

1993 PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS BY CATEGORY

ALTERNATIVES

Regarding the alternatives, what we have heard today will lead me to believe that opinion is gravitating towards Alternative 4 or 5.

I am in favor of Alternative 5 with a slight modification. I think the research and monitoring portion should be doubled to 20%. We don't know enough about Mother Nature and how the ecosystem works.

I am glad that you did not bring Alternative 1, which is to do nothing.

I was confused on page 9 where there are x's. How does that help us understand what we are doing? For example, is river otter only under Alternative 5?

I like Alternative 3, but I am not sure I like the policies. I am not sure the restoration action should cease. I am not sure it should be limited to the spill area. It should be considered on a case-by-case basis. I basically like that approach.

Alternative 3 is pretty reasonable. I am in favor of habitat protection. It would be good to unload this money. Fat processes like this are natural targets. You have to guide the money within the agencies.

I would like to express preference for allocation scenario 2.

I support Alternative 2, and I looked at a combination of this with an endowment fund to finding a long-term solution.

I wanted to speak up for Alternative 2. The best use would be habitat acquisition and would be the best thing to prevent further damage and give the species a chance to recover. I am very much against an endowment. You ought to be able to make a ten year plan. The fund should be ten times greater for an endowment.

I think the Trustee Council and the staff has done a great job of coming up with these alternatives. We really need the habitat acquisition.

I have a question about how the alternatives are listed. There is less and less habitat acquisition. It seems biased against habitat acquisition. Is that a random way of numbering them or is there some intent on the part of the Trustees to guide us away from habitat acquisition and more toward comprehensive? Personally, I believe that habitat acquisition is a form of restoration, and I would like to see it labeled as such.

Why is Alternative 1 not posted? I noticed that recovery would not

be monitored for this alternative. Natural recovery could certainly be monitored and should at least be considered. The rest just means groveling over a bigger slice of money. On habitat acquisition and protection, I am vehemently opposed to any transfer using these funds from private ownership to the National Park Service or any status of wilderness protection. The Park Service is just a tourist industry like any other. The numbers of people attracted to justify their existence is a big negative impact on the area. I would not like to see these funds used to take private land wherever and put them under Park Service or to upgrade from a refuge status or multiple-use status into a wilderness status. It is unnecessary.

ARCHAEOLOGY

The issue of archaeological remains has to play a role somewhere.

During the oil spill, our old village site was vandalized by oil spill workers. That hit very near and dear to a lot of people here. There must be some mechanism to restore, monitor and protect the old village site.

BEAR

BROCHURE

On a lighter note, I just want to say that all in all, besides the criticism ... you did a pretty good job getting something out to the public (inaudible) and they can respond, you know, it's something I wanted to say besides criticism. It's very good to get the stuff out and to the public like this, and I'd like to see more, more of this, and then we can see if what you're saying too.

I would just like to comment. I know in Valdez they were laid out at the post offices as well as every mail box so that people could have them, and then they were in both of our local papers as well as the Anchorage Daily News, so I know in Prince William Sound it did get broad ...

First of all, I'd like to echo the words that I really like this brochure ... I think it's laid out nice. It looks -- it invites reading. It's sort of uptick and upscale and a -- very exciting to read. But I, too, have thought there are parts of the text I might have differing views on -- with -- as to how much they advocate one position or another ... But I'm concerned about some of the things that Mr. Cloud has mentioned that they have -- also Mr. McCune -- for example, no doubt when the DEIS comes out and later on the EIS, and finally the restoration plan, all of that's going to be a rippling motion. Each is going to incorporate at least the academic, the scientific study, available before all the refinements that we've discussed ... We didn't discuss the value of trusts, and we haven't talked about the fact that statements made

about this species may only apply to a certain area. So my question is if all -- if all that's true and people have responded to this, which is really quite a great presentation, and indeed they are going to be delivered copies at all these public meetings, this is what they're going to respond to ...and because of the fact that you said they've not been selected to do that this summer, which may or may not be the question, I really worry about the value of the weight given to public input, considering the iterations of the product. So, I would like to suggest that the staff or someone think about that a little bit because I'd hate to have a lot of people make comments on this and then might have changed their view or amplified it more with improved information that comes throughout this process. It might not be -- you might want to do a second version of this and make it -- instead of the orange and black, make it blue and black ... so that people can respond to different things, and you can have the benefit of our input as it goes along, because I think there will be some improvements that will come along that the public (inaudible -- coughing) I think that will have to be considered, and having an adequate interpretation of what the public process provided. I think it's a very -- a great brochure, and for the initial attempt, I think it's very good.

I would like to also say (inaudible -- extraneous noise) it's great job of doing this. (Inaudible -- extraneous noise) great job. It's real easy reading and informative. One question I have -- maybe it's redundant -- here before -- but when I read through the categories of restoration action, I'm trying to figure out for landowners that aren't interested in selling your land, aren't interested in easements, aren't interested in conservation easements or whatever, but still want to be involved in restoration where there's critical habitat and stuff, I've got to find out where in here there is working with private landowners like, maybe, put up a -- a bird house -- like on Afognak, I'm doing -- it's covered with bird houses that the Forest Service put up there like maybe twenty years ago. I don't know if they're harlequin ducks or wood ducks or something, but -- and those kinds of things and helping design cutting units and designing buffers and maybe instead of planting spruce, plant another species that would help the recovery to come back faster, just those ...On private lands -- and, you know, the section habitat protection and acquisition for uses on Kachemak, for example, and talks about acquisition and protection ... As I said before, the focus is to protect -- to help -- a resource recover, and you can do that be designing cutting units differently or putting harlequin duck houses or preserving a piece of habitat or replanting something or -- or making buffers bigger around streams, and those are things that can be done without acquisition.

