### R&R COURT REPORTERS

24

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	MR. BARTON: I'll try to get perfection here, though,
3	Juneau, you aren't coming in.
4	DR. GIBBONS: Who do you have at your end, Mike?
5	MR. BARTON: Pardon me?
6	DR. GIBBONS: Who do you have at your end?
7	MR. BARTON: I still didn't get the question.
8	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who's here.
9	DR. GIBBONS: Who's there at your end from the Trustee
10	Council?
11	MR. BARTON: We have Curt McVee and myself. I was
12	going to ask for Juneau, Juneau identify who's there.
13	DR. GIBBONS: The Trustee Council Members are Rosier $\Big($
14	and Pennoyer.
15	MR. BARTON: Okay. We don't have Sandor or Cole?
16	DR. GIBBONS: No. We don't even have a quorum.
17	MR. BARTON: Well, I guess we need to recess until we
18	can round them up.
19	DR. GIBBONS: Okay. We're recessing.
20	MR. BARTON: All right. But you'll need to notify us
21	when you get both.Sandor and Cole.
22	DR. GIBBONS: Okay. We'll call you back.
23	MR. BARTON: Okay. Thanks.
24	DR. GIBBONS: Do you have your number there?
25	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 278-8008.

MR. BARTON: 278-8008. 1 Okay. Thank you. We'll be back with MR. PENNOYER: 2 3 you in a couple of minutes I hope. MR. BARTON: 4 Okav. 5 (Off record) 6 (On record) ..... (indiscernible) this is a MR. BARTON: 7 continuation. We have in Anchorage myself, Mike Barton, 8 representing the Secretary of Agriculture, and Curt McVee, 9 Special Assistant to the Secretary of Interior. Would those in 10 Juneau identify themselves for the record? There is a record 11 12 being kept here in Anchorage. MR. PENNOYER: Steve Pennoyer, National Oceanic & 13 Atmospheric Administration. 14 MR. ROSIER: Carl Rosier, Alaska Department of Fish & 15 16 Game. MR. SANDOR: John Sandor, Department of Environmental 17 18 Conservation. MR. COLE: Charlie Cole, Department of Law. 19 20 MR. BARTON: We all have copies of the Agenda in front of us, items that were continued over from the last meeting. 21 The first item on the Agenda is the review of the Restoration 22 23 Framework. Dr. Senner. DR. SENNER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24 Can the

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

people in Juneau hear me?

(Indiscernible telephonic responses)

DR. SENNER: All right. Thank you. The -- you have all been provided copies of a draft of the Restoration Framework document, and this was given to you at the last -- the earlier part of this meeting here in Anchorage. The general goal of the Restoration Team is to release a Restoration Framework and the 1992 Annual Work Plan concurrently, and the hope is to do that later this month.

The idea, then, is to invite comments from the public on both the Restoration Framework and the Annual Work Plan, and then based on those comments do two things; first, a final 1992 Annual Work Plan will be issued. The Framework document, however, is viewed as a one-time document, and the idea is to take comments from the public on that and then use them as the basis for preparing a draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement which would come out in the fall; and we have been targeting September, 1992 for that draft document.

The Restoration Framework describes the structure and process that is being established to implement the settlement. It gives background on injuries and restoration options and invites comments on issues that are helpful in the development of the Restoration Plan and draft Environmental Impact Statement. In that sense, it's intended to be a scoping document to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Today, what we'd like to do is have your comments on the substance and concepts of the Restoration Framework. think we'd like to avoid, if possible, serious word-smithing. I think we need to get your feedback on the concepts and then spend another week taking your comments and those that come in from Restoration Team members and legal advisers and produce 6 7 another draft of this Restoration Framework for your consideration. And hopefully, after another draft is completed 8 and reviewed by you, we would be close to having something that could be signed off and sent to the printer. But I do want to 10 stress that we're not seeking approval of this document today, 11 we want your comments and then we'd like to take it back and improve on it.

\_ Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other presentation than I think we could open it for your comments.

Comments, discussion from the Council MR. BARTON: Members?

> Mr. Chairman. MR. McVEE:

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: You know, we have some specific Yes. I guess that some of those we were to get in by yesterday, March 8th. But I guess two suggestions; one would be to have some legal folks, some of the legal team, take a look at the document from the standpoint of the right nomenclature and how -- whether it reflects, you know, the

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

technical -- proper technical language relative to those concerns. And the other thing is a review by the Chief Scientist of the damage. Maybe you've already done that, I don't know. If you have done that .....

DR. SENNER: I can clarify there. The version in the document you have was not -- did not have the benefit of Dr. Spies' comments. We do now have his comments on that chapter and we would integrate those into the next version.

MR. McVEE: Okay. I think, other than that, that the -- you know, specific suggestions we could just get -- you know, have -- get those to you. So -- but I think the legal review would be worthwhile.

DR. SENNER: I agree. I should say we have had -- we have provided copies to, I believe, five of our different attorneys and have heard back from some of them, but we'd certainly invite additional legal review.

MR. BARTON: Other comments?

MR. PENNOYER: Stan, Steve Pennoyer. How many copies of this do you think you're going to be sending out?

DR. SENNER: Dave might know better than I, but I believe the notion was to print about 3,000, and we have a mailing list on the order of 2,000 or 2,500. Dave, do you -- can you clarify further?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct, Stan.

MR. PENNOYER: Just as a question for the group as a

## 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

whole, about half of this document is just reproducing the various legal documents that support it. Is there -- do people feel there's a need to send out 2,500 copies of that, just as a question; it's a fairly sizeable amount of the package. And I'm not sure if folks need to read through the whole -- individuals might write and request it, is there some option maybe of allowing that to happen and provide it to those who clearly would be interested rather than sending 2,000 -- 3,000 copies of it?

DR. SENNER: Mr. Pennoyer, I -- this is Stan, I can just say the -- we'll do whatever the Trustees want on that. The reasoning or logic in putting in the Appendix was to make the original documents as accessible as possible to the public. We simply wanted to go the extra mile and put it all right there in front of them. But it probably has resulted in the loss of some additional trees if we do put them in there.

MR. BARTON: Other com- -- ....

MR. PENNOYER: You could put a notation in there that reference to the documents that are available and they are available upon request or something.

MR. BARTON: Are you making a motion?

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. I move.

MR. BARTON: Is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

MR. BARTON: It's moved and seconded. Anymore

## R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE (907) 272-3022 discussion? Any objection to the motion? Okay. So moved.

DR. SENNER: All right.

MR. BARTON: Other comments or questions on the Restoration Framework?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He can't see your hand.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is John Sandor. I have just a question on the Restoration Plan schedule. Is that set back a month as a result this is not going -- this was to have gone out for public review -- and then it's going out for public review when?

DR. SENNER: Mr. Sandor, we are still basically on schedule. Our target, all along, had been to have this Framework in the mail by mid-March, and we are not going to make that but we're probably only missing it by a couple of weeks. And at this point, I don't think that that would result in a delay in the longer term schedule on the Restoration Plan and the other things that follow. We're certainly trying to hold to the original schedule.

MR. SANDOR: We do have -- well, there is some, as you say, word-smithing and some relatively small changes that have been sent to you. And you suppose you can get those out within two weeks? So you'll be on -- the answer to the question is we're on schedule then?

DR. SENNER: Yes, we are; and we'll try and keep -- stay that way.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Trustee

Council authorize the distribution of this Restoration Plan as published, as refined by the comments that comes from this group according to the schedule that's published.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second that motion.

MR. BARTON: Was there a second down there?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Okay. Any further discussion on the motion?

MR. PENNOYER: One question, Mike, (indiscernible).

Stan, would you lead me to the section where it points out the

Stan, would you lead me to the section where it points out the acceptability of acquisition of alternative resources as one (ph) restoration?

DR. SENNER: Okay. Mr. Pennoyer, if you'll look in Chapter 7 which begins on Page 53 of the document, and the page numbers are down at the bottom, this would be just right in front of the Appendices. Have you got that?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, I do. Thank you.

DR. SENNER: Okay. If you look at the bottom of that page, there's a letter "A" that begins "no action" under the heading Possible Restoration Alternatives. And what we have outlined are six alternatives, and these include no action, Letter B is management of human uses, Letter C is manipulation of resources, D is habitat protection at acquisition, E is a combination of the above options, and then the last one,

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

Letter F, would be acquisition of equivalent resources.

But that is the intent, to just indicate there are different emphases one could have in developing alternative for a draft restoration plan.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. Okay. Stan, does that then follow through somewhere under criter- -- how would you evaluate the acquisition of equivalent resources under your criteria section?

DR. SENNER: Okay. The .....

MR. PENNOYER: Follow through in the other sections is what I'm sort of getting to.

DR. SENNER: Okay.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

most viahle

MR. PENNOYER: In what situations would that be the

most viable alternative?

DR. SENNER: Okay. If you turn back, then, to Chapter 6, it's just the previous chapter, on Options, Criteria and Evaluation, I think it's our view that these criteria, A through K, are really appropriate whether one is talking about something that is direct restoration or replacement or acquisition of equivalent resources. This is -- excuse me, this is on the bottom -- or Page 47, where the options/criteria are. Those criteria are really applicable, regardless of which type of restoration you're evaluating.

Now, perhaps, it isn't clear, and I would admit I haven't read it from that standpoint, whether -- it perhaps isn't clear that one could apply those criteria to any type of restoration action and maybe there's some clarification there.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. As I read through them, they seemed to be only related to a specific injury or lack of in natural recovery. And that wasn't clear to me, but that's -- I must have quit on Page 53 so thanks for pointing out that last one.

DR. SENNER: Okay.

MR. SANDOR: Follow-up question, if I can. On Page 56 then is a chart which I presume put this in perspective. And the way I interpret that chart is -- that flows (ph), the document is, in fact, places that -- it into that perspective,

# 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

and it seemed to be a good chart.

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

DR. SENNER: Yeah. Mr. Sandor. There are two charts, in fact, yeah, Page 56 and 57, and they present kind of alternative concepts or ways to approach decisions here. and the -- there's sort of two extremes, one is a very hierarchical way of looking at it and the other is just the opposite.

MR. SANDOR: Excuse me. On the other hand, though, they both stem from the injured resource in the process of recovering them (ph)?

DR. SENNER: That is correct. And that is because -- I mean as we understand it, the Settlement says that all Restoration Funds are to be spent on the restoration of injured resources or the equivalent of, and so we don't get away from connections to injury.

MR. BARTON: Well, that's consistent, I believe, with the March 1, '91 Federal Register Notice in the criteria and steps that we adopted in that document.

Other comments or questions?

MR. COLE: Yes, Mike, this is Charlie Cole. Are we, in any sense, approving anything in this document if we vote now to send it out for public comment?

MR. BARTON: No. No, that's all we're doing is approving it to go out for public comment. And my understanding is that upon completion of that process, then we would formally adopt it.

DR. SENNER: And I .....

MR. COLE: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. SENNER: Yes. I would say I think the intent of the drafters here is that everything in the document is fair game for public comments, and you've made no final decisions beyond, you know, whatever.

MR. BARTON: Any other comments or questions. Was it the intent of the maker of the motion that we would have an opportunity to provide the word-smithing comments that we might have as well as any legal review into this document before it goes out?

MR. SANDOR: And within a reasonable amount of time. That's why I was asking the question about the time frame. There's some word-smithing and some review, but it's essentially to send -- it authorizes the Restoration Team to send this out for public comment.

MR. BARTON: As I understood, and maybe Dr. Senner can clarify this, the intent was to have the Trustee Council go over it one more time, is that right?

