was passed out today for science studies.

Obviously, certain scientific studies are important, but again,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

we feel that there is enough information already to proceed on an aggressive habitat acquisition program, and we encourage the Trustee Council to direct the Restoration Committee to proceed with an aggressive program.

Finally, the Alaska Center for the Environment urges the Trustee Council to recommend that the State and Federal governments not reimburse themselves for costs that they've incurred in response to the Oil Spill. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Are there any questions? Thank you very much.

MR. PHIPPS: Yeah.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: I have just been informed that unfortunately the teleconference network has other duties at 6:30 and we're going to have to be off the line at 6:15. I was not aware of this before, that gives us very limited time tonight, and I would request that whoever sets up tomorrow night's conference — teleconference make sure that we're not having an end restriction if we can avoid it. I had intended to go to either 6:30 or 7:00 o'clock tonight, and this is going to cut us very short.

Given that problem, perhaps what I need to do is go around the various (indiscernible) stations and take one person from each station sort of in rotation. So, if you could be thinking of who might be your first in line. I apologize for the rush but I have no control over it. And we'll go out to

the various stations now and take one person from each station. I encourage you to try and keep your remarks to about five minutes because we apparently have very limited time. The stations I have on my list are Fairbanks — is there anybody in Fairbanks who wishes to testify?

TELECONFERENCE BRIDGE: We have one person here in Fairbanks.

MR. PENNOYER: That'll take care of the whole location then, fine. Would you please go ahead.

MR. JUNAI: Yes. Thank you. My name is Glenn Junai, and I'm Assistant Professor of forest ecology (ph) at the University of Alaska - Fairbanks.

I came tonight to learn a bit about what is being considered by the Trustee Council in the program of allocating the Settlement money, but also to express some frustration and hope against hope that there might be some opportunity, that my specific complaint is that there hasn't been, up until now.

In 1986, I began a project to investigate Green Island and Prince William Sound to actually look at its biological (indiscernible - background coughing). And one aspect of that study was to determine how it had recovered since the 1964 earthquake which devastated the marine environment down there. When the Exxon Valdez Spill happened in 1989, I tried to work through whatever avenues were made available to me, which turned out to be none, to offer the background of that

R & R COURT REPORTERS

investigation to do a study to see, since we have 1986 prespill data, what this area -- how this area had been affected by the Spill. Through reprogramming some funding I had from the continuing investigations of Green Island, we're able to do -- we were able to establish some initial spots (ph) at the area and look at them in 1989 and 1990.

But I'm about ready to throw in the towel now. There just has not been an avenue for a person wanting to do this kind of investigation in the open and not as a part of advocacy of process to establish and create new law (ph) but to find out what happened. There's just not been the support process, this competitive arena to be able to do that. I published two articles on what I've seen so far, but at this point we're dead in the water; I can't continue without some additional support. And I was hoping against hope that the damage -- pardon me, the Settlement -- the funding would offer some avenue that I could offer this idea to continue this investigation to see what the natural process of recovery is at this location, which is fairly representative of much of the area that was oiled, and we do have some good data from the '89 and '90.

These aren't resources that are related to what was damaged, but these are the resources that were affected. And do, I don't hear that now; I hear a course of boos from people saying we're spending too much money on science. I'm not exactly certain because it's been under the cloak of litigation

R & R COURT REPORTERS

sensitivity, but much of the money that has been spent on investigation, on damage assessment, has been carefully devised as I understand it so that it wouldn't be studies for their own sake or to find out really what's happening but to establish the case that the Government wanted to make in court to establish liability, how much damage and what was damaged.

So I have to come tonight simply to say that I still think there's a missing element in what's been done so far in the assessments, the investigations and the studies and that is to look not at the key resources that might've been damaged but the full range of biological diversity resources that were affected. And I do believe that it is important that we know what happened to those -- to the full range of diversity. And the findings as I last reported from my latest work out there, was that this wasn't a discreet event in time, there are affects of the Spill that are continuing.

Everybody seems to be in a mental state right now where they say they want to assume that this event is over, we're now doing something with (ph) recovery. That's not — that's over idealization, and I think it would be a mistake to close our eyes to some of these other aspects of the Spill. And I would like to have somebody somewhere point out an avenue where I might be able to put this proposal in front of somebody to do something about it. So, thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Do Trustee Council members

R & R COURT REPORTERS

have any question? I'm not sure we have receipt of your proposal, so if you care to provide, I'm sure the Restoration Team could take a look at it. We do have ongoing studies to continue closing out damage assessment on evaluation of injury to various resources, and I don't know if they're in your particular area or not. But if you have a particular proposal, perhaps you could send it in.

Are there other questions? Okay.

MR. COLE: I'd like to make a comment on that.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

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. COLE: I think that really we would like to receive his proposal, not just say he can send it in; but I really think that we would like to see his proposal and he should send it to the Administrative Director and we will take a careful look at it. And furthermore, Mr. Junai, we are -- you could contact I'm sure the Administrative Director and we have the Restoration Team and present your proposals there, and we will give you full support of what's been gone on so far.

MR. JUNAI: All right. Thank you. You're breaking up badly on the network, but I get the drift that I should contact the Administrative Director is that right?

MR. PENNOYER: That's correct. Mr. Gibbons, would you care to get him the address of the forum (ph).

MR. GIBBONS: Pardon?

MR. PENNOYER: Would you care to give him an address to

send the proposal to?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. Go ahead and send that to 645 "G"

Street, Anchorage, Alaska, 99501, include attention of me, Dave
Gibbons.

MR. JUNAI: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee, did you have a comment.

MR. McVEE: If my mike works I do. I guess my comment is that Mr. Junai's identified an area I think that we need to give some consideration to fairly soon, and that is how do we notify the public across the board so, you know, that we are taking proposals and provide an opportunity so everyone has an equal shot. You know, we've had a number of proposals come from outside, but yet we have not provided a formal notice that we are taking.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes. I think we think we discussed that at the last meeting, actually, and had encouraged some type of process to formalize that. Marty Rutherford, do you want to comment?

MS. RUTHERFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. I was going to be making this as part of the presentation that we didn't get to today on time lines. But one of the notes I was going to advise you of is that we are expecting to be able to go out request for proposals to the public and to other agencies by May 15th, and hopefully have those proposals in hand by August 15th. Now, we were looking towards a '93 field season for

those, but that's something that we can discuss further tomorrow.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. All right. I think we need to move along, unfortunately, this is going to get truncated on us by the fact we're going off the teleconference line at 6:15. Perhaps, I should continue down the list of remote sites and taking one person from each site. I again encourage you to take probably no more than five minutes so that we can get through as many people as possible.

The next site we have on-line is Whittier, is there anybody in Whittier that wishes to testify?

MS. HITES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is Linda Hites in Whittier. I would like to encourage the Trustees to look at Dr. Junai's proposal. I have had the pleasure of visiting his Green Island site, it's one of the rare sites that we do have pre-Spill data on and was not subjected to extensive cleanup. So, flag that proposal and pay attention to it, I think it's a good idea to continue with that study.

I also have a resolution that the City of Whittier -City Council passed this past Monday night supporting the
concept of acquisition of sensitive habitat, certain timber
rights within the Sound and other areas. I will be sending
that to you and won't take the time to read it tonight. But we
would particularly like you to consider lease option purchase
or lease purchase options so that we miss the window of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

opportunity to acquire critical habitat.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Hites? Okay. Thank you very much. I have received an announcement that we can extend the teleconference tomorrow night later than we had originally intended, so there will be opportunity for people to testify at that time.