DR. SENNER: It's whatever your pleasure. But what I had thought we were doing was to take your comments now and whatever written ones you provide, and then give you one more iteration to look at and, perhaps, give your final approval to. And we would hope to have that to you next week.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I may have been off base and the

motion be amended. But the motion as I made it was to authorize the Restoration Team to send this package out for public comment after this word-smithing and whatever other defects might be noted. But if we're going to stick with that schedule that's published, it has to go out this month.

MR. BARTON: That's right. And that's what I understood your motion to be, Mr. Sandor, that's why I asked the question. So right now, we have a .....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: .... motion on the table to approve this document subject to word-smithing and legal review without any further action -- and released for public review without any further action of the Council. Anymore discussion on that motion? Any objection to the motion?

Okay. We've adopted it.

DR. SENNER: Thank you.

MR. BARTON: Moving along to Item 2 on the Agenda is the Eyak proposal. Dr. Gibbons.

DR. GIBBONS: Yes. At the February 28th Trustee

Council meeting, you directed the Restoration Team to review

the issues of and the urgency for addressing the Eyak

Corporation/Sherestone timber harvesting -- harvest moratorium.

The Habitat Protection/Lands Working Group has been in contact

with the principal parties and has obtained additional

information. This information has been looked at

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

preliminarily, and in the Trustee Council package there is a draft summary in there and also some material from the Sherestone proposal.

The Restoration Team has drafted a letter that's included in the public package as well as the Trustee Council package. And it walks through the procedure that we've done in the last week. The only sequential step presently we have for identifying and protecting the habitats important to injured resources and services is found in the Federal Register Notice; and this is also included in the package with the area highlighted.

The Restoration Team feels that these provide the basis for protecting habitat but need to be expanded. As a result, the Restoration Team is developing draft objectives for the habitat protection, evaluation criteria, short—and long—term processes for habitat protection, and a definition of imminent threat. The resulting draft information will be presented to you at the April Trustee Council meeting.

The Restoration Team recommends that the Eyak

Corporation/Sherestone proposal be considered after an overall

habitat protection framework has been established by the

Trustee Council.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Dave, that last sentence, what is after

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

1	an overall habitat protection framework has been established,
2	that's after the April meeting?
3	DR. GIBBONS: After the April meeting, that's correct.
4	So, we will present you with the objectives, the evaluation
5	criteria and the process and a definition of imminent threat.
6	MR. BARTON: Comments or questions from the Council
7	Members?
8	MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.
9	MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.
LO	MR. McVEE: I move we accept the language that has been
11	developed by the Executive Director and Staff.
12	MR. BARTON: Is there a second?
L3	MR. PENNOYER: For the purposes of discussion, I'll
14	second it.
L5	MR. BARTON: Okay. Mr. Pennoyer seconds the motion.
L6	MR. PENNOYER: Yes, I second it.
L7	MR. BARTON: Discussion or comments from the Council
18	Members.
۱9	MR. PENNOYER: Question, Mr. Chairman. The motion on
20	the floor is the last paragraph of the March 9 letter signed by
21	Dr. Gibbons?
22	MR. McVEE: Yes. And the motion was to accept the
23	language of the last paragraph that was presented by
24	Dr. Gibbons.
25	MR. PENNOYER: But Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Implicit in that is what's in the previous paragraph, though, that we will be presented with these criteria, we will have the short- and long-term processes and so forth at the April meeting so a decision could be made at the April meeting about the criteria, and based on that we could either (indiscernible) or get along with discussion of where we go with the Eyak proposal?

MR. BARTON: Dr. Gibbons.

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

MR. COLE: Well, this is Charlie Cole. I'm not sure I could go along with the view that we will be in a position to evaluate this or any other proposal at the April meeting.

Period. Would you like me to state the reasons?

MR. BARTON: Please do.

MR. COLE: Let me say this, that we will simply have before us the criteria at that meeting which is presented to us by the Restoration Team, that does not necessarily mean we will accept that criteria at that time, Number 1. Number 2 is even if we accept the criteria at that time, we may want to have an overall view of how this criteria will function before we make decisions on specific proposals. That's one of the things I have in mind when I say that we might not necessarily be in a position to act on this Eyak proposal at the next meeting.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. I don't think I was -- Step 1 was to say the criteria would be there based on the words in Paragraph 2 of Dr. Gibbons' letter, not that we'd necessarily be able to do it. Step 2 would be to discuss what we do in the meantime, if anything, with the Eyak/Sherestone proposal. And I think it's fairly evident, I don't have a map in front of me, I don't know what the specific areas are, I can't clearly relate yet in my own mind what the values are that are being proposed versus the cost. There are a lot of questions that still have to be answered. And the next step was going to -- I was going to bring up was that we'd agreed that we couldn't do much without, at least, discussing criteria.

Are there things we should do with this or other proposals between now and April, or should we wait to even discuss them further until the April meeting? That was sort of the direction I was going. I don't disagree with Mr. Cole at all, I'm not clear we're going to be ready to do anything just because we have adopted or maybe haven't adopted criteria at the April meeting.

MR. BARTON: Well, I believe the motion is that the Eyak Corporation/Sherestone proposal be considered after an overall habitat protection framework has been established. And I don't see that we're going to do that by the April meeting. We did, I think, last meeting charge the Lands Habitat Work

Group with the development of objectives and criteria for the April meeting.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. I guess it was my impression of the language that's in the draft, we talk about, you know, the fact that resulting draft information will be presented. And this is talking about criteria, et cetera, for a short- and long-term process for habitat protection, that this would be presented to the Trustee Council at the April Trustee Council I guess I understood that language to be informative, you know, and that that would -- you know, that we would have the first look at that kind of information. And then the following paragraph to be, you know, a separate thought that we would not deal with the Eyak/Sherestone proposal until that framework had been established by the Trustee Council. I don't think that -- I didn't read this as saying we were going to have something established in April, you know, or committing to But I think that earlier we said that we should, you know, get on with this habitat protection criteria and concepts as quickly as possible because of the interest in this area.

MR. BARTON: Further discussion or comment?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: This phrase "overall habitat protection framework" is not really defined adequately enough. But I guess what I'm concerned with is several things. What I see at

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE (907) 272-3022 the end of the tunnel or at some point, and hopefully sooner (
than later, is that this Trustee Council will reach an
agreement or an understanding or consensus that what we're
willing to do is a more specific thing; like protection of
critical habitat. And it's a step to get into that process,
the identification of critical habitat. And the Eyak proposal
as laid out, as I look at it and understand it, doesn't really
do that, and this bothers me.

And I think it would be a shame, I think, if we send a signal that somehow this proposal is, you know, close to being approved by adoption of this motion, and that we're set on a -- I guess we're set on a path that, in effect, does this, not necessarily at the April meeting or the May meeting. I would have been more comfortable with a motion that describes not only the overall habitat protection framework but the very specific criteria for identifying and protecting critical habitat. Is this overall protection -- habitat protection framework going to do that? And so that's, I guess, the question I've asked.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'm a little uncertain, as I think

Commission Sandor is, about what the word "framework" means in

that last paragraph. Could we have an explanation of what that

word means?

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. BARTON: Dr. Gibbons.

1

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. GIBBONS: The understanding of the Restoration Team and Habitat Protection Subgroup members that are present in Anchorage or here can chime (ph) in more if they feel more definition is needed. But the framework includes, of course, the objectives; why you're doing the activity you're doing. It has evaluation criteria, and that will be detailed enough to evaluate each proposal in a uniform manner. And we've been looking at areas with points — evaluation criteria with points and these types of things to try to come up with proposals that you can evaluate and one stands out more than another one based on the proposal itself.

The short- and long-term process, what we mean here is we feel that the short-term process, perhaps, would deal with the moratorium issue, imminent threat type of issues; and the long-term process would deal with the broader range of things as we move down the road a few year (ph) and it fits true (ph) the long-term process of evaluating the proposals; having a better tie between injured resources and habitats that they need. And then the last part would be a definition of imminent threat, what is imminent threat and do you link that to the moratorium proposals.

So, I'm providing an overall both short-term and longterm process for dealing with this issue.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Dr. Gibbons, maybe if you did include the last two sentences of the previous paragraph as an explanation of what we're really trying to say; it's not as complete but it's certainly more complete than the last paragraph of that letter. It talks about the draft objectives, the evaluation criteria, short— and long-term processes; it says a little more than you've already said. And I think that's really my previous discussion, that that was more what we had in mind than just an overall framework, which won't tell us too much. I would hope in Apri we'd have practically a case history of looking at things. You have a proposal now and kind of specifics of how criteria will fit into evaluations of such proposals, that's sort of what I had in mind.

MR. BARTON: I'm confused.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: One of the things that I continue to harp on is that I would like to see us have before us, more or less, an overall plan of what we're going to do with respect to the acquisition of critical habitat, et cetera, before we get too far along. And one of the things that caught my eye was the note in this report that there were 46 documented anadromous streams on the Eyak lands; that's 46. And could we have any sense of how many anadromous streams exist within the entire

affected oil spill area, since we're looking at the protection 1 of critical habitat? 2 I'm sure we must have that somewhere. 3 MR. BARTON: MR. PENNOYER: (Indiscernible - telephone cutout) that 4 that information could be put together but I'm not sure that I 5 6 could pick a number at the present time. 7 Well, it ..... MR. COLE: Well, it'd probably be several hundred. 8 DR. GIBBONS: 9 MR. PENNOYER: It'd be -- yeah, I'm sure it would be. MR. SANDOR: Thousand. 10 11 MR. COLE: Commission Sandor says at least a thousand. In the whole spill area? MR. PENNOYER: 12 MR. COLE: Yes. 13 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. 14 That would probably do it. MR. SANDOR: 15 MR. BARTON: Just a minute. 16 You could probably make it a thousand 17 MR. SANDOR: 18 plus. MR. COLE: Well (indiscernible - interrupted) ..... 19 Juneau, we're having a hard time picking 20 MR. BARTON: you up. 21 MR. COLE: Well, if there are 46 on these lands, that 22 would be, essentially, five percent of all the anadromous 23 streams in the entire oil spill affected area. And I would 24 just have sort of a hunch that a thousand, therefore, would be 25

somewhat low but I can't say. But anyway, in a sense, makes my point, talking about a thousand, plus or minus, anadromous streams that we should evaluate for their value as critical habitat.

MR. BARTON: Well, that -- Mr. Cole, that was the source of my confusion; at the last meeting, we said that we intended to bring this habitat restoration effort into synch with the long-term restoration effort. And yet, I thought I heard us -- at least some of us saying that we were going to deal with this issue separately. So, perhaps, somebody could clear up my confusion. Or am I confused?

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it has to do with short- and long -- I wasn't at the last meeting, obviously, but I think it had something to do with short- and long-term and immediate threat, moratoria (ph) and whether you're losing opportunities and that type of thing. I don't -- as opposed to the longer term consideration -- I think it was looking at lost opportunities wasn't it? That was the reason that there might be some need for a more expeditious look at possible lost opportunities, not to do them in a rushed way without evaluation but to do them first if we suspect there's a lost opportunity, make it sort of a priority.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: I thought some of our concern was that Eyak

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE (907) 272-3022 and Sherestone had presented the proposal and had been attending our meetings, I think almost from the very beginning, and that there was a feeling on the part of the Trustee Council that they deserved, you know, some response to those proposals, maybe not in terms of how we were going to deal with it but at least in a time frame of when we would be prepared to deal with it in kind of -- in a manner of fairness.

MR. SANDOR: Well, that's true.

MR. BARTON: Where does that leave .....