I'll continue down the list, Tatitlek, is there anybody from Tatitlek that wishes to testify?

TATITLEK: Not at this time, we'll provide written testimony and possibly testimony tomorrow at tomorrow's session.

MR. PENNOYER: Fine. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. If anybody has to go tonight and can't be there tomorrow night, they should probably take precedence. I have been also asked to take Kodiak next. Kodiak, do you have people that wish to testify, can we take one member from Kodiak? Mayor Sullivan (ph) are you there? Kodiak, are you hearing me? They may have gone off line.

Let's continue down the list then. Cordova, anybody from Cordova that wishes to testify tonight?

TELECONFERENCE BRIDGE: Yes, there is, just a moment, please.

MS. McFERNEY: Yes, this is Mary McFerney, Executive Director of CDFU in Cordova, which CDFU stands for Cordova

District Fishermen United. And we'd like to be on record supporting the projects that are outlined in the Damage Assessment Work Plan and the Restoration Work Plan regarding ADF&G's ongoing salmon tagging and enumeration projects, and also the herring evaluation projects. We feel that those are very critical to restoration and enhancement consideration.

We would also like to be on record supporting the proposal for land acquisition. Land acquisitions are essential for habitat preservation and resource enhance (telephone cutout) and they should be given a very, very high priority

Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you very much. Any questions of the Trustee Council at this time? Thank you. Let's go on to Valdez and take somebody from Valdez. Is there anybody in Valdez that wishes to testify? Back again and try Kodiak. Kodiak, have anybody from Kodiak that wishes to testify tonight?

TELECONFERENCE BRIDGE: I don't believe Kodiak is on line, Mr. Chair, nor is Valdez.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Homer, anybody from Homer that wishes to testify?

HOMER: No, sir, not this evening.

when it comes to allocating the Settlement funds.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you very much. Seward, anybody from Seward that wishes to testify tonight?

MR. SPIRELLO: This is Seward.

MR. PENNOYER: Do you have anybody there who wishes to testify?

MR. SPIRELLO: Yes. My name is Richard Spirello (ph),
I live 24 miles north of Seward. I have two topics of comment;
the first concerns public participation in the restoration
process and the second concerns spending the Settlement fund.

Public input must include more than just gathering and recording our testimony. I propose that the Trustees and empower local people who would represent themselves only to provide specific and practical alternatives for restoring affected areas. Subcitizen's groups already exist but the Trustees could create many more. The Trustees could assign geographic areas to private citizen's groups and then challenge them to propose specific alternatives for restoring the areas.

To compensate for the real or perceived lack of technical expertise of ordinary citizens, the Trustees could hire or borrow personnel from scientific, environmental or natural resource organizations and make their expertise available to the citizen's groups. As examples of agencies whose expertise might be tapped, I cite the Institute of Marine Sciences, the Alaska Center for the Environment and the National Park Service. These organizations are already involved in the restoration process but not as technical advisors to citizen's groups. And to further aid the citizen's

groups, I propose providing access to office supply, postage, secretarial services and meeting space.

And before leaving the subject of public participation, I want to comment on the testimony itself. Too often I have seen testimony just recorded and then buried in the appendix of the next document published by the agency collecting it. This is unsatisfactory. The Trustees ought to publish testimony, and the Trustees ought to publish their own response to it. I want the Trustees to publish the collected testimony about the restoration, and I want the Trustees to publish their specific addressing of the issues raised and their specific reasons for rejecting proposals and their actual plan to implement those proposals not rejected. I want the Trustees to make it clear to the public how they actually used public testimony.

And finally, I want to comment on how to spend the Settlement funds in a general way. Spend funds only to restore the affected areas, make the affected areas produce the same quality and quantity of biomass and scenic amenities that they produced before the Spill. I include the uplands as well as the submerged lands. And I include plankton and bottom dwellers and not just telegenic species such as otters. Where it's impossible to restore affected areas, acquire equivalent resources. And to that end, I think it's appropriate to use Settlement funds for the Katchemak Bay State Park buy-back. And it would also be appropriate to make similar buy backs of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

private holdings here on Resurrection Bay, including the inholdings in Kenai Fjords National (indiscernible - background coughing).

As an example of how not to spend the funds, I cite the proposed Aquarium tourist attraction in Seward; although, it may be touted as a scientific endeavor, it's only a flagrant attempt to use Settlement funds to build a tourist attraction in Seward. Resurrection Bay is our attraction, restore it. I don't think that building hotels, marinas, road and tourist facilities in Prince William Sound or elsewhere by any reasonable standard restores the affected areas, let those projects secure their own funding.

The Settlement funds are finite and they're irresistibly attractive to schemers and developers. Every Settlement dollar spent on economic development projects is a dollar not spent to specifically restore the flora and fauna of the affected areas. I trust you to guard those funds and to spend them only to restore the affected areas. So please do not violate the trust and thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, sir. Any questions from the Trustee Council? Thank you very much. We'll go on now to Kenai. Anybody from Kenai that wishes to testify tonight? Kenai.

KENAI: We're just observing at this time, thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Chenega, anybody from Chenega that

R & R COURT REPORTERS

wishes to testify tonight? Juneau. Anybody from Juneau that wishes to testify tonight?

MR. JANKA: Yes. This is David Janka (ph), I'm the Director of Prince William Sound Conservation Alliance in Valdez, I guess that's why I wasn't in Valdez to testify, why we weren't on-line I suppose.

Anyway, thank you for the review of today's proceedings. And I had made comments last night at our Public Advisory Group road show last night on the process of the Public Advisory Group, we appreciate that; there was a lot of good ideas last night presented.

At this time, Prince William Sound Conservation

Alliance requests the Trustee Council to initiate some sort of an option to purchase for the habitat acquisitions. Some -- we support the habitat acquisitions and -- very much. But some sort of a moratorium is needed now on all the lands until the studies, the framework -- the Restoration Framework is completed and the analyses are put together so we have some guidelines and knowing what we're doing. Because a lot of money can be thrown out a lot of different directions right now and some good, possibly bad but we're not going to know. And unfortunately about a couple of months away until trees are going to be falling and we won't see those forests again many hundreds of years. So I really support some sort of a buy back option, something to where we can put a moratorium such as the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Forest Service put on many (ph) of their purchases when the Spill took place; they were ready to put out a tremendous amount of board feet out for sale, and when the Spill took place, they shut it down and are now amending their plans. I hope we can do something along those lines for the private inholdings.

I think HB 411, Cliff Davidson's Bill, would help in assisting that purchasing because there is much of a concern that there's not going to be a great deal of money from the Trustee Council available in '92, you know, and that the House Bill 411 would help with that option purchases.

The other comment this evening is in support of the Oil Spill Public Information Office or what is known now as the Public Resource Center. I didn't have time to go over a lot of some of the options that were presented in the packets, I just got those when I came in this afternoon. As a person who potentially would like to sit on the Public Advisory Group or at least have input into it, I would see the Resource Center as being invaluable as my -- as any -- as all of the Public Advisory Groups learning curve especially the first couple of years takes place, as studies are finished out, as studies are released from litigation, closures (ph) that there be a place where we can get this information as well as the public as well as the subgroups, Council and such.

I'm not sure how I won the hat (ph), people can run it.

And I feel that seven (ph) is definitely a little high and preinformation of any amount to the entire public might be a
little high but somewhere in-between there. But the strong
support, our group gets a lot of requests from people all over
the country on information about the Exxon Valdez, and to have
a center such as this to help us help them as well the future,
the next 10 years of restoring the damaged environment is going
to be invaluable.

Thank you very much.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Any questions from the Trustee Council? Okay. We have about 10 minutes left on the line. Perhaps, we'll go back through the sites and let people -- anybody in the remote sites that wants to testify do it and then I'll come back to Anchorage and we can finish up here. Anybody else from Fairbanks? Fairbanks?

FAIRBANKS: Fairbanks doesn't have any more participants.

MR. PENNOYER: Whittier. Do some of these twice after they're off the line before and I've forgotten. Cordova, anybody else from Cordova?

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. This is John Thompson, I'm

Chairman of the Prince William Sound Loggers United. Prince

William Sound Loggers United is an association of individuals

who have been employed to perform logging work on timber owned

or controlled by Eyak Timber, Eyak Village Corporation and/or

assessed to them (ph) joint enterprise of White Stone (ph) that reside in the Cordova area.

We are the people whose Alaskan jobs and security will be eliminated by the purchase or in adverse condemnation by the Trustee Council of all or most timber rights in the Prince William Sound area. We are the people who were promised approximately 10 years of logging employment in the area. Some of us were induced by the expectancy of such job security to relocate to South Central Alaska from other states and areas. Along with that, comes a responsibility of signing rental agreements, the purchase of homes, vehicles to work, enrolling our children in schools, daycare centers, et cetera; basically being productive citizens in our community.

While we acknowledge that there may exist public support for the acquisition of land and/or (ph) timber in the Prince William Sound area to deserve the standing force (ph) in the public interest, including such purposes as recreation, aesthetics and fish and wildlife protection. We implore the Council to include the sacrifice of our jobs in any plan for acquisition which we'd get from the termination (ph) of planned logging activity.

The people of Alaska and of this Council should remember that more than the resource centers must be compensated. The rights of the loggers being eliminated in this acquisition must also be compensated. More than the value

R & R COURT REPORTERS

of the timber will be taken (indiscernible) will be taken as our ability to partake in a productive manner in our community.

It is our belief and that of our legal counsel that the Trustee Council and -- excuse me -- our employers have not only a legal but a moral obligation to include us in any transaction which directly or indirectly purchases (ph) our jobs, thereby extinguishing them along with the purchase of trees in the Prince William Sound area.

We ask only that our property interests and our employment relationships be given the same respect and legal protection as the property interests of Shearstone (ph), White Stone, and Eyak and the forest of Prince William Sound. If the preservation of our forest — of such forests and the resulting loss of our employment is in the public interest, so be it; but include us in this plan to help us survive. Make us your allies and not your adversaries in what must be done to benefit the Prince William Sound. And I thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Any questions or comments by Trustee Council members? Thank you very much, sir. Going on down the list, I guess Valdez had nobody last time. Kodiak, are you back on the line now? Homer, anybody else from Homer?

HOMER: No, we're observing only.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Seward, anybody else from Seward? SEWARD: There is no one else to testify. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: I think Kenai was off the line last

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

time. Kenai, is anybody from Kenai on the line?

KENAI: We're just observing. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. And Chenega last time was not -- did not want to testify tonight. Juneau, anybody else from Juneau?

MS. STANCARA: This is Theresa Stancara (ph). I've been a resident of Valdez for nine years, and I'd just like to say that I really support the timber acquisition, timber rights and land. I think the coastal areas have damaged enough by the Spill, and we need to save and preserve what's left, and that that does include the uplands.

Also, I'd like to really support the Oil Spill
Information Center to remain open. I think that it does serve
a very useful purpose. There are many people that are
constantly asking for information and it's a good source for
that, so I definitely support that. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you very much. I've been down through the list of remote sites twice now. Is there anybody else on line from remote stations that still wishes to testify? Any stations with people who want to testify tonight?

MR. NAVA: Yes, calling from Cordova. My name is Tom Nava (ph), I'm a spokesman for the Prince William Sound and Copper River Regional Salmon Planning Team. We, at our last meeting in January, past a resolution that I'd like to read at this time. Excuse me.

Whereas pink salmon stocks in the Prince William Sound were clearly damaged by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. whereas damage assessment and restoration science work on pink salmon in Prince William Sound provides information greatly contributing to the understanding of damaged stocks and their interrelationships with other salmon stocks in Prince William Sound. And whereas, resolu- -- restoration of these damaged stocks is largely possible only through fisheries management actions that are highly dependent upon information generated from damage assessment and restoration science projects. whereas the economies of the Oil Spill affected communities in Prince William Sound are largely dependent upon the salmon industry and are directly benefitted by the improved management precision brought about through knowledge gained from existing salmon restoration science projects. And whereas the integrity of wild salmon stocks in Prince William Sound will receive benefit from knowledged gained from these programs, and this knowledge will have application to salmon producing -production planning and the future of the salmon industry in Prince William Sound.

May it thereby be resolved that the Prince William

Sound and Copper River Regional Planning Team strongly endorses
the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council's continued support for
restoration science projects for salmon in Prince William Sound
as the long-term method of restoration of damaged wild stocks

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

through applied science -- or excuse me -- applied management, scientific evaluation and enhancement of the commercial fisheries.

And that's the end of our resolution.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions or comments of Mr. Nava tonight. Okay. Thank you very much, Tom. Anybody else out on the teleconference line that needs to testify tonight?

MR. BECKER: Yes. My name is Carl Becker, I'm speaking in Cordova. I'm a fisherman, and I'd like to speak in favor of the acquisition of lands and development rights with a significant portion of the proceeds from the civil settlement funds.

I'd also like to address my concern that vital research for the fisheries may somehow go lacking in funding. But I must say that it's difficult to come out in support of specific projects without a full disclosure of the research that has been done to date and a better understanding of the damage that has occurred. I assume that the peer review that has been conducted in the years since the Oil Spill has selected those projects which have demonstrated a significant degree of damage, and that is why they have continued to be funded. And I would like those to receive the funding that they merit, and also, that their results to date be released to the public.

I'd just like to say in the interest of the fisheries that unless research is continued into the effects of the Spill

R & R COURT REPORTERS

on our -- both fish and other resources, it'll be difficult for the Department of Fish & Game to manage those resources in a manner that will lead to their recovery.

So I would urge that the larger portion of the civil funds be devoted to acquisition, a significant portion to research, and I would urge that the State and Federal governments forego any paybacks for expenses to date. Thank you very much.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, sir. Any comments?
Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Yes. Mr. Becker, this is Charlie Cole.

Have you seen the proposed budget for the -- let's say calendar

year 1992?

* MR. BECKER: Mr. Cole, no, I haven't. Are you referring, perhaps, to what has been released in the Daily News story today, is that correct?

MR. COLE: Well I didn't get around to reading the Daily News today I must say. But presumably they're reasonably accurate, is sometimes the case. And what I wanted to say and present to you is this simple question. If you look at the budget, I see there's at least 31 million dollars proposed in the budget and I'm told there is a little more, three or four million, that's about 35 million, and if you support those projects and then you support the acquisition of habitat in addition and the acquisition of options, how do you propose

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

that the Trustee Council resolve that dilemma; there is no more money left for the acquisition of habitat or the receipt -- or contracting for options if we support all of these proposed budget expenditures. And how would you propose that the Trustee Council solve that problem?