Mr. Chairman, that's true. MR. SANDOR: And you'll recall the question I asked of one of the representatives when he asked about a signal; and I believe the record would show that I said well what would be a signal in dollar value. And the answer to that question if 500,000. And of course, different people would react to that figure in different ways. But the proposal as it's now defined (ph) goes way, way, way beyond that, and is a proposal that seems to me -- goes far beyond protection of critical habitat but goes, in fact, addresses every possible opportunity or chance for protection of critical habitat. And I'm afraid if we give a signal that this proposal is in the ballpark, we'll be flooded with similar proposals elsewhere.

And that's why I was hoping you'd -- if we could get some consensus at our April meeting about what specifically we're after in the way of critical habitat; somewhat like the

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

next to the last sentence in that second paragraph of Dr. Gibbons' memo, that comes close to doing that. I didn't see that in that last paragraph of Dr. Gibbons' memo and -- but I understand the motion is one of combining both the first and second -- or the second and third paragraphs. But I'm not so sure that would even do it.

But I guess in summary, the proposal, as I understand it, from Eyak and Sherestone is way, way beyond what I anticipated. And if we just move forward without giving some kind of -- or reaching some kind of a reaction on this, maybe we'll be creating problems of identifying other proposals, inviting other proposals, 'cause we have to treat all of these potential parties the same.

, MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: The question I have is somewhat along the line of Commission Sandor's. If -- I'm not sure what the Commission is saying. When we get done with the April meeting, we'd like to be able to be pretty specific about our criteria. And, in fact, not just have general criteria that we would then step back and sort of look at and not know exactly how they fit the bill, but basically (ph) how do -- like coastal buffer zones fit the idea of restoration in our view and as a priority, and the timber holdings around Eyak Lake and areas meriting special attention and so forth. There ought to be

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

pieces in there that I'm not sure I understand -- and they may
fit, I don't know, but they're not obvious to me how they fit
restoration.

As Mr. Cole pointed out, we've got a lot of anadromous streams all through the country, and I'm not how they stack up (ph). So, there's just a lot of things. As you go through the criteria, it'd be helpful if we were getting specifics so I understood how that related to the type of things we're seeing. And maybe that's we can do for the present moment.

MR. BARTON: Well, I wonder, too, if we couldn't compare the proposal against the March 1, '91 criteria since that's what we have to work with at the moment.

Other comments or questions?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. I guess what I'm hearing from a number of the Trustee Council Members that -- or at least what I'm reading into what I'm hearing is let's get the criteria developed, let's have the program -- habitat protection program developed for our consideration. And, you know, then we will deal with any and all proposals, I guess. I think that, you know, if that's what I'm hearing with the -- and if we want to let the RT reconsider, you know, this draft with the permission of the -- to the second, I'd be willing to withdraw my motion and we could, you know, turn the project back over to the RT

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for reconsideration.

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: And what would we expect them to do upon reconsideration?

MR. McVEE: Well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Are you saying that the Restoration Team has already done its work with respect to this proposal?

MR. BARTON: No, I'm not saying that at all. I'm just not -- I'm not understanding what we would expect them to do that we wouldn't expect them to do with the present motion.

MR. COLE: I have a little trouble following that. You might ....

MR. BARTON: We have a motion on the floor to consider the proposal after the development of the overall protection framework. Prior to that, the development of that framework, it's my understanding that we would develop draft objectives for habitat protection evaluation criteria, short— and long—term processes and a definition of imminent threat. If we're going to ask the — it seems to me then if we adopted this motion, then we would bring this back and apply whatever it is we approve at the April meeting.

I'm having trouble understanding then, given that, what we would expect the Restoration Team to do if we asked them to take this back.

MR. COLE: That they haven't already done?

MR. BARTON: Right. At this time.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: I guess my thought there was that on the basis of the discussion that the Trustee Council have had that they could clarify this draft that's before us and some of the timing and, you know, that aspect of it as to when we might get to the point of dealing the proposal; something positive, you know, to give to Eyak and Sherestone.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, I guess the -- Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer.

the same vacuum we've got, they don't have any idea for sure what our criteria are going to be. And I think the number of things they've got in here illustrate that. I don't know what the Restoration Team or the proposers are going to do with this if some were -- some of their signals don't go until after the April meeting. I mean I think that's your guideline, you're going to have to wait until you have the criteria in-hand before you do very much with it, unless you're willing to send some signals out now and ask them to come back with something different, and even then it may not fit what you adopt in April -- we adopt in April.

MR. BARTON: I'll withdraw my second. Is there a motion?

MR. McVEE: Are you going to move to reconsider?

MR. SANDOR: Maybe another point of clarification or information. I'm not sure that these March 1, 1991 criteria are what the Restoration Team is working with. Maybe that would be the point to start, at simply, in effect, resigning or signing off on these criteria. But if you look at the Federal Register in what we're dealing with now, the Trustees have developed the following preliminary sequence of steps for use in identifying or protecting strategic fish and wildlife habitats and recreation sites. And it goes on to describe the criteria — is, in effect, the Restoration Team operating from the basis that those are the criteria that are to be used in the process and to apply, that in the previous section of that

MR. BARTON: Well, I think that maybe that is a good starting point and that that is the criteria against which the proposal could be evaluated. I don't -- I'm not sure of the answer to your specific question; if Dr. Gibbons cares to help us out.

Register? (Indiscernible - interrupted) .....

DR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think the
Restoration Team feels that this is the basis but we need more
detail than what's described in the Federal Register Notice;
some of the things that were talked about earlier, costal

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

buffers or some of these things. And how do you evaluate proposals and make priorities; this one's higher priority than this area. And so, it provides the basis but it doesn't provide the entire process.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman. As a starting point, I mean this would be helpful to have, at least, a reaffirmation or, in fact, any modification extension or elaboration of these criteria. But that would get to a major problem I have is with the motion that was on the floor that was now withdrawn, apparently, is this Restoration Framework is so broad. This would help, I guess, to get -- to maybe try to discuss this point.

Like at first (ph) a question, would -- is it the intent of the Restoration Team then to, at the April meeting -- or was it the intent at the April meeting to take these criteria and if, in fact, they needed refinement to actually propose them to the Trustee Council?

MR. BARTON: Dr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah. I think the intent of the Restoration Team was to take these five criteria or sequential steps and expand upon them, providing more detail and the process for dealing with proposals, and come back to the Trustee Council at the April meeting with this greater detail and bigger framework.

MR. SANDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would move

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

endorsement of that proposal; in effect, directing that the Restoration Team do that for the Trustee Council's consideration as a part of whatever it presents in April.

MR. BARTON: Is there a second?

MR. McVEE: I'll second.

MR. BARTON: Any further discussion of that motion?

Any objection to the motion?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I would like to comment briefly on this very troubling issue in the possibility that my views would be considered by the Restoration Team. But underlying the -- much of the support for the Sherestone proposal, which comes from the public, is the desire to halt logging on these lands. I think that's clear; we read it in written comment and we hear it in oral comment. And yet, it seems to me that the United States of America, through its Representatives in Congress, has expressed a policy of the United States that these lands are available for logging; otherwise, the Congress would not have enacted legislation granting these lands to private landowners without limiting logging on them.

So, now we as Trustees of the Exxon Valdez funds are being asked, broadly speaking, to overrule, as it were, congressional policy and to halt logging on these lands by buying them back or acquiring the easements. It troubles me

## 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 that that result will flow if this Council is largely guided acquisition of lands or habitat to thwart that congressional policy. So, therefore, I conclude my remarks on this subject .....

MR. BARTON: Thank you, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: .... with respect to my views of the fundamental approach to be taken by the Restoration Team are.

MR. BARTON: Thank you, Mr. Cole. Other comments, other discussion?

You know, we've been talking about identifying critical habitat and the various ways to protect that habitat; one of the threats being logging. But I presume that if we're really concerned about acquisition to protect critical habitat, that we're really more concerned -- or concerned more -- about more than just logging, too. The item under discussion has been logging, but it seems to me that there are other threats in the future, and that we need to be talking about maybe development rights as a body or fee simple for those critical habitats. I guess that's my comment.

The other -- another comment I have relates to Mayor Weaverling's letter that he introduced I think on the 27th of February regarding mitigation for loss livelihood, and we have not dealt with that question either.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. COLE: Let me respond, I think in the interests of expression of my views is that Congress surely knew when it conveyed or authorized the conveyance of these lands to private landowners without any prohibition of logging on them that logging on those lands would be apt to destroy critical habitat. I mean surely Congress was aware of that. So, I am simply saying that as we think about mandate in the expenditure of the Exxon Valdez funds, we must bear in mind that the expenditures should be related to the acquisition of habitat to restore damaged resources owing to the Exxon Valdez spill, not simply to acquire habitat to protect resources in the broad sense.

MR. BARTON: That, I think, has been my working assumption, and I think that is also embodied in the March 1 Federal Register Notice.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman. That's really the way I interpreted that. And I guess as a specific example, that I presume that Congress would accept and understand if Harlequin duck nesting areas are found -- are known or are found to be present in limited numbers, and if, as I understand is the case, that these nests are critical to the restoration of the damaged resource, then that I think that test would be met of identifying and protecting those rights (ph). And that's partly what led for me to make the motion of defining those kind of critical habitats, but that isn't related (ph) to

## 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 damage to resources or ....:

MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: In the interest of sharpening this discussion, perhaps, a little bit. You see, we much be careful that the fact that logging would damage Harlequin duck habitat, per se, is not the critical test. Because Congress had said it's all right to log these lands, if you damage Harlequin duck habitat. And that's the narrow focus of which I'm trying to get to. We surely do not want to thwart congressional policy.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. I guess I agree with Commission Sandor about the linkages. And of course, in the current proposal in front of us, as I pointed before, it's a little hard to see some of the linkages. But in any private property or even on National Forest lands there, of course, can be laws and determinations made that govern that habitat use. So, while the land was certainly made available to private ownership, I'm not sure that any — that that rules out subsequent protection of some kind if there's an over-arching (ph) concern.

So, I think I'll wait to see the specific application of either Mr. Cole's discussion or Commissioner Sandor's in the criteria that are put in front us, hopefully related in some

way so I can relate to the specific proposals that we've seen 1 2 here. MR. BARTON: Do we have a motion in front of us, does 3 4 anybody know? 5 MR. SANDOR: Yes. UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, you do. 6 7 MR. McVEE: Yeah. The motion, Mr. Chairman, I believe was MR. SANDOR: 8 that -- I thought I made is some time ago. 9 MR. PENNOYER: Is there a second to the motion. 10 MR. SANDOR: Maybe I'll restate it and if there's no 11 second, it can die for want of second. And that was that the 12 Restoration Team at the April meeting would develop -- would 13 present to the Trustee Council for approval the March 1, 1991 14 15 criteria related to the habitat protection, and refine it if it feels necessary to do so for consideration and possible 16 approval by the Trustee Council. That was the motion I had 17 intended to make would thus (ph) make it. 18 MR. BARTON: Was there or is there a second? 19 MR. McVEE: There was a second. 20 21 MR. BARTON: There was a second. Any further discussion on the motion? 22 MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman. 23 MR. BARTON: Yes. 24 25 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague is asking.

#### 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

2 MR. BARTON: We can't hear you. 3 MR. PENNOYER: He's coming to the speaker. Fine. 4 MR. BARTON: This is Jerome Montague, Mr. Chairman. 5 MR. MONTAGUE: We've interpreted, as Dave has indicated, a short-term and a 7 long-term approach. The short-term approach we're generally interpreting as meaning something on which we would take action before the Restoration Plan is completed. And on that point, I would like to bring your attention to Criteria 3 of the 5 that 10 are listed in the Federal Register Notice. And at the end of 11 the 3 it says: This would include evaluation of other 12 restoration alternatives these resource injuries. And I would 13 just like to point out that action before the completion of the 14 15 Restoration Plan would preclude a very complete evaluation of the alternative restoration measures, which I thought you 16 17 should be aware of, of why you're voting on this motion. 18 MR. BARTON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Montague. 19 further discussion from the Counsel? MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, one quick question. 20 21 MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer. Commissioner Sandor, as I understand it, MR. PENNOYER: 22 23 you have really (ph) substituted what's in the Federal Register Notice as a basis for these determinations. But don't we still 24 want them to look at the things that are in the end of the 25

This is Jerome Montague.

MR. MONTAGUE:

paragraph, the second paragraph -- excuse me -- of Dr. Gibbons'

letter which say that they're going to look at the evaluation

criteria, short- and long-term processes using as a starting

point or basis the items presented in the Federal Register

Notice?

MR. SANDOR: Yeah. Mr. .....

MR. PENNOYER: You want them to do more if needed (ph).

MR. SANDOR: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, the motion was to

essentially start with what was in the March 1 Federal Register

and to add whatever additional criteria or information that

MR. PENNOYER: At the April meeting.

MR. SANDOR: At the April meeting.

MR. BARTON: Further discussion? Is there objection to the motion? Hearing none, it's adopted.

they want to present to the Trustee Council for consideration

Item 3, the Public Advisory Group. Mr. Piper.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman.

and proposed approval.

MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: We took part -- took care of one part of Item 2. A related (ph) item of Item 2, if it meets with Trustee Council's pleasure, it seems to me that the Restoration Team in dealing with this issue might benefit by follow-up work that was performed by the Nature Conservancy in a previous contract. And I guess in relation to this, I would move to

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

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 (907) 272-7515

authorize the Restoration Team to be in contact and possibly work with the Nature Conservancy in reaching a definition of critical habitat and a process of this.

So, the motion is that (1) authorize the Restoration

Team to contact the Nature Conservancy and explore the

possibility of developing a proposal that could be considered

at the April 9 meeting, of utilizing their expertise.

MR. BARTON: Is there a second? I'll second the motion.

MR. COLE: Well, I'll second it to have a second on the floor.

MR. BARTON: I bet you to it, Mr. Cole. Discussion.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I'd ask Dr. Gibbons, you have what they prepared before, is that one of the bases for what you're doing -- the Nature Conservancy study contract is one of the bases for what you're doing not?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct. We had a close-out meeting with the Nature Conservancy on the document that we had prepared -- requested prepared by them. They have given us recommendations on how to approach criteria and processes, and we will use any information we have to build a framework for dealing with this. We hope to use their expertise whenever possible to help us out. They're very good at this type of thing, they've done it a lot, so we plan to use their expertise.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: So -- Mr. Chairman. So, you basically 1 were going to follow-through with what Commission Sandor --2 3 therefore, his motion fits into what your plan was anyhow, is that in essence? 4 DR. GIBBONS: In essence, that's correct. 5 MR. BARTON: Further discussion? Is there objection to 6 the motion? Hearing none, the motion's adopted. 7 Further 8 discussion on Item 2, the Eyak proposal. 9 MR. COLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. 10 MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole. MR. COLE: In looking through these materials which 11 were furnished us, and as I recall someplace in here there was 12 a note that 96% of the land in Prince William Sound is 13 government owned, is that true? Did I ..... 14 MR. BARTON: I believe that figure is in here. 15 16 MR. COLE: Do you say that's right? 17 MR. BARTON: I believe that figure is in here. Dr. Gibbons, can you -- do you know? 18 DR. GIBBONS: I'm just trying to put my finger on it 19 20 now. 21 MR. BARTON: It's a substantial amount of land, there's no question about that. 22 MR. COLE: Well, the question that I have is this: 23 there any plans from the Department of Agriculture, Forest 24 Service to permit logging on any of these lands in Prince 25

William Sound owned by the United States and under the 1 2 stewardship of the Forest Service? MR. BARTON: Not at this time. 3 Is that sort of a plan that's under review MR. COLE: 4 or -- by the Forest Service? 5 The Chugach Forest Plan is currently 6 MR. BARTON: Yes. being amended as a result of the oil spill to evaluate the 7 management activities that have been proposed in the 1984 Plan. I wonder if it would be in order to request 9 MR. COLE: 10 the Restoration Team to look into that plan and the review and furnish us with information on that as well as any such 11 proposed or contemplating practice -- contemplated practices on 12 13 State land. So, this sort of goes along with my view that we should look at Prince William Sound, and Afognak, and Kodiak 14 and downwind as an integral unit. 15 I think that would be appropriate. 16 MR. BARTON: Is there a second to that motion? 17 I'll second it. 18 MR. SANDOR: MR. BARTON: Okay. Any further discussion? 19 20 objection to the motion? Hearing none, the motion's adopted. Further discussion on Item 2? 21 Item 3, Public Advisory Group. Mr. Piper. 22 Mr. Chairman. There are two pieces of MR. PIPER: 23 paper that we'll be working off here, I think both of them are 24 in your packet. The first is a memorandum dated March 9, 25

signed by Dr. Gibbons on behalf of the Restoration Team about the Public Advisory Group. The second piece of information that should be attached to it is a brief legal opinion and 3 4 analysis of the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act done by State and Federal legal counsel. 5 6 The over-arching purpose behind discussing this today 7 is so that ..... Mr. Piper, let us find that, first. 8 MR. BARTON: 9 MR. PIPER: Okay. What I have is a March 7 letter, is that 10 MR. BARTON: 11 the same letter? Dr. Gibbons, is that the same one? My is 12 MR. PIPER: dated March 9? 13 DR. GIBBONS: No. There's a few changes in it. 14 There's a March 9th newer version. 15 16 MR. BARTON: Okay. Is there a way to get a copy of 17 that? 18 DR. GIBBONS: There should be copies available there at the meeting. 19 20 MR. BARTON: Okay. We have it or I have it, others had 21 it. Go ahead, Mr. Piper. 22 MR. PIPER: The over-arching purpose in considering this today is to adopt the basic procedural requirements for a 23 Public Advisory Group so that the Trustee Council would be in 24 accord with the court order requiring that requirements like

this be in place within 90 days of the affective date of the Settlement.

The first on the list is a charter. We've -- Staff has taken a cut, of course, at a generic charter, but because of the time that it will take to put a charter through the approval process, we propose that we draft a very specific charter based on the action that you take today on the procedural requirements.

If you take that action, this is what it will pretty much allow you to do. First, it will allow us to write that specific charter and through the designated federal agency deal with that federal secretary who does the approval and oversight of the Public Advisory Group for this purpose. And it would also allow you to solicit nominations from the public. And as a practical matter, this would be going out for a second round of public review in conjunction with the Framework document so that the public, not just in the spill area but outside of the spill area, would get a crack at reviewing this.

At the close of that 45-day Framework comment period, what would likely to do is that you could make whatever charter amendments you felt were necessary based on public comment. You could go ahead and appoint that group, and you could have it in-place and functioning during the writing of the actual Restoration Plan, which Dr. Senner has discussed that would be coming out in September is the target date. So, the goal here

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

is to have the group functioning during the writing of that plan which would guide restoration activities off into the future.

As I said, the first item is the charter, and that deals with the subsequent items on this list. Membership, the Public Advisory Group should contain 15 members; that was the upper limit that the Trustee Council put on that in a motion last week. The Restoration Team decided to go with all 15 because it gives you the maximum amount of flexibility for balancing that. It also optimizes or maximizes the potential for the public to be involved in a variety of ways.

Balance and representation, the Public Advisory Group, according to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, must be fairly balanced is the legal terminology. We propose that it's fairly balanced among at least the following principal interests; aquaculture, commercial fishing, commercial tourism, environment, conservation, forest products, local government, landowners -- or Native landowners, recreational users, sport hunting and fishing, subsistence and science and academic. This is, essentially, the list that went to the public and this is the one that you reviewed that went out. Mr. Barton indicated a desire to take a second look at it, and this is your chance to do so.

Also, by Trustee action last meeting the Trustee
Council voted to reserve at least one seat for local

## 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

government. Another special provision would be required under the Settlement -- the Chenega Settlement, which would be that Native interests be represented. What the Restoration Team has proposed is that Native interests other than subsistence shall be represented by at least one traditional or Indian Reorganization Act Village Council, essentially, one of the village governments and ANCSA corporation.

Nomination and selection, fairly simple. The public would nominate, organizations would nominate and the Trustees would appoint.

Powers and duties would be that the Public Advisory

Group is supplementary to the public process as a whole, that

it has a non-binding role in its advice, and that its principal

interaction with the Trustee Council is presenting its views

during Trustee Council meetings in whatever form it chooses.

Support would be provided through Staff through the Administrative Director's Office. Currently, the proposal -the approval of the Trustees is that one of the information officers be the liaison on an as-needed basis. We -- the Restoration Team does note that the public comment has requested Staff -- you may want to revisit this as time goes by, depending upon the work load. It's based on the models of other advisory groups the State and Federal government deals with. There's often a fairly substantial care and feeding aspect to it, and down the road, if it appears that the work

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

load is heavy, you may want to revisit this.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In terms of budget, the Trustee Council would approve a list of spending guidelines, such as meetings, reimbursements and so on. And the Public Advisory Group would allocate its approved budget among those items as it saw fit, with a cap established by the Trustee Council. The current suggested budget, based on 15 members, is \$106,000.00 for this planning year.

MR. BARTON: This planning year being?

MR. PIPER: Well, the original one was for an entire year, I think one of the reasons it may be reduced is that we're looking at the Federal fiscal year and Tim Steele may help me on that.

MR. STEELE: The -- yeah, Dave, you may want to elaborate or certainly catch me if I'm wrong here. But the Restoration Team took another look at the comments from the Trustee Council and the guidance was being developed by the subgroup and revisited the budget, basically, to 106,6 is what they put on as a recommendation.

MR. BARTON: Is that for a normal fiscal year or the residual part of a fiscal year or is that an annual budget figure, I guess is my question?

MR. STEELE: That's through the rest of this oil year. We're going to be changing from that, but basically through that year.

#### 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

MR. BARTON: Okay. So, it's not an entire -- do we 1 2 have .... 3 MR. STEELE: It's an entire year but they will not be in-place for that entire year because they haven't been appointed yet. And so, it's through the end of February of 5 193. 6 7 MR. BARTON: Do we have an annual cost for this operation? 8 For this year, the recommended cost ..... 9 MR. STEELE: 10 No, no. An annual cost. MR. BARTON: No. MR. STEELE: You do not have it yet, you have a 11 recommendation for this 12-month period. 12 MR. PENNOYER: Well, it should -- yeah, annual cost, 13 14 should be the same, it's through the end of February of '93, which is 12 months, that's an annual cost no matter when you 15 start it or end it, is it not; or do you anticipate the cost to 16 go up or down? 17 MR. STEELE: That's the rec- -- .. 18 19 MR. PENNOYER: Is that start-up costs, buying (indiscernible) stuff or is for other meetings that you ..... 20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 21 No. MR. STEELE: That's the recommended annual cost. 22 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chairman. 23 24 MR. BARTON: Yeah, Mr. Pennoyer. 25 Mr. Piper, maybe you can help me out MR. PENNOYER:

here. We have a memo of March 9th, which is a general discussion of various aspects of the Public Advisory Group. We have a memo from legal counsel of March 5th that gives specific corrections to, I think, a charter document that I have dated February 25th. You say the first item's the charter, is that a more detailed document with the legal counsel's corrections what we're really looking at?