MR. BECKER: I guess I haven't had a chance to look at that budget, I just saw the final — the bottom line on that. And I guess I'll just have to read a different newspaper. But what I would suggest is that both the State and Federal Government forego any repayment of their expenditures to date. I think that that was a — it's unfortunate that government has to spend money sometimes the way the State and the Federal Government have, but I would say that that is money that's basically under the bridge and that we should go on now with the restoration process and devote as much money as we can to that.

And I know that's not a very satisfactory answer, perhaps, but that's the best I can do right now without taking a closer look at that budget. And I wish I could address it more specifically.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. Well, I would say that we would be pleased to furnish you with -- you know, perhaps we could even fax to you there in Cordova tomorrow morning an outline of that budget if we could have a fax number.

MR. GIBBONS: It's there.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-0572 OR 277-0573 277-8543 FAX 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-7515 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-3022 MR. COLE: It's there. Mr. Gibbons says it's there, if you could make arrangements to take a look at it. And with respect to the monies which are now in the State and Federal treasuries, that could be released by legislative appropriation, and you may wish to contact the Legislature and your Representatives to see if they want to turn that money back to the Trustee Council. Thank you.

MR. BECKER: Yeah. Thanks, Mr. Cole. The fax number that I could get that budget at is 424-6000.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons.

MR. BECKER: That's the City of Cordova offices. And I appreciate your suggestions, and I will be contacting my Legislators regarding the criminal funds and the use of those for acquisitions and research. Thank you very much, I appreciate the chance to testify.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons.

MR. GIBBONS: Those were tel- -- faxed to the Cordova Volunteer Teleconference Center, Cordova City Hall at 424-6000 yesterday.

MR. BECKER: Okay. Then what I'll do is I'll be sure to get a copy of those and you all won't have to make another fax. Thank you very much.

MR. PENNOYER: I think I was informed that we had to end the teleconference by 6:15, we're slightly past that now. I apologize, but I think we'll have to take anybody else that's

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on line tomorrow night. So at this point, I'm going to terminate the teleconference, and we'll be starting again on the teleconference at 5:00 o'clock tomorrow evening. Thank you all.

I think what we'll do now is go ahead and allow -- or finish up the public testimony here in Anchorage. Who else wishes to testify tonight? Yes, ma'am.

(Pause)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BRODY: I'm Pamela Brody with the Sierra Club, which has approximately 2,000 members in Alaska. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. I would also like to thank the Trustee Council for early in the day choosing to forego the option of being reimbursed for your own expenses out of the Settlement funds, I really appreciate that.

There are several things I'd like to talk about tonight. First of all, I'd like to make the point that restoration dollars are most important now, this year and in the next few years, that up front restoration costs are what we should be looking at. And so when it comes to deciding when to reimburse government costs, that if that is to happen, it's better to happen later rather than sooner so that more money is available now for restoration.

I also was unhappy to see that there's no line item in the budget for acquisitions, and I am told that acquisitions could be done out of the remaining money, which is about six or

seven million dollars, but I would rather see that as a line item and that that should be one of the first things that the Trustee Council looks at as one of the most important things.

Regarding the reimbursements to the State and Federal Government, will be going to the Legislature and recommending, in fact, that they choose not to be reimbursed. And I would like to request that the Trustee Council also make that recommendation to the Legislature. But if, in fact, they are going to be reimbursed, again I'd like to say that that can come out of the final few years of payments rather than the current years of payments, and that would free up some money as Attorney General Cole says would be needed.

The next thing I'd like to talk about is the endowment proposal that Commissioner Sandor introduced today. And we are very concerned about this proposal. One of the things that concerns me is that it says that this would be for "perpetual funding of important programs and projects"; and I'm not sure what that means and perhaps I'm misunderstanding. But it doesn't sound like the wording the Memorandum of Agreement which says purposes of restoring, replacing, enhancing, rehabilitating or acquiring the equivalent of natural resources injuries (ph) as a result of the Oil Spill. This is what we expect the money to spent on, and it may be that this is the purpose of the endowment; this particular document does not say so.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Also of concern is if this money goes into an endowment, then who controls how that money is spent, is that still the Trustee Council or some other body? And what would be the payment money available — when would money be available? And there are several options here; one of them is — the first one is that it will be only the earnings on this endowment that would be available. If that happens, there would be very little money to begin with when we need the money most; and a lot more money later when we would have less need for it.

There is also two options of what they call levelized payments of 20 million dollars a year, 20 million dollars plus overhead. I'm not sure how that would work in terms of cash flow so I don't understand it too well. But again, I think it has the problem of not providing the money when we need it most.

My next point I'd like to talk about the studies which you will be considering tomorrow. And we are concerned about the total amount being requested for studies, 21 million dollars, since you are concerned. And I don't have the knowledge at this point to say what studies I think are appropriate or not appropriate. But I would ask the Trustee Council to seek the advice of peer reviewers outside of the agencies. The agencies have made the proposals and for them to also judge which proposals should be funded is a conflict of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

interest I would think. They may have the best of intentions but it is in their interest to make those amounts as large as possible.

That's -- for this year, I would recommend getting the outside peer review, and for future years, I would recommend that agencies and outside consultants both have the opportunity to submit proposals and compete for these funds.

My fifth point is that there is some need, I believe, of fast track decision making process, both in terms of acquiring options on lands for restoration and also on deciding whether or not to approve studies. Some studies, I believe the decisions need to be made very soon or the opportunity will be lost to do the study this summer, and I think some process is necessary for addressing that.

And my final point is about public participation. In terms of the budget, I think that it is important that the Public Advisory Group have staff and that, also, that they be able to hire their own staff. And I also think that it's important that the library continue to remain open to the public and not be archives alone (ph).

Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you very much. Questions for Ms. Brody.

MR. SANDOR: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SANDOR: Just a comment. Pamela Brody, we very much appreciate your comments with respect to the endowment, the Restoration Team will be evaluating that and other proposals, the projects and programs must, under that scenario, benefit restoration of resources. It also includes such proposals as extension or acquisition of the resources (indiscernible - background coughing) and so forth. Your comments will be very helpful.

MS. BRODY: Thank you very much, Commissioner.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

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. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'm on another issue. Thanks. But I've been told that in addition to this 30 million here that we're dealing with -- let's see if I can get the exact number so I'm on track -- 30,118,000, that the proposed budget involves some other money, something which brings it up to 35 or so. Am I off base on that or is there something to that?

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, that figure is the total, the 30 million figure, and as far as I know there aren't any other expenses. And further, the 30 million represents projects not studies, many of the projects are not studies.

MR. COLE: Well I didn't mean to be specific about it, it's just the total budget that is 30 million 188. All right.

MS. BRODY: In answer to that, I believe what has been proposed is 53 or 54 million to be -- to go to reimbursements

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE

272-3022

to the Federal and State expenses, and then approximately 30 million for the programs and projects. And so there remains six or seven million that's not budgeted at all, it's not part of the 30 million, it's available.

MR. COLE: I'm now getting to there. The 29.5 million some weeks ago went into the State Treasury, and the 24 plus million some weeks ago, at the same time, went into the Federal Treasury. So that's why I say in order to, you know, recoup that 29.5 million that the State received, it's in the Treasury now you see and you have to get it out somehow if you want to put it into these projects. That's what I was trying to explain earlier.

MS. BRODY: Could I ask then for the future years, what's going to happen to the payments that come in; is it decided how much will go into -- directly into reimbursements?

MR. COLE: Well the Memorandum of Agreement provides the total amount of monies which will go for -- to reimbursement of the State and Federal governments or a formula for determining that. We have agreed between the State and Federal governments that the total reimbursements will be phased in over a period of five years in order to allow monies to be available for this very purpose which we're addressing now. And I think it was, you know, 25, something like that, it came down a little bit toward the end.

But remember then, there's the 50 million dollars which

R & R COURT REPORTERS

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is under the legislative and the executive budget process which Representative Davidson's Bill is addressing now. And that's something that — those monies could be used for restoration purposes under the same formula as the limitations on expenditures of the funds here except for this study — science study center is slightly broader in that regard.

Does that answer your questions of sort of where we are?

MS. BRODY: Yes, that's helps. Could I ask one more question?

MR. COLE: You bet.

MS. BRODY: Thank you. The agreement to pay back over the first five years, is that something that can be revisited or is that set in stone?

MR. COLE: The total amount I think is set in stone under the Memorandum of Understanding approved by the Federal Court. How that's paid back I would say, not having thought about it before, but I would think that there would be some flexibility there.

MS. BRODY: Thank you.

MR. COLE: I can't say for sure, that would require, I think, the joint agreement of the State and Federal agencies, but it's something that I think the State, in any event, would be prepared to consider; although, the legislature sometimes seeks money.

MS. BRODY: Thank you.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. I guess, you know, the concept of the endowment as I understand it would provide some funds for those that will follow us that may have an idea or ideas that are better than ours relative to restoration of Prince William Sound, you know. So I think on that basis it certainly has some merit.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you very much. I think we'll go on now, next testimony. Bob Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I'm Bob
Anderson, the guy from Cordova with many hats; one being the
President of Shearstone Company and another being a City
Councilman down there. And we have submitted a proposal to the
Council at the request of others suggesting a moratorium for
companies like us that are presently, and have been for several
years, involved in logging activities.

Let me -- I would like to go over a little old ground that I covered with you the 10th just to refresh all of our memories. I mentioned that I was involved in probably most of the land selections within the Chugach Region in the last 15 -- 17 years due to my capacity at one time as president of the Chugach Region and the president of the Eyak Village Corporation. I have also assisted the other villages within

the Region in some of their land selection problems as they pursued their various goals in selecting their land.

But with that in mind, I would like you to rest assured that I don't speak for any of the corporations involved, I'm not an officer in any of those corporations. But I think the history is important because back when all the selections were made they were made within the confines of the ANSCA (ph) that spelled out certain ways that you could do it. Maybe 20 years later now, it might not be a bad idea to bring all the players to the table and take a look at it.

I know, for instance, the Eyak Corporation hadn't thought about any land trades, per se, or land sales, per se, but I think they might want to revisit it now. And now would be the proper time to do it I would think in my mind. I know I helped make those selections, I think I can see where I might recommend to them to make some readjustment. I would suspect that maybe some of the other villages haven't done that either. Maybe the Chugach Region hasn't done it either. But I think this is the proper time to do it.

I think I mentioned at one of the other meetings the Chugach National Forest is now going through its five-year review on its management plan, that also adds impetus to why now might be the proper time to all get down to the table. As most of you know, the State is not a major landholder in the Prince William Sound, the major -- they mainly have

R & R COURT REPORTERS

responsibility for management of fish within the Sound. Now, the State can be an important player in the management scheme of the Sound.

Some other areas that I think -- we continually seem to talk about the eight or 900 million dollars, or whatever the figure is, it seems like it's supposed (ph) to be drifting away and it's not as much as we thought it was when we initially started. We seem to talk about the 800 million or 900 million, there are a number of other options that should be taken a look at too; timber for timber sales, land trades, Federal property. I mean just a whole raft of things that could be put into this thing. And I think that's one reason, amongst many, that our company is interested in trying to do something.

Besides what we see as a mass of public support for us to stand down for three years and not do our logging for three years while you can go through a process and decide how we're going to manage that Sound out there. I've been a resident of that Sound for in excess of 50 years, I think I know a lot about it. Those things have come to mind. We haven't done that since the land claims process first started.

One reason I'm here tonight and my company is here is when this moratorium concept was first brought forth to us, we thought about it and thought that as long as our company wasn't harmed and we were dealt with in a reasonable manner we would be more than willing to try to cooperate. Normally, we would

R & R COURT REPORTERS

have been operating in early January, we have not fired a chain saw yet. And that wasn't done without considerable risk financially to us as a company. We do have a social conscience. We're aware of how our neighbors feel. We're all long-time residents of this state. And, it was for those and other reasons that we've done it.

We're being pushed to the point now, though, where we do have to operate. We will probably have to -- unless we get a clear signal from the Trustees that you folks do want a moratorium, we are going to have to start our operations now. And that will put us back to where we were last year, unfortunately; and we didn't enjoy last year, it wasn't much fun for us. But you have to understand, I think, a little more of the history on why the corporations selected the timber and other things. In many ways, in Prince William Sound and our area of Alaska, it was probably the only asset that could help buy the future that ANSCA had set out for it.

So you have to understand why Native corporations in general are in some -- part of the reason in why they're in the timber business. They don't like the -- in my view, I can't speak for them but they don't like the public pressure; they don't like to be seen as folks that are defoilers of the environment. They're very cognizant of those feelings; I know I am, it's bothered me a great deal. But we're committed to making our company successful, if we don't get a moratorium, we

R & R COURT REPORTERS

have to log. We have a responsibility to ourself.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And if and when we do log, one thing we've found out is we've found out that there's a tree out there that is not sacred; there is somebody out there that doesn't want us to cut that tree down. But the other thing is that we do know is when we do start up, if we have to start up next week, we are going to be into some areas that are extremely sensitive. And I just want to feel that Bob Anderson has done his part to try to make — do our half of trying to make a moratorium work in case we do have to go back to logging lastly (ph).

That's really all I have to say. If you have any questions, I'll be more than happy to try to answer them.

MR. PENNOYER: Bob, from a business standpoint, what do you consider a clear signal?

MR. ANDERSON: I don't know. That bothers us quite a bit, Steve. I need to have a lot of certainty that there is a moratorium. If I shut this company down, we've taken the risk — a tremendous risk of millions of dollars, you know. Steve, maybe you can help me out?

MR. RENBERG: Money's always nice.

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. Money's always nice, that solves our problems.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I guess

MR. ANDERSON: But we need an indication, a strong indication, a comfort level (ph). I think that we do -- we'll

have a moratorium. I don't know what the answer to that one is.