MR. PIPER: That's right. The other -- if you'll notice, there are certain blanks in the legal analysis as well, because those questions simply aren't answered, such as the budget.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Isn't it easier if we deal with the charter and those elements that have to go into the charter sort of independently from some of the procedural items such as which interests are represented and so on. It seems to me like that there's only a few elements now left to deal with in order to, you know, get the charter approved or get it in the process. One of them was the 15 members, which I think we have dealt with; another one is the cost -- the annual cost, which I understand now, you know, we basically have a recommendation on. And I think there was a third one which was the .....

MR. PIPER: Man years.

MR. McVEE: .... man years that would be involved.

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515

And okay, then there's a fourth one which is, you know, who's going to push the paperwork through the federal process, a designated agency to do that.

And I think those about the only four items we need to deal with in order to get the charter. The other elements, you know, the balanced representation and so on are things that we need to deal with but they don't have to be in the charter.

MR. BARTON: I move the Department of Interior push the paper through, is there a second?

MR. COLE: Second.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Second.

MR. BARTON: Any further discussion? Any objection?

MR. PENNOYER: Don't you dare, Curt.

MR. PIPER: If I could just elaborate on the charter one moment. At the last Trustee Council meeting, the Trustees approved the first cut of the charter based on a legal review and word-smithing. We have the legal review, which essentially upgrades the specificity of that charter, and any decisions that you make about some of the other items like the budget will upgrade that specificity further.

MR. McVEE: Could we do a com- -- .....

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: And then Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. McVEE: Yeah, one thought just -- you know, that it 1 seems like we're getting close to closure on this, maybe a 2 3 comprehensive motion which would be to adopt -- a motion to adopt the draft generic charter and with those four blanks 4 5 filled in; the 15 members, the -- what was the other one -the ..... 6 7 MR. PIPER: Man years and budget. .... man years and budget and ..... 8 MR. McVEE: The Department of Inter- -- ..... 9 MR. PIPER: If you want to volunteer the Department of 10 MR. McVEE: Interior to push the paperwork through, that would be the 11 fourth item. 12 13 MR. BARTON: I thought we just did that. I would so move that's in (ph) MR. McVEE: Okay. 14 15 order. All right. MR. BARTON: Is there a second to the 16 17 motion? 18 MR. PENNOYER: Second. MR. BARTON: All right. Mr. Pennoyer. 19 MR. PENNOYER: I was just going to ask Mr. McVee, that 20 then, basically, includes -- your motion includes all the 21 22 various word-smithing and changes that are in the March 5th legal counsel memo as corrections to the generic charter you 23 approved before? 24 Yes. That was the intent. 25 MR. McVEE:

## 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

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

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. BARTON: Further discussion?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, a question.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: The March 9 memorandum, I presume, was summarized, essentially, the charter changes and what's intended in that -- I guess the question is are we -- is this motion of adoption of this charter and changes recommended by counsel in the March 5 memo also, essentially, adopt this March 9 -- the content in this March 9 memo as well?

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. No. It only addresses those four elements that are necessary for the charter.

There's no intent to address in this motion the balanced representation, the nomination and selection of empowered (ph) duties and support; although, that's maybe inherent in the budget item, but I think those are operating procedures which don't have to be addressed in the charter.

MR. BARTON: Further discussion? Is there objection to the motion? Hearing none, the motion's adopted. Any further discussion on the Public Advisory Group item?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. I think there's a couple of items that need -- I notice in the legal memo it states that well, does not appear the means for ensuring a fairly balanced member- -- are you talking about just the charter or the whole

item?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARTON: I'm talking about the whole item, but the charter's certainly fair game.

MR. PENNOYER: I noticed the legal memo says well, it does not appear the means for ensuring a fairly balanced membership on the Public Advisory Group must be included in the charter. The procedures used to comprise the group should be clearly stated by the Council to allow the designated agency to describe to the GSA (ph) the plans for obtaining balanced membership. So, I presume we still need to talk about how we're going to go out and nominate or seek nominations.

MR. BARTON: Where are you reading?

MR. PIPER: If I .....

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Piper, did you .....

MR. PIPER: If I could .....

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PIPER: I think I understand what Mr. Pennoyer is saying. But what -- the items in the March 9th memo that you need to get at now are as follows: Letter B, which is balance and representation; Letter C which is nomination and selection; Letter D, in some part, their powers and duties; specifically Dii). I know that's sort of a bad number to deal with here so .....

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

#### 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

MR. COLE: Let us address 2.B. entitled Balance and Representation.. I think that we should discuss that, and if you don't mind, I would like to propound a question to Mr. Piper.

MR. BARTON: Please do.

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. COLE: What is the difference between the category Environment and the category Conservation?

MR. PIPER: There are lots of different kinds of groups that deal with issues in the environment and conservation; sometimes, they take on different functions. I hate to pigeonhole a group for itself, but let me use examples from Southeast since they're out in the spill area. One might argue, for example, that something like territorial sportsmen would be a conservation group; they undertake specific kinds of actions of cite (ph) specific sorts of proposals; an advocacy group or a group that works on a broader spectrum of environmental issues may be similar to the Southeast Alaska SEAK (ph).

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PIPER: Sorry, I'll go through the whole acronym but ....

MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: What troubles me is that this listing there of the groups, 12 as I hastily count them, is not specific enough to give me comfort; for example, as I have just mentioned the difference, possibly, between environment and

conservation. It seems to me if we're not very careful we would get, you know, two -- an individual or the same general category representation in the environmental listing as well as the conservation listing. And I think we have to be careful about that.

The same comment applies to the forest products category. Who is in the forest products category; loggers or landowners desiring to sell their forest products?

The same thing troubles me slightly with respect to the categories Native landowners and subsistence. Now, we -- I'm not saying there's not a distinction between those groups because I full well recognize there is. But I don't -- I think we must be very careful about overlaps.

And then I think that I'm a little bit (indiscernible - telephone cutout) on those categories to be little i) one and little ii) two. There's -- ii) is special provision for Native interests, which indicate that there should be at least one traditional or Indian Reorganization Act village council and at least one ANCSA corporation. Well, that would be two Native interests, and are those Native interests both within the category of Native landowners?

You see, I'm just a little troubled that these are a little too terse designation of the principal interests. And lastly, I would say that we should give very serious consideration to putting two members of the legislature on this

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515

group. I suspect that they would -- Staff could very quickly say look, I mean I see you have provision for at least one seat for local government, how about state government? They will certainly make that observation; therefore, I would suggest we might want to say two from the state government and one from the Senate and one from the House (indiscernible - interrupted) ....

MR. BARTON: Two from the Federal government?

MR. COLE: I was afraid you were going to say that. I saw that one coming, I must say. But at any rate, you know, whatever. But I think when you start putting local government in there and not state government, we're heading for trouble.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chair- -- .....

MR. COLE: So, that's my comment. Thank you.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. Charlie, I served on an advisory board for the Land Use Council, and we had two Legislators on that at one time. And I don't recall the statutory problem, but they were told they could not serve on that advisory board for some reason; I don't remember all the details, but they had to step down and we lost that contact.

MR. COLE: Maybe we could ask our learned counsel to look into that. I mean I think it's, you know, something that we need to give a lot of thought to. Because I'm here responding to their requests daily that I appear before 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

and I have a good sense of how they feel about this.

MR. BARTON: Further discussion or comments.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer.

1

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Maybe the way we go about this will say something about the decision we have to make here today. Are we actually having to pick the specifics of the categories today, or the specifics of the numbers of people in each category, or are we indicating the people we will accept nominations from and based on the quality of the nominees we'll try and achieve a broad interest across these representative categories? Are we really saying we're going to have at least one from each one of these? I have the same problem Mr. Cole has about environment and conservation, to some degree recreational users and sport fishing and hunting; they may be the same people; maybe we'll get a really good candidate that can represent two of those interests together.

So, are we having to decide without seeing the nominees at this time, how many are in each category specifically, or are we going to send something out saying these are the categories we're going to look at and achieve a balance between them? We made a couple of minimum things in here we've said, but do we really have to go beyond that?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Piper.

MR. PIPER: Mr. Pennoyer, Mr. Chairman. No, sir.

#### 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

There's — the Restoration Team specifically avoided the issue that each of these had a designated seat. The intent is that the interest be represented, whether they're — whether one individual represents two or three interests is, basically as you said, a call of the quality or the qualifications of the individual. The only seats that we've actually designated for interest are those that either (A) were designated by specific Trustee Council action being the local government seat, and the second one being the fact that there be a meet of interests seat as required by the Chenega Bay Settlement.

So, these are not designated seats for each of these groups, that's not the intent of the recommendation.

MR. BARTON: Well, do we need to identify the interest, or at all or try to list the interests?

MR. PIPER: Well, what you have to be able to do in your -- to get your charter approved and to get the paper pushed properly and pushed out the other side in Interior is that it be that you show that you're trying to fairly balance among the interests and that you have a plan to do so. And I would anticipate that that would include explaining what those interests were that went into your consideration.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. I guess it's very helpful to have some type of a listing that seems like it could be identified

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

as these would be the possible interests that would be considered; that would serve as a basis then in the nomination process for groups to target, you know, on some possibilities. We might find that there are some others that we want to consider before we make the final cut, but I think we have some flexibility there. But I think it's useful to have some type of a listing, maybe it doesn't have to be all inclusive.

MR. BARTON: But I wonder about 2(B) or not to be, and 2(C) and the juxtaposition of those. If I interpret 2(C) correctly, are we -- well, let me ask the question. Are we saying that the nominations must come from public interest groups, among others, and then what are those public interest groups; and is that question then answered in 2(B)?

MR. PIPER: The -- Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Piper.

MR. PIPER: The intent of 2(C) is merely to say that the -- and it's largely in response to public comment, that if the Trustees are balancing the Board and they get to the issue of commercial tourism, for example, that the Trustees do not select someone from out of the blue, so to speak, but rather it be from a recognized, active professional group in the area, such as the Alaska Visitors Association or Prince William Sound Tourism Coalition, that kind of thing.

It would -- one of the reasons that we went to the maximum of 15 members was to give you that flexibility, also,

## 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

of balancing things as you saw you needed to. You might draw two people from one segment or not, but you're not specifically targeting individual groups and certifying them as able to give nominations.

MR. BARTON: But the implication .....

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I think that this is a very, very critical area because much of the public confidence in the, you might say, integrity of this group dealing with the Public Advisory Group rests on how these people are selected. Because if we're not extremely careful, and fair and balanced, the charge against us will be that we hand-picked the members of this Public Advisory Group to sort of stack the deck.

And so, I think, first, in addition to that, that in C we should say, instead of a recognized professional, service or public interest groups, we have to key (ph) those people to the cate- -- the principal interests listed in category B. So, I think that the Public Advisory Group members from nominees presented by the public -- or by, you might say, members of the principal interest groups listed in B. I mean otherwise, if you don't do that, C is sort of meaningless. Or maybe it isn't C that's meaningless but B is meaningless.

MR. BARTON: Well, that implication is reinforced by the fact that if we took one person from each of those interest

groups and the other three, we come up with 15.

MR. COLE: That assumes that we don't deal with the "at least" language in (i) and (ii).

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. COLE: Of course .....

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: Yes. I think that it's been pointed out to me that the (ii) language should be, you know, one traditional or Indian Reorganization Act village council or one ANCSA Corporation; that the requirement is that there would be one representative from that -- representing those three entities.

MR. BARTON: Which three entities?