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Well, Bob, I heard some flexibility in two respects; one, I heard you talk about the moratorium and the possibility of the corporation being interested in trades or acquisitions of various forms of property, including Federal property, it might even be surplus, a variety of thing — a flexibility of deferring action with compensation, of course. I thought I also heard that you're sensitive to certain specific areas being of special interest, even though all trees are sacred. And, you're aware of course the Nature Conservancy Proposal and that moratorium proposal, so it seems that you are looking at the possibility of trades as well as selling in fee rights.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, the Shearstone Company only owns timber, John. But in my way of thinking I think we've got to look beyond the 800 million or whatever that figure is. We've got to look at the other avenues. I would even suggest that you try to drag Alyeska and Exxon back into this thing, they haven't settled with the Third Parties, and I think they have a responsibility. Companies like mine and the Native groups in the Sound, we're the ongoing victims of the Oil Spill. Now, we're being criticized for activities in our logging efforts, and a lot of that was brought on because of what Exxon did to

R & R COURT REPORTERS

us; so I think they have a respo- -- but we have to explore all those areas. I think you have the responsibility to explore beyond 800 million dollars or whatever it is.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Are you offering the possibility that the Native groups would also take some of their recoveries from Exxon and contribute to the habitat there?

MR. ANDERSON: I don't know that, Charlie; I'm not an officer in any of those, though I am acquainted with a lot of people there. But I would think that they would be open to that suggestion. It would certainly be worth exploring now (indiscernible).

MR. COLE: Let me tell you what bothers me in these proposals that we get to us (ph), and I haven't discussed this with other Trustees. But what bothers me is we have reasonable proposals, I would say that from the Afognak group, from your people. But it troubles me that we would make commitments on certain areas without looking at the overall problem of the habitat and the necessity to protect habitat in Prince William Sound. And, if we say all right, the Shearstone proposal looks sensible and we will take options on it or we'll do that now, and then we will do it in Afognak, and then as time goes on, without looking at the whole thing, we wind up and we find that there's some very critical habitat that we don't have enough money to acquire. Then we say my God, I mean you know what a

colossal problem we have now, you know, on our hands; we don't have enough money to buy habitat, this other habitat is critical.

And I think what -- you know, at least my present thinking, without having the Council and advice of the public and other members, is to say we should look at the overall habitat problem in Prince William Sound and see what's the most critical habitat, and how much it will cost and how much money we have available, and then make, you know, a rational, reasoned approach as to the habitat we acquire and how we spend the money and how we fold these in to the money we're spending for administration and the money we're spending for these projects and not just studies. And that's what troubles me.

I realize that time is of the essence they say in the law, but you know, I think that we really have to study critical habitat first.

MR. ANDERSON: Well I have to agree but how do you solve problems of companies like us, we have ongoing businesses and, you know -- business and we're -- this year our production plan is we're going to shoot for at least 28 million feet of timber. We're back into those areas that we'll be harvesting in areas that we're getting hammered for. We're not enjoying it.

I'm not convinced that there's not a spot in Prince
William Sound for the logging industry. What I am suggesting

R & R COURT REPORTERS

is that I think that now is the time to take a look at it, find out where the spot for our industry is. Maybe it's not where we're at, that's why I'm suggesting other possibilities of spots or whatever that it takes to either move us, buy us out or whatever. But we cannot be asked like a lot of people out in the -- we can be asked but we're sure as heck not going to do it to just shut our company down; we've done that for a number of weeks now already at tremendous risk to us. And but that's what we're being asked to out there by a very large majority of the population, even some folks that don't have a problem with logging, they're saying the same thing; we would like to have you shut down for two or three years, and that's what I see coming (ph).

MR. COLE: Let me say I have asked Commissioner Heinz and the Department of Natural Resources, if you can is to just produce for us an overall map of Prince William Sound so we have this overview, and then we can look and see where the Spill affected areas were, where the critical habitat areas are, and then, you know, approach it from than angle. That's been my view, that's what I'm trying to do.

MR. ANDERSON: Well

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: I'll pass.

MR. PENNOYER: Any other questions at this time. Thank you, Bob.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. ANDERSON: Thanks, Steve.

MR. PENNOYER: More testimony from -- yes, Mr. Parker.

MR. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Pennoyer. My name is Jeff Parker and I'm speaking on behalf of the Alaska Sport Fishing Association and Trout Unlimited. If you, by any chance, recall my testimony from last time, I speak by organizing my thoughts in numbers, sort of like a child paints I guess; I hope my thoughts will be usable.

I have 12 points I want to quickly skate across. One is that we support the trust proposal or endowment proposal that has been put forward by Commissioner Sandor, that we support it in concept; I haven't yet reviewed it with respect to the details. I think I have less reticence about it than Pam Brody of the Sierra Club voice because I think it consistent with Commissioner Sandor's remarks, Attorney General Cole will probably attempt to keep us within -- or keep you folks within the law as to what to spend the income on endowment from -- or for what purposes you spend it.

With respect to another point that I would like to express support for and that is, if I understood correctly Dave Gibbons comments that the Trustee Council has decided to allow a public nomination process with respect to acquisitions. That's really my second point. I think that's fundamental so that the process remains open.

Third, the last time on December 10th, I spoke to three

recommended criteria for purposes of deciding what acquisitions were appropriate. Roughly those criteria were that the land involved — the land be valuable for habitat or use value purposes that, that it face a clearly identifiable near or long-term risk and that the acquisition of the fee title or conservation easements in the land bear some relationship to the injuries occasioned by the Spill, regardless of whether those are injuries to resources, to services or to non-use values.

Therefore, my third point is that I am pleased to see that the Trustee Council is apparently continuing the thrust of the March, 1991 Federal Register Notice which was basically consistent with those criteria.

However, with respect to that, I have one criticism and that's the fourth point. That is that Notice spoke of recreational sites. I think that if people -- it would be better to say recreational lands. People do not recreate in this state in the same manner that they all rec- -- or in the same -- all recreation does not occur in the same manner as it occurs at the mouth of the Russian River. I think you could describe the mouth of the Russian River as a site. I think Prince William Sound, Southeast Alaska, Southwest Alaska have the recreational use pattern is much more disperses; people utilize the lands as opposed to just specific sites.

My fifth point is that I was pleased to hear also in

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Mr. Gibbons summary that the Trustee Council is apparently not limiting itself over the long haul to an area that is "affected by the Spill" and that you will look towards restoration through either habitat acquisition or acquisition for purposes of restoring lost services or lost non-use values outside of some, what is to me, an ambiguous area that is an area "affected by the Spill." I would urge you to be very careful about limiting your efforts within any such alleged area, and that you move expeditiously towards broadening the view of where it might be appropriate to acquire lands for either purposes of conserving habitats and therefore restoring resource value or restoring use value or non-use value.

I think that basically in order to broaden that view it basically comes down to about 25 corporations, they're clearly identifiable in the Native Claims Settlement Act, as I recall it's Section 9 -- and somewhere between 9 and 11. But there are approximately 25 corporations that are in the southern coastal drainages, and I think it's very hard to say that there is more than one area outside of the southern coastal drainages that would meet the criteria of a clearly identifiable near or long-term threat, roughly one of the criteria in the March Federal Register Notice. And, I would be pleased to give a list if you would wish of what I think those corporate lands might be as possible candidates or possible interested parties on a willing seller/willing buyer basis.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

My sixth point is a narrow concern, and I cannot speak for either the Sport Fishing Association or Trout Unlimited at this point specifically on Restoration Proposal Number 106, which is to double the Fort Richardson hatchery output for purposes of planning catchable, that'll be six inch, rainbow trout in Anchorage lakes due to the fact of an expected almost zero return or severely limited return of sockeye salmon in the Kenai River system and when the 1989 age class returns.