MR. McVEE: Well, it would be the traditional or Indian Reorganization Act village council or one ANCSA Corporation; I guess maybe there's two entities here. Yeah.

MR. BARTON: Is that consistent with the Chenega
Settlement? I mean does -- is the Chenega Settlement
structured in such a way that that seat is already
predetermined to eliminate one of those two groups? So which
group does not get a seat?

REGINA: My recollection of the Chenega Bay Settlement is that one seat on any Public Advisory Group, at least, is guaranteed for the Native interests, which is defined as Class I and Class II of the Chenega Bay thing. So, it's -- the Native interest is defined as a conglomerate of the traditional

or the Native vil- -- or the Reorganization Act village or the 1 ANCSA Corporation. So, you've only promised one seat for those 2 3 three interests. That doesn't answer your question of how do 4 you choose it. And I assume that you will receive nominations 5 from their lawyers or from them or ..... 6 MR. BARTON: I doubt that we'll ask the lawyers. 7 MR. McVEE: Thanks, Regina. MR. BARTON: Is there a motion? 8 9 MR. COLE: Thanks. MR. BARTON: Is there a motion? 10 11 MR. COLE: Well, consistent with -- Mr. Chairman. MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole. 12 MR. COLE: I move that request -- we request the 13 Restoration Team to furnish us with greater specificity of the 14 15 principal interests listed in B and to elaborate on the nomination and selection process shown in Paragraph C. 16 MR. BARTON: Is there a second? 17 I'll second that. Further discussion? 18 Question, Mr. Chairman. 19 MR. SANDOR: Is there objection to the motion? Hearing 20 MR. BARTON: 21 none, the motion's adopted. Further discussion of the Public 22 Advisory Group? 23 MR. PENNOYER: We have some discussion here, Mr. Chairman; when Mr. Sandor -- Commissioner Sandor said 24 question, he wasn't calling for the question, he had a question 25

for the maker of the motion.

MR. SANDOR: Yeah.

MR. BARTON: I apologize. Mr. Sandor, please ask your question.

MR. COLE: You were right the first time.

MR. SANDOR: That's all right, Mr. Chairman. I just -the question I had was I presume that since we've adopted the
charter and meet our obligation for the 90 day requirement and
that the motion is perfectly in order, we do not have to do the
specificity by today, is that true?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That .....

MR. BARTON: That's not my understanding. I thought we needed to deal with -- I'm looking at the legal advice offered in the March 5 memo on Page 32, Paragraph 6. I thought we were -- we had to -- well, let me read it: The Federal Advisory Committee Act regs provide that the designated agency, the Department of Interior, shall describe the GSA, the plan for obtaining a fairly balanced membership. So, we need to do that; now, whether that means what we're -- if there's another way to do it other than what we've been discussing, perhaps. Is that right, Mr. Piper.

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, my question was just to make certain that we leave this meeting today with our obligation on that 90 day requirement. And the presumption is that we can deal with the specificity as outlined in the motion on the

floor, and deal with what other remaining issues that must be dealt with in that March 5 memo. I just wanted to make that clear.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: 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.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: With the consent of the second, I would like to amend my motion to say roughly as follows: Move that the Public Advisory Group required to be formed under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding be comprised of at least the principal interests listed in Paragraph B of the March 9 memorandum, that one seat on that group be reserved for a local government representative within the area of the Exxon Valdez oil spill, that the group be represented by one Native individual from a traditional or Indian Reorganization Act village council or one Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act corporation, that the Trustees publicly solicit nominees from each of the principal interests listed in subparagraph B, and that following receipt of nominees from the principal interest groups the Trustees appoint to membership on the Public Advisory Group those individuals whom the Trustees decide will most fairly represent each of the principal interests groups, and that care be taken in those appointments to avoid overlapping representation of the principal interests.

MR. BARTON: Is that the end of the motion? 1 MR. COLE: Yes. 2 3 MR. BARTON: Discussion? Let me -- I have a question. Is it your intent to limit the nominations to the interests 4 that are identified? 5 MR. COLE: Yes. 6 7 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. 8 MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee. 9 I guess my question is along the same MR. McVEE: 10 lines, Mr. Cole, in that if we in our wisdom have missed some interest group here, and we find out through, you know, the 11 12 nominations process that that is true, we would not have an 13 opportunity, as I understand it then, to reopen consideration of the list. 14 15 MR. COLE: That is not my understanding. MR. McVEE: Okay. 16 17 MR. COLE: I think that we could always correct grievous errors. And I also think that if we're judicious in 18 19 the appointments, we will find that no -- or that it's unlikely that any single individual will be so narrow as to not have 20 21 some shade of representation of other interest groups within himself or herself. 22 MR. BARTON: Further discussion? 23 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. 24 25 MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer.

# 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

MR. PENNOYER: The intent of the motion is something 1 2 about no duplication, but there are basically 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 listed categories and we have 15 members. 3 So what did you mean by no duplication, Mr. Cole? 4 5 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. My thought was to avoid the appointment of an individual who might be both an 6 7 environmentalist and a conservationist. MR. PENNOYER: So, we'd still would stay with 15 8 9 members, the total (ph). MR. COLE: 10 Yes. MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. 11 12 MR. COLE: Yes. MR. PENNOYER: In other words, he is (indiscernible -13 telephone cutout) overlapping representation? 14 MR. COLE: Pardon me? 15 MR. PENNOYER: Overlapping representation? 16 17 MR. COLE: Yes. That was the concept, an overlapping representation. 18 MR. PENNOYER: More than one (indiscernible). 19 MR. COLE: We don't get say two environmentalists, one 20 21 who represents the environment interests and then another environmentalist -- well, self-proclaimed environmentalist, for 22 that matter, who says -- is the conservationist category is 23 24 my -- what I had in mind there. And the same is true dealing with rec- -- the category recreational users and sport fishing 25

or sport hunting; you know, it's a pretty thin line what's recreational user as distinguished from a sport fishing user. But that's the concept that I intended to convey when I used the term overlapping interest.

I just think that if this is going to work, we must very fairly and balancely form this Public Advisory Group so it represents a very broad spectrum of the interest groups in this process.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: I would like to offer up an amendment to the motion that would broaden out the nomination process to include, I guess, nominations from the public. And while I think it's important to solicit the various interest groups, that I think it's also worthwhile to offer or to accept nominations from the public. I realize that this might give us more applications to sort through, but that I believe that it conveys, you know, the fact that we're trying to select a broad range of interests from all those that have an interest in the area and in the programs.

I'd like to offer up an amendment to include public nominations.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: The maker of the motion consents to the

#### R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

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 (907) 272-7515

2 MR. BARTON: Okay. 3 MR. COLE: .... with the consent of the second. 4 MR. BARTON: Are you asking if we have a second 5 MR. McVEE: Or we can amend ..... 6 7 .... did somebody there second one --MR. BARTON: second that? Well, to clear up ..... 8 9 MR. COLE: I'm simply saying I consent to the proposed 10 amendment. 11 MR. BARTON: Okay. MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. 12 13 MR. PENNOYER: To consider a friendly amendment, if the 14 second agrees. 15 MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee. 16 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. With that acceptance then there is a place in the proposed motion that where we could put 17 that language, and I guess it's down about -- I'm not sure of 18 my punctuation, but third or fourth sentence where Mr. Cole was 19 saying that the Trustees publicly solicit nominees from each of 20 the principal interests in Paragraph 3. And, this would be the 21 additional language, and the public. And following receipt --22 and go on then, following receipt of nominees, so on and so on. 23 24 MR. BARTON: The second agrees.

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

That's acceptable. I meant to punctuate

MR. COLE:

25

amendment ....

that motion by a comma preceding each that which is contained in the motion.

MR. BARTON: The second agrees to that too, whatever it was. Further discussion?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman. I speak in favor of the motion with a point of clarification. And this was raised originally with the definition of environment and conservation groups, and I think Mr. Piper pointed out that one such group was the Southeast Alaska Conservation Council, which in its name would suggest that it's a conservation group, which it professes to be but it also professes to be a coalition of the environmental groups in Southeast and points to the problem of definition of those two terms. And I think that's going to be a point of possible confusion. I think this can be dealt with, with my understanding that simply the Trustee Council will have the opportunity, when it gets all of these nominations, to come up with a fairly balanced list. And I, therefore, speak in favor of the motion.

MR. BARTON: Further discussion of the motion?

MR. SANDOR: Call for the question.

MR. BARTON: Okay. Any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, the motion's adopted. Further discussion of Public Advisory Group.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. COLE: I move that one member each of the Alaska 1 House of Representatives and of the Alaska Senate be appointed as ex-officio members of the Public Advisory Group. 3 MR. SANDOR: I second that motion. 4 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. Could you define ex-5 officio? They don't participate in the votes? 7 MR. COLE: I'll have to go look that up in Black's Law Dictionary, but I have a sense that if they can't be there, as 8 a matter of law according to Mr. McVee, that we could have them get -- receive notice of the meetings, participate in the 10 discussions of the meeting, and not vote. I think that's what 11 I would view as an ex-officio member, but I'm not schooled in 12 this type of thing so I really don't ..... 13 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. I was more interested in 14 the maker of the motion's intent. I don't care what ex-officio 15 means unless it was -- the intent was ..... 16 MR. COLE: Well, that was my intent. I think they 17 should have, you know, a voice in this process. 18 19 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. 20 MR. BARTON: Any further discussion of the motion? MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, one other question came 21 22 up. MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer. 23 MR. PENNOYER: Would these ex-officio members be 24 selected by the Trustees like everybody else, have lists 25

presented or .....

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. COLE: Well, I would have in mind -- thank you for calling that to my attention -- to be selected by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. COLE: I mean that's just my thought.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. BARTON: Is that an amendment?

MR. COLE: I'm not going to say another word 'cause I'll get in trouble if I do.

MR. PENNOYER: I wasn't trying to get you in trouble, Mr. Cole.

MR. BARTON: The motion now reads that we'll add as exofficio members one member of the Alaska State Senate and one
member of the Alaska State House to be selected by the'
President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Further discussion? Any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, the motion's adopted. Further discussion of

Item 3?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

DR. GIBBONS: This is Dave Gibbons, I just need a point of clarification to the Trustee Council on this. What was approved here today will -- for the Public Advisory Group will be reflected in the Framework document that will be going to

## 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

1	the public at the end of the month. So we just want to make
2	that clear to the Trustee Council.
3	MR. BARTON: Further discussion of Item 3, the Public
4	Advisory Group?
5	MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Gibbons. When do we
6	actually start the request for nomination process and look (ph)
7	for names?
8	DR. GIBBONS: We've been collecting names through the
9	public scoping sessions along. The formal request, we haven't
10	done that yet, the formal request.
11	MR. PENNOYER: Would that happen before we get all the
12	Frameworks back from the public and the comments on the
13	Restoration Plan and everything else? I mean this is a
14	separate action that will occur quicker more quickly, better
15	term (ph). What was your intent?
16	DR. GIBBONS: The Restoration Team hasn't discussed
17	this yet. I would think it would be helpful, you know, if we
18	include these comments in there, that we can solicit, perhaps,
19	at the same time.
20	MR. PENNOYER: So when you send out the request for
21	comments, you would send out a request for nominations?
22	DR. GIBBONS: Yes.
23	MR. PENNOYER: And not wait until we get all the
24	comments back. Thank you.
25	MR. BARTON: Further discussion of Item 3? Well, my

1 compliments, Mr. Piper, I only found one acronym and no 2 abbreviations. Are we ready for Item 4 of the Agenda, the Restoration 3 4 Team Operating Procedures? 5 DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman. MR. BARTON: Dr. Gibbons. 6 7 DR. GIBBONS: Let me preface my comments to say that 8 the Restoration Team is still functioning. 9 That's good to know. MR. COLE: We're heartened. 10 MR. BARTON: Yeah. 11 DR. GIBBONS: This was first presented to the Trustee Council on February 5th -- the February 5th and 6th meeting. 12 At that meeting, it was requested that the Trustee Council 13 14 supply any written comments to me by the next meeting. 15 received comments from the Department of Interior concerning 16 the operating procedures. The Restoration Team reviewed those

MR. BARTON: And the date of that draft is what?

since the draft that was presented to you at that meeting.

and incorporated -- agreed with some of them and disagreed with

others, and has provided another draft of this document at the

28th meeting. And basically, the document has not been changed

DR. GIBBONS: That draft is dated February 25th, 1992.