I suspect that both those organizations, Trout
Unlimited and Alaska Sport Fishing Association, which
repetitively have dealt with and have been very frequently
opposed to a number of different types of enhancement projects,
particularly -- well I shouldn't say particularly of this sort,
but that isn't to say that we have opposed all enhancement
projects. We've opposed a number though and have been on a
number of planning teams for the State concerning such
proposals. I would expect that those -- that both Alaska Sport
Fishing Association and Trout Unlimited will have reservations
about that Proposal Number 106 being an adequate restoration of
lost use values.

My seventh point on land trades -- maybe I should adjust this, excuse me, to keep from bending over. I used to negotiate land -- or assist in negotiating land exchanges for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service in the 19- -- late 1970's, and specifically assisted on a number of exchanges and they're in

R & R COURT REPORTERS

ANILCA (ph).

The comments that were made previously about this state being too picked over for purpose of land exchanges or at least substantial land exchanges I think were very accurate comments. The State has had a history of first State selection, and founded upon that, borough selection and municipal government selection, Native claims selections, conservation, if you will, selections, really designations, as well as many state conservation designations. All of that leads -- has led -- has been -- has created very much a picked over situation, and I think that there'll be not very much prospect for substantial use of land exchanges within Alaska.

Aside from that, though, the previous gentleman's comments about the potential for exchanges of surplus Federal lands, those that are surplused to General (ph) Services Administration, those were useful comments. Similarly, if you want to get wishful thinking, the RT, the Resolution Trust Corporation certainly has plenty of federal land.

My eighth point, reimbursement costs; I would concur with the general comments previously made by others that the Government try and stagger their reimbursements costs so as to facilitate conservation efforts more up front. With respect to that, if you were able to do so, you might be able to utilize monies that are available for possible acquisition in this fiscal year or in this calendar year for options on the

critical sorts of habitats that Mr. Cole was referring to. I concur very much and am pleased to have heard the tenor of Attorney General Cole's comments on that, options tailored to critical areas, whether they are critical habitat or critical scenic views for use value are an appropriate way I think to view early use of limited monies.

My ninth -- I believe my ninth point is that there's too much research in this budget, that's been addressed elsewhere.

My tenth point, a very quick one, is -- well, actually, let me come back to that. Yeah. My tenth point and it's not germane to the restoration project -- process, either legally nor should it be probably politically. But one of the things that many of the Trustees or some of them may not be aware of is that it is fairly easily -- easy to document that in an economic sense that -- for purposes of producing jobs and commerce, wilderness based recreation industry is probably one of the most productive of jobs in terms of visitor days that we have in this state.

I will give to the Trustee -- or I'll mail to the Trustees a study that was sponsored by the Alaska Sport Fishing Association, the Alaska Hotel & Motel Association and the Alaska Professional Sport Fishing Association, the latter a trade association of lodges, that shows job production and commerce off of certain comparable wilderness based recreation

R & R COURT REPORTERS

industries and non-wilderness based recreation industries. And I hope you'll find the conclusions interesting, legally not significant but useful, perhaps, for other purposes or these purposes.

Finally, an advisory group, obviously, our group -- our associations would be interested in participating in selecting a reasonable candidate to the advisory group. That's the eleventh point.

The twelfth and last one, annualization of payments. If there is great demand to do a lot up front, early with limited money, it may be possible to utilize what limited monies you have to add -- to create a payment plan to a conveyor of property or property interests; a corporation, for example, that is relinquishing certain interests or the fee title; so that you don't have to acquire -- you don't have to pay it all in Year 1 but you can stagger and pay over time. That would allow you to accomplish more in -- at the front end with limited resources. And I hope that vague explanation is reasonably clear.

Those are my 12 points, I hope I skated fairly fast.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Jeff. Questions of Mr. Parker? Thank you very much.

MR. SANDOR: It was sent. Time is going on. But this annualization of payment plans, I suppose that -- how far can that be extended into the future and with an endowment -- could

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1 endowment incomes be used for the pay -- those kinds of 2 payments? 3 MR. PARKER: I would think that you could design it so 4 that an endowment income would cover that. And basically, as 5 the principal of the endowment grows, the income would grow and 6 basically it would be sort of like a mortgage; if you've got more money to pay on your mortgage than you're obligated to 7 8 pay, you can probably buy out -- you can shorten your mortgage 9 term, basically. 10 MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman. I'd suggest that you convey those ideas to our Restoration Team. 11 MR. PARKER: That I do so? 12 MR. SANDOR: 13 Yeah. That's fine. 14 MR. PARKER: 15 MR. SANDOR: Yeah. Fine. 16 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Questions. Thank you very 17 Yes, sir, you've been trying to get up there and I've 18 been looking right past you, so why don't you go ahead. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd just like to request to be 19 the first speaker tomorrow. 20 21 MR. PENNOYER: That's -- you can be the first one tomorrow night. 22 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I've passed you by too long tonight, I 24 MR. PENNOYER: 25 agree. Yes, ma'am.

MS. RODERMAN: Hi. I'd just like to make a few comments. My name is Lisa Roderman (ph), I am an eight year resident of Cordova and I've also been the principal investigator on a damage assessment study aimed at evaluating the affects of the Spill on sea otter weanlings (ph) and involved in some of the other damage assessment towards (ph) sea otters.

I'd like to just -- I'll try to keep my comments brief,
I just have two points I'd like to make. One was prompted by
Mr. Anderson's comments and so I hadn't planned to speak on
this. I agree with the Trustees and with Mr. Cole in
particular that study is needed in order to identify all of the
critical habitats in Prince William Sound. And, in fact, we
submitted a proposal to identify critical habitats for sea
otters. However, in order to expedite the process of buying
some lands now, I would suggest that the Trustees could get
individual scientists together who have been working in Prince
William Sound for a long period of time on particular species,
get them together for a very brief meeting initially and ask
them to identify the most critical habitats for their species.

In other words then, there will be some critical habitats that go unidentified and to identify those some say well we need it. However, I think off the top of our heads, most people that have been studying anything in Prince William Sound for a long period of time could identify certain areas

R & R COURT REPORTERS

10.

anyway. And a lot of the people that you should speak with have already been involved in the damage assessment process and so are readily available to the Trustees.

My second comment has to do with the importance of expert (ph) peer review. And I don't mean these comments as a criticism of anyone that's been involved in the process, many of whom I consider friends, no process is perfect and any process can be improved. The peer review process I believe is one of the most important processes in this whole damage assessment and restoration business. It's certainly one of your biggest ticket items, and it -- also, the studies that the peer reviewers are reviewing is your biggest ticket item, and it's also -- the studies are crucial to your accomplishing your goal of aiding in the restoration of Prince William Sound.

At this time, the peer reviewers are acting, however, in an advisory role to the Trustees and to the agencies only. And that process hasn't been perfect. I think the public -- the problem is this, is that the public has not had access to these studies or the data because of litigation needs. And, therefore, the public assumes that the recommendations in all cases of peer reviewers are being followed, and therefore, that the best studies are being done, and also which is just as important to the scientific process, by the best available people. And yet, in all cases this is not true, and in some cases agencies have done studies that the peer reviewers don't

R & R COURT REPORTERS

recommend.