MR. BARTON: Thank you. Comments or discussion on the Restoration Team operating procedures?

MR. PENNOYER: We're getting a copy.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer.

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 said we're just getting a copy, Mr. Chairman, it just got handed to us.

MR. BARTON: All right.

MR. COLE: Could -- Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Yes. Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Are there any issues in this operating procedures which -- or about which there is substantial dispute?

MR. BARTON: Does any member have substantial dispute with the February 25th operating procedures.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: I guess -- and I don't have a copy of that right in front of me at that time, but one thing that I have felt pretty strongly about is that the Trustee Council should, you know, certify or confirm or whatever the right word is the appointment to the subgroups. And I guess I've spoken about this in the past, the reason is that we want to get, you know, the best talent possible, and this would be a way of kind of having a second look at those appointments and seeing that within our respective organizations that we have tapped the right person for those subgroups.

So, I guess with that, I would move that the RT identify, recommend to the Trustee Councils the necessary

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

subgroups and chairmanship and membership; and that the Council will, you know, approve the membership of the subgroups.

MR. BARTON: Is there a second to the motion?

MR. COLE: Second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole seconds the motion. Discussion?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. Mr. McVee, can you tell me what the intent is? In other words, we're going to vote on the people, different agencies that say they're going -- let's say the RT proposes a particular subgroup, plans, planning or whatever, we're going to then have to sign off on who -- the agencies that will be on. Are we going to sign off as a group then by unanimous consent on each individual appointment of the people that go in those subgroups; is that your intent?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: I guess it would be my intent that we would have an opportunity to review, you know, the appointments so that we could be assured that we have the best talent possible. I believe that -- you know, that's what we've talked about in the past, that there be one representative from each of the Trustee agencies on the subgroups, generally; sometimes that might get split between, you know, two people within an agency or within subdivisions that that might happen. But that the Trustee Council, itself, should have some interest, my feeling, in, you know, basically who's being appointed to the subgroups;

#### 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

and this would be one way to keep track of those assignments. 1 Further discussion? MR. BARTON: 2 DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman. 3 MR. BARTON: Yes. Dr. Gibbons. 4 Under Number 8, work assignments on 5 DR. GIBBONS: Page 2, Mr. McVee, are you recommending then a change of the 6 7 wording to the second to the last sentence? Let me read it. There's an acronym right off the bat. The RT shall, at the 8 discretion of the Trustee Council, assign work group members 9 10 with subsequent -- we have notification. You would like to change the wording approval of the Trustee Council, would that 11 12 meet the intent of ..... MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman. 13 MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole. And let -- why don't we get 14 15 Mr. McVee to answer the question first, and then you can speak. MR. COLE: Yes. 16 Mr. Chairman. Yes. I believe the word 17 MR. McVEE: "approval" at that point would do it. 18 MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole. 19 20 I'm sorry, where are we looking at? MR. BARTON: Page 2. 21 22 MR. COLE: You mean you want (ph) to change subsequent notification to approval? 23 MR. BARTON: Yes, I believe that's the intent of 24 Mr. McVee's motion, is it? 25

MR. MCVEE: 1 Yes. 2 MR. BARTON: Yes. 3 MR. McVEE: That's true. Further discussion of the motion? MR. BARTON: 4 5 MR. COLE: Well, could we just think about that for a minute, please? 6 Certainly. 7 MR. BARTON: 8 MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman. MR. BARTON: Mr. Sandor. 9 MR. SANDOR: In thinking about that and the impact of 10 that is just to say that if the Restoration Team if they were 11 12 working on an activity and decided a working group was 13 appropriate, they would have to seek the agreement of the Trustee Council before that group could be convened or 14 identified, is that what's intended? 15 16 MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee? 17 MR. McVEE: I guess my feeling is that, you know, that if they had been given direction -- if the RT had been given 18 direction to form a subgroup, that they could proceed with that 19 and function on an interim basis, but then at the earliest or 20 next Trustee Council meeting, they would identify and ask for 21 approval of the membership on that list. 22 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 23 24 MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole. 25 MR. COLE: I think what we should do is sort of put a

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

period after assign working group members. And then say: 1 2 member of the working group must be approved by the Trustee Council at its next regular meeting. 3 MR. BARTON: Does the maker accept that? 4 5 MR. McVEE: That's acceptable. MR. BARTON: Does the second accept that? Who seconded 6 that motion? 7 Mr. Cole. REGINA: 8 MR. BARTON: Oh, Mr. Cole seconded it. I assume that's 9 acceptable then. All right. Any further discussion of the 10 motion? 11 12 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, just one guestion. 13 MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer. mr. PENNOYER: There are two separate thoughts here; 14 one is who forms working groups and the other is who assigns 15 16 the members. And I assume that we're not saying -- we're 17 leaving in here the thought that working groups will be basically approved by the Trustee Council as well as the 18 members, so there's no formation of working groups by RT; that 19 both the working group itself and its membership are both 20 approved by the Trustee Council at the next available meeting, 21 is that correct, Mr. McVee? 22 MR. McVEE: Yes, that's correct. 23 24 MR. PENNOYER: The wording is a little bit

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

(indiscernible - interrupted) .....

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: The RT shall at the discretion of the Trustee Council assign working group members. One could do a little better, say assign members of each working group. But I think it's clear from the language if once we put a period after members that the Restoration Team will assign members to the working group. That's clear.

MR. BARTON: I think it is. I understood

Mr. Pennoyer's question to be, though, who authorized the

formation of the working group in the first place; who

identified the need for a working group. Is that your

question, Mr. Pennoyer?

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. I thought it was more critical to us that we didn't want working groups that will proliferate, and we definitely wanted any new working group to be cleared with the Trustee Council. And my second thought was did we also want to approve the members that different agencies assigned to them, that was the subsequent question I thought. And the wording ought to reflect both if we want both to be true.

MR. BARTON: Yeah.

MR. PENNOYER: And I certainly want it clear that we're not authorizing working groups to be formed and start work and be funded unless we've actually talked about it.

#### 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

MR. BARTON: And at the present time, ..... 1 2 MR. PENNOYER: I think ..... 3 MR. BARTON: .... the motion just deals with the second question. 4 MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think the intent is here. 5 Dave -- Dr. Gibbons is nodding his head at me. The intent was 6 7 never here to have the RT form its own working groups; and obviously, if you have to approve membership, you really going to approve the working group, too. It just needs to be a 9 10 little better worded, I think. MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 11 12 MR. BARTON: Yes, Mr. Cole. MR. COLE: May I restate the motion again? 13 You certainly may. If we have time. 14 MR. BARTON: Well, thanks. Well, I'm trying to do 15 MR. COLE: Yeah. something but I'll do it quickly. Each working group and each 16 17 member of each working group must be approved by the Trustee Council at its next regular meeting. 18 MR. BARTON: Does the maker accept that? 19 Yes, that language is acceptable. 20 MR. McVEE: The second offered it. Any further 21 MR. BARTON: Okay. discussion? 22 MR. COLE: I could do better if I had more time, but 23 thank you. 24 MR. McVEE: You were cut short, yeah. 25

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: The intent is clear, the wording could be changed later.

MR. BARTON: Any further discussion? Any objection to the motion? Hearing none, the motion's adopted. Any other Council Member have further concern?

MR. ROSIER: ....

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 have one .....

MR. ROSIER: Go ahead.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rosier -- Commission Rosier yielded the floor to me. I have one additional question on the action rules of voting. And we have here that -- and I guess you acted on this last time, that it required five of six RT members to bring a recommendation to the Trustee Council. Then down below, it says: Dissenting views shall be included if requested by an RT member. I guess this is a recommending body and we're the decision body, and I have a little trouble for a 4/2 vote not being brought to my attention if it's that dominant, 2 to 1, in essence, for approval or something. Ι don't mind working with this, but I guess I'm a little concerned that I never did like the old thing of 3/3 and the one guy breaking the tie, I think that's too close. it still strikes me as I'd like some record of it. like to know there was that level of disagreement so I could at least ask a question.

So, I think I'd prefer to have that dissenting views --

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

something to the effect that if a vote is 4/2, the matter will be, at least, brought to the attention of the Trustee Council or something like that.

MR. BARTON: Second to the motion?

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Pennoyer has hit

MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Pennoyer has hit on the same issue that I was going to speak to on this. My preference, of course, was for a quorum before we conduct business. It seems like the 5/6 votes (ph) that we're talking about here on this is quite a departure from the norm associated with conducting business in such a group. And from my standpoint, I would very much like to hear views but it seems to me than a minority view should really be more than two people in my estimation. We should always be striving for consensus here, but it certainly be my view that a simple quorum is a better way to do business.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Commissioner Rosier, I'm not sure I understood what you said entirely. A simple quorum is the best way, you mean in terms of a positive vote or just .....

MR. ROSIER: Yes. A Positive vote.

MR. PENNOYER: ..... conduct -- so you're talking about 4/2 being still positive?

MR. ROSIER: That's correct.

MR. PENNOYER: Believe me, Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515

to get killer whales back, ..... 1 MR. BARTON: We're comforted. 2 MR. PENNOYER: .... even though I know that the 3 Restoration Framework goes on at great length about how they 4 were damaged -- potentially damaged by the spill. 5 MR. BARTON: That was before the review. 6 I haven't heard a second to either one 7 MR. PENNOYER: of the two motions so do we have -- are these separate motions? 8 Certainly, your motion, Commissioner Rosier, wasn't the same as 9 mine. 10 MR. ROSIER: No, that's correct. 11 MR. PENNOYER: You're saying to bring any vote 4/2 12 forward, and I simply said that if it gets 4/2 I want to make 13 sure that it's brought to my attention so we make the decision 14 not the RT; there's that level of disagreement. 15 MR. BARTON: Can we deal with Mr. Pennoyer's motion 16 Is there a second to Mr. Pennoyer's motion? 17 motion dies for lack of a second. Mr. Rosier's motion, is 18 19 there a second to Mr. Rosier's motion. MR. SANDOR: Could the motion be restated? I'm not 20 sure I understand the motion. 21 MR. BARTON: Mr. Rosier. 22 There are two motions made with MR. PENNOYER: 23 24 one ....

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

The second motion.

MR. SANDOR:

MR. ROSIER: The second motion was ..... 1 We're having a difficult time ..... MR. BARTON: 2 3 MR. ROSIER: .... a quorum. ..... hearing you, Mr. Rosier. MR. BARTON: 4 MR. ROSIER: I say the motion was that a simple quorum 5 be provided for the conducting of business within the RT. 6 that would actually -- voting, it would take a positive vote of 8 a minimum of four to, in effect, carry the business of the Restoration Team. MR. COLE: Didn't we vote -- Mr. Chairman. 10 MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole. 11 MR. COLE: Didn't we already -- the second part of that 12 13 failed for lack of a second, wasn't that Mr. Pennoyer's motion? MR. PENNOYER: No. The difference between the two 14 motions was mine a vote of approval would still require five of 15 16 six, but that if it was 4/2, it would at least be brought to 17 the attention of the Trustee Council so we could ask questions if we wanted to. Mr. Rosier's motion is that a 4/2 vote 18 19 actually passes the motion. MR. BARTON: Is there a second to Mr. Rosier's motion? 20 21 The motion dies for lack of a second. Further discussion of the February 25 operating procedures. 22 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. 23 24 MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee. A couple thoughts, and I don't know whether 25 MR. McVEE:

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

these need to be in the procedures. But I guess that in most cases it will be helpful for me to have the minutes of the RT meetings; you know, particularly those that just precede the Trustee Council meetings, because from that I feel like I can get a sense of what the minority positions are and some of the positions. So, you know, I'm going to request from Pam Bergmann that she get me copies of those, and one possibility I guess would be just making those available for the various Trustee Council Members if they have similar interests, if not, I can deal with that.

The other one is that I think we should set a goal or kind of the RT should set a goal for getting agenda items and materials out in advance. And I certainly appreciate why, you know, there was a problem this week in getting items out very far in advance because the meeting was of very short notice. But I think we should, you know, try to establish some type of goal there that we can shoot for in the long run, of maybe having materials in-hand, you know, seven days in advance or something like that.

MR. BARTON: Further discussion. Further -- any motions?

MR. COLE: I would like to comment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'd just like to say if we could at least have them over a weekend, that's about the only time I think I

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

find that I have an opportunity to review this type of 1 material; and I have no doubt that each of the other Council 2 Members are in the same situation. So, irregardless, as my 3 father would say, of whether we get them seven days in advance, 4 if we could at least get them the weekend in advance, that 5 would be very helpful. 6 MR. BARTON: Is that a ..... 7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second. 8 .... motion to add that to the duties of 9 MR. BARTON: the Administrative Director? Is there a second? 10 MR. PENNOYER: Second. Administrative Director second. 11 MR. BARTON: Any further discussion? Any objection to 12 the motion? Dr. Gibbons. 13 MR. COLE: Well, I would simply say I don't think we 14 15 real- -- I didn't have in mind styling it as a mandate, it's just simply a request to try to deal with it, if possible. 16 17 whatever. MR. BARTON: Is that an objection? 18 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman. 19 20

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee a question?

MR. BARTON: Sure.

What you said you were going to do with MR. PENNOYER: your RT members is perilously (ph) close to what my motion said, which was simply that I wanted it brought to my

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

21

22

23

24

attention. Now, you're going to have it unofficially brought 1 to your attention, I guess each one of us can do the same; is that basically sort of what you're saying? 3 MR. McVEE: That's basically what I was saying. 4 think it would be useful for me to see the RT minutes. 5 MR. PENNOYER: Well, let me ask a question then. 6 the RT minutes contain dissenting views which it says shall be 7 included if requested by an RT member? 8 DR. GIBBONS: The -- Mr. Chairman. 9 MR. BARTON: Dr. Gibbons. 10 DR. GIBBONS: Right now, the RT minutes are -- records 11 all motions, records the voting and then the final action of 12 13 that vote; we don't take verbatim transcripts. But .... MR. PENNOYER: No. 14 DR. GIBBONS: And it will be there. That information 15 will be there. 16 Mr. Chairman. MR. ROSIER: 17 MR. BARTON: Yes. Mr. Rosier. 18 In terms of the minutes, do they MR. ROSIER: Yes. 19 20 reflect the votes by agency? DR. GIBBONS: We can do that. To date, they've 21 reflected a general -- you know, a total vote, but if it's the 22 pleasure of the Trustee Council, we can record by agency. 23 MR. BARTON: Mr. Rosier. 24 25 MR. ROSIER: Yes. I would certainly request that.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

Is there agreement? Is there objection? 1 MR. BARTON: 2 MR. COLE: I move we adjourn. Is there a second? 3 MR. BARTON: MR. PENNOYER: Second that (ph). 4 MR. BARTON: Are we ready to do anything with these 5 operating procedures? The Chair would entertain a motion to 6 7 adopt them as we've amended them. MR. PENNOYER: So moved. 8 9 MR. COLE: Second. MR. BARTON: Any further discussion? Any objection to 10 the motion? Okay. 11 The operating procedures dated February 25 are adopted as we've amended them here today. 12 Item Number 5 on the Agenda. Dr. Gibbons. 13 14 DR. GIBBONS: Yes. Very, very short item. I put this 15 on at the request of Mr. Pennoyer, and I think it's timely. 16 What I'd propose that the Restoration Team do is to pull the 17 records from the Trustee Council meetings on approval for the budgets of this year together by agency and initiate the 18 19 process to petition money from the courts, allowing for the 20 appropriate notification in the paper and OMB and the various 21 stipulations. 22 MR. PENNOYER: This sort of -- Mr. Chairman. 23 MR. BARTON: Mr. Pennoyer. 24 MR. PENNOYER: Sort of following the budget operating

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

procedures you looked at last time with the diagrams and so

forth in it? Yeah.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Are we going to get a bank account for this Trustee Council?

MR. BARTON: I think we need to refer to the Financial Management Team's report on that question. I don't know whether it's a bank account or what is proposed there at this point.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Chairman, that's why I had monitored (ph) the agenda items, it says process for and initiation (ph), so I'm not clear we have actually -- I'm sorry, I missed your discussion at the last session, but I'm not sure we totally understand what we're doing here yet. And I had more in mind more somebody that's actually getting this ready and might bring it back to us on the 17th or something to take a look at, but I want to know if somebody is actually preceding with definitively looking at that process and the manner in which we get the request. 'Cause I suspect there's some folks out there, you know, (indiscernible - telephone cutout).

MR. BARTON: The Financial Management Team is looking into that matter, if I understand what they're doing correctly, along with the whole procedure and process that needs to be gone through in terms of actually accessing the money and getting the necessary approvals or notifications, at least on

#### R&R\_COURT REPORTERS

the Federal side and I understand on the State side that's a little unclear at this point, so I don't know that we can resolve it. Is that an accurate representation of the situation on the State side?

MR. PENNOYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, we don't have to resolve this here today, I just wanted to make it an item and get it definitively scheduled so whoever -- I'm not sure who it is out there that's working on it -- they know they're supposed to come back to us in the near future and tell us where we are.

MR. BARTON: And I believe that's on their .....

MR. PENNOYER: Maybe reschedule it for the next meeting and send this request to whoever is working on it out there.

MR. BARTON: That .....

MR. PENNOYER: (Indiscernible - interrupted) .....

MR. BARTON: I believe that's underway, Mr. Pennoyer.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Fine.

MR. BARTON: The Financial Management Team, which consisted of State representatives as well as Federal representatives.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess the question (ph) -- I'm not sure what their time schedule is, I haven't seen a report from them on how they're proceeding, I don't know when it's going to be done. I just would like some feeling for the timeliness and relative to the needs of the system.

MR. BARTON: There was a NOAA representative on that.

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515

MR. PENNOYER: Oh, that's good. But I still would like the group as a whole to understand where the timing is on it, and from the feedback I got I'm not sure they had a scheduled one. So, I think if we schedule something for the next meeting and give us a progress report, a definitive idea of where they are of where we are, that should be adequate, and then at least we can comment relative to what's happening.

MR. BARTON: We'll schedule it.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

MR. BARTON: Any further discussion on that item? Is that it then?

MR. COLE: Move we adjourn.

MR. PENNOYER: Second. How about the last item on the agenda?

MR. BARTON: It's moved and seconded that we adjourn.

There's one item left on the agenda about the next meeting, is
there objection to the motion to adjourn?

MR. SANDOR: I would like to know when we're meeting.

Are we meeting on March 17, Mr. Chairman? If so, that's fine with me. But I do have a Senate (ph) Committee meeting in the evening, 7:00 to 9:00, so -- and I have a Cabinet meeting is in the morning. So, the time that would be really good for me would be some time between 1:00 and 5:00.

MR. COLE: Other than being on the 17th of March, when is that?

## R&R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: That's a Tuesday. 1 MR. COLE: Next Tuesday? 2 MR. SANDOR: No, no. 3 4 MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. Dr. Gibbons, do you want to 5 MR. BARTON: Yes. enlighten us on the need for this meeting at this point? 6 7 of the ..... Yes. Hopefully, it'll be a short 8 DR. GIBBONS: 9 meeting. We want to present to you the 1992 Work Plan that you approved at the February 27th and 28th Trustee Council meeting. 10 Present the revised Restoration Framework Plan to you. And I 11 just picked up the third item on the agenda would be the 12 joint -- release of the joint Settlement funds; that would be 13 the three topics. 15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is did they approve the plan for the Framework. 16 MR. BARTON: All right. 17 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman. 18 MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee. 19 MR. McVEE: I'll be in Washington, but my alternate 20 21 would be available, I believe, for that date. MR. BARTON: Yeah. I'll be unavailable on the 17th and 22 the 18th, otherwise, I'm free; but I have a very competent 23 alternate also. 24 25 MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman.

### R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. BARTON: Mr. Cole. 1 MR. COLE: Do we need to have a meeting to receive 2 this? Why can't it just be, you know, delivered to us and 3 4 that's it, you know. Dr. Gibbons. MR. BARTON: 5 That's acceptable with the Restoration DR. GIBBONS: 6 Team unless I hear anything different. 7 MR. BARTON: Well, and as I understood it, you weren't 8 proposing a sit-down meeting necessarily but a teleconference? 9 DR. GIBBONS: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. 10 MR. SANDOR: Well, then the only other thing, 11 Mr. Chairman, to resolve is whether there's a meeting in April. 12 All right. Let's deal with April. MR. BARTON: 13 Dr. Gibbons, help us deal with April. 14 DR. GIBBONS: We propose a meeting date of April 10th, 15 and there was some scheduling conflicts, and that was one of 16 the topics that needed to be brought up today is when we could 17 probably get together with the Trustee Council on a face-to 18 19 face meeting. Suggested sometime in the week of April 6th or after. 20 MR. COLE: Commissioner Rosier looks as troubled as I 21 22 feel. That's what I'm trying to hurry through, 23 MR. BARTON: I'm also troubled. 24

# R&R COURT REPORTERS

25

MR. PENNOYER:

I'm gone the week of April 6th, 13th and

20th and the 1st. 2 MR. SANDOR: Well, to make it unanimous, I'm troubled as well. 3 I suggest we adjourn this meeting and let MR. BARTON: 4 the Restoration Team try to find a commonly suitable date for 5 an April meeting. 6 7 MR. COLE: I agree. 8 MR. SANDOR: Great (ph). 9 MR. BARTON: Would somebody move that? MR. PENNOYER: So moved. 10 MR. McVEE: I'll so move. 11 MR. COLE: Second. 12 Any objection to the motion? MR. BARTON: 13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: None. 14 This meeting's adjourned. MR. BARTON: 15 16 (END OF DAY'S PROCEEDINGS) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

### R&R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET (907) 277-0572 OR (907) 277-0573 FAX (907) 274-8982

25

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE (907) 272-7515

## CERTIFICATE

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 93 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustee Council, taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 9th day of March, 1992, commencing at the hour of 2:30 o'clock p.m., at the Simpson Building, 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 12th day of March, 1992.

Karen & Squiers

Notary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires: 03/29/94

OFFICIAL SEAL
STATE OF ALASKA
NOTARY PALIC
KAREN 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