And I think the whole process could be improved if the decision as to which — the decision is best to which studies went forward was left up to the peer reviewers themselves. In other words, you're paying these people a lot of money, and you obviously have respect for their opinion because you've employed them to review these studies. And why not give these people the power then to make their decisions as to which studies go forward and who is going to do these studies. I think that the process then would have more credibility to the public. You'd avoid any question of conflict of interest such as has been raised by the agencies simply filling their own coffers if you did this; the peer reviewers have no conflict of interest; and I think there would be considerable dollar savings as well.

Those are my only comments. I had one other comment which is just that to aid in this process and maybe to kick it off I would suggest that the public could be made — the comments of the peer reviewers in terms of the recommendations as to studies that are being put on the table now could be made available to the public. And also, I would, you know, very much advise the individual Trustees to utilize the very formidable resources and knowledge of the chief scientist personally to understand how closely the peer review process is aligning with which studies are being proposed. You see a set

of studies and I think maybe falsely believe in all cases that those are ones that were recommended as going forward.

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. PENNOYER: Questions or comments? Thank you very much. Is there anybody else that needs to testify tonight?

Yes, sir.

MR. RENBERG: Thank you. My name is Steve Renberg (ph), I'm the CEO of Eyak Corporation; I also wear the hat of financial manager of Shearstone, Inc. As a follow-up to Bob Anderson's comments and to Mr. Cole's comments about wanting to do a study of the areas first and determine the critical habitat, I think the point was is that we've been asked to do a moratorium so that study -- those studies could be done so that we're not logging in what may be determined to be "critical habitat."

The proposal that you received, I believe it was for three years; that could be divided down into one year increments. It doesn't have to be, you know, you have to give us a three year moratorium or nothing. We are at a critical crossroads. I advised them that we really should have started January 15th. We've got to make a decision. We have to do something starting Monday. And, in fact, I'm going to Cordova tomorrow to meet with the logger to lay out the plans and the units that we're going to be doing.

But the whole purpose was to enable the studies to be

done that you're talking about and give the time element involved. And if you start out with one year and say look we'll do the moratorium just for one year and then towards the end of the year we'll make a decision whether we want to continue on or not. That would certainly help us.

The other thing you asked for was what number would make us feel comfortable. There was a number proposed that would give us an idea that yes, you are serious about a moratorium; that would allow us to plan with out logger whether or not they're going to continue on through the year or we're just going to pull out what we felled and decked (ph) from last year.

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. PENNOYER: Questions? I

MR. SANDOR: What was that figure?

Half a million. MR. RENBERG:

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Are there

MR. RENBERG: By the way, you get something for that.

MR. PENNOYER: At the end of the process.

MR. RENBERG: Well, no, I mean part of our proposal was whatever was paid in would be used for (indiscernible interrupted)

> For the purchase (ph) fund. MR. PENNOYER:

MR. RENBERG: Yeah. As a payment on something. dollars that -- we agreed that any dollars put in would be --

R & R COURT REPORTERS

272-3022

would acquire some kind of a resource at the end.

MR. SANDOR: 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. PENNOYER: Anybody else tonight? Yes, sir.

MR. STEINER: Just a real quick one. I won't be long. The one thing I wanted to ask is whether or not the repayment of the 29.5 million dollars and the 24 million dollars to the State and the Feds without any public involvement in that decision, is that meaningful public involvement? Is that within the bounds that Judge Holland accepted the Settlement and the MOAs? Evidently, the decision was that it is, I'm just curious.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Actually, under the document that Judge Holland approved, both the State and Federal governments could have glommed on to all the money.

MR. STEINER: With no public involvement?

MR. COLE: With no public involvement; slam, bank, slam, dunk, you know. But we didn't do it, you know, and we decided to take this money over time to allow the very process, like I say, which is going on now, you know. And the public -- time for public involvement on that issue was when the MOA and those agreements came up for public comment; I mean, you know, it was there. I realize there, you know, are some problems there. But I mean it has had full public comment. And I think

the governments have been -- you know, done the right thing in order to stagger that payment. And for I think the State would -- certainly I would be prepared to even set that back a little bit if we could, you know, in order to allow more money up front; took a little money up front and maybe it would've been, you know, some thought to taking a little more money back at the end of the line. It's a thought we would think about I'm sure.

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

MR. STEINER: I think that would certainly help within (ph) the reason a number of people feel that the money now and not 10 years (ph) or so. Thanks. I appreciate that consideration.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Any other question?
Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON: Yes. I just have a comment. You know, I'm certainly sympathetic for -- to the concept of altering the repayment schedule. But I do think in all fairness we need to remember there wasn't any public involvement when the agencies were scrambling for money to do this job and borrowing money from programs, in some cases, from other areas of the country. So, there's that side of the equation also that ought to be considered as we move forward.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. You know, in terms of the reimbursement, it's not, you know, simply paying back

government if effect. In a way, you're paying back some of the people who we did take money and projects away from to do the work. So I mean I'm not going to argue about all the pieces of it, but in many cases, agencies like ours forewent (ph) to projects in areas to the damaged resources that were important to people as well. So at least the reimbursement covers that type of thing, it's not just simply putting money back into government. In our case, it'll buy more research in Southeastern. We forewent for two years when we did the Prince William Sound work, you know, helped on ground (ph) fisheries search in certain areas that we didn't do, that type of thing is involved as well, as well as other areas of the country.

So -- but we'll certainly look at the time schedule question.

MR. STEINER: Very good. I guess the last thing is the reason the citizens wanted a settlement was so that we would have some money for restoration. And, if we're backloading the restoration money, then there really was no compelling reason to settle. And, I think you've seen some of the outcry about the terms, the conditions, the payments of the settlements. That was the one compelling reason the public wanted the settlement so

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think it's our intent that we do accomplish that restoration. And I hope that the plan that we come out with will help give people a chance to comment on that

and we'll assure you we are. 1 Further comment for tonight? We were advertised at 2 8:30 tomorrow morning, is that still your desire? 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 4 Sure. MR. PENNOYER: Okay. I quess you are. 5 MR. SANDOR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, one thing. 6 7 MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Sandor. 8 MR. SANDOR: We had la- -- at our last Trustee Council meeting we'd asked the Restoration Team to look at that 9 proposal by the Nature Conservancy, if you will, with regard to 10 acquisition. And I wonder if between now and the meeting 11 tomorrow we might reflect on this critical issue with regard to 12 acquisition and the 500,000 proposal as a critical sign, that 13 14 we might deal with that tomorrow. MR. PENNOYER: The first item on the Agenda tomorrow I 15 16 think will be the review of Mr. Rice's report and questions and 17 comments, and it would be appropriate to do that at the same 18 time. 19 MR. SANDOR: Thank you. MR. PENNOYER: 20 21

Thank you very much, see you in the morning. Adjourned.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

24

23

22

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 277-0572 OR 277-0573 FAX 274-8982

509 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-8543

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-3022

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

CERTIPICATE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

STATE OF ALASKA

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

) 85.

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 228 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustee Council, taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 5th day of February, 1992, commencing at the hour of 11:00 o'clock a.m., at the Egan Convention Center, Space 4, 555 West Fifth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 10th day of February, 1992.

Karen & Oquiers

Notary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires: 03/29/94

OFFICIAL SEAL
STATE OF ALASKA
NOTITY FUBLIC
KAPEN E. SQUIERS

R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515

1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE (907) 272-3022

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501