I think that -- at least our company would be a lot more interested in those kinds of ... things than -- I just -- I read through this whole thing, in fact twice, trying to figure out where that would

fit in, and I didn't find it, and I haven't heard many people talking about it, but I think it's -- at least for our company -- it's something that -- if we've got areas that are critical to the recovery, we would like to work the government.

I was pleased with the brochure. Although it was long, it was clear if you took the time to study it.

I don't think the majority of us realize the importance of answering the brochure questions.

It might be useful if people knew how the brochures were distributed. I would like to compliment the staff on distribution. I might have done it a little differently. It needs a wide distribution. People have until August to comment.

You mentioned that this brochure had been mailed out to 28,000 people. I never got one.

CLAM/MUSSELS

There is also no mention of bivalves (clams and mussels).

When you get to spending these monies, I agree with Mr. Cole on what has happened to our clams.

Seldovia Bay use to be full of clams. No one can explain why there are no clams. Some say pollution and some say it is an algae. A database of some sort might help to determine why there are no clams.

I made a request for testing the clams. Out here near the clam bed was a cleaning station and I don't know if the stuff at the cleaning station contaminated the clams or if it was a combination. The cleaning station is where the boats came in.

The blue mussels were very thick in our bay before the spill. They are coming back now, but they are smaller (2-inches). I don't know what causes the slow growth.

CLEANUP

The only thing happening with the clam beds is that the oil is still locked in affecting the clam. I would like to see that cleaned up.

There is no sense in putting money into restoring it until you have cleaned it. It doesn't make sense to put animals back in until the subsurface oil is cleaned so it doesn't affect anything. All the shoreline animals travel the beach.

Throughout many of the public meetings of the Trustee Council,

there was much talk about the net environmental benefit as it relates to recovery of the oil. It is my opinion that when Jacqui Michele and her group did the study during the winter, the phraseology was more appropriate to cleaning techniques rather than restoration. I don't think the terms are applicable in the phase we are in now.

I guess when you think of cleanup, we are all pretty flattened. I think we are still grieving over the oil spill. It will take a long time to get over that. When we think of cleanup, to think about another oil spill is inconceivable, because I don't think we could handle or survive it in the psychological sense. I hope that there is lot of land acquisition. An island for the birds or a bay for the sea otters is what we should be doing. I would like to see as much money as possible dedicated to acquisition.

I thought that Exxon and Alyeska were mandated under law to pay for all the cleanup, and I don't understand how settlement money is being used for cleanup. Isn't that mandated under two or three federal laws and state law that they are liable for all clean-up costs? How did Exxon buy back their liability under law? So the federal court struck down the state and federal statutes that require them to pay for cleanup? Doesn't it seem kind of silly to pay for their cleanup if they had to pay for it anyway? So you guys all work under Judge Holland? You're all his boys?

Are they surveying these beaches to do hydrodynamic purges? Were these proposed by any contractees or employees of the Restoration Group? I would like to have a listing of all these removal proposals that were done under study or by recommendation of anyone associated with the Restoration Group? If they are necessary to restore PWS to pre-spill condition, it may very well deem further cleanup, and I would like to see DOJ's opinion regarding necessary cleanup which are not compensable under the Water Pollution Control Act, 4603.822.

COMMERCIAL FISHING

COMMON MURRE

As a community that was invaded by the common murre this spring, I have never seen anything like this before, and I've been here a few years. What caused it and can it be traced back to the spill?

CRAB

Inside these passages, I have not caught one king crab. I have run 4,000 hooks and haven't caught anything.

DEADLINES

This is a general question. The deadline for comments was -- is --

August 6th. That is also the deadline for the draft ... restoration plan.

DEER

EELGRASS

Protect those eelgrass plants.

ENDOWMENT

Well, I have a couple of other comments here. One being specifically with respect to the discussion of endowments. I was disappointed to that endowments didn't receive more discussion in this document in terms of both your natural recovery (inaudible -- paper rustling) recoveries that extend beyond a period of the spill -- with respect to the natural cycles that occur, and much of the lack of data system was the result -- results from the lack of good baseline data to start with, and I realize that when you get into talking about much broader scale environmental monitoring, you can potentially get into some legal questions, but I think the need to consider long-term monitoring and research programs is very serious. I think that endowments are the best opportunity to address those. I think that getting into addressing those, you potentially get into addressing five to -- whatever it was -- ten percent of the segment for research and monitoring too, and in that sense I'm concerned that the options are limited to that. I'm not saying that we should spend a huge amount of money in that area, but I think that there may be some artificial limitations on that we -- that aren't really appropriate, especially when we consider the nature of the ecosystems we are dealing with. Much of the natural cycles in the northern Gulf of Alaska are multi-year cycles, running seventeen to twenty-four years, not nine years or eight years or whatever we have left in the settlement.

Regarding endowment, I would be in favor of that, but I would feel strongly an independent body should manage it. The beauty of the Trustee Council is the relative objectivity they have. If an endowment was set up, there should be more public involvement such as citizens groups, fisheries groups or recreation groups. I am disappointed that none of those groups are represented on the present Trustee Council. If you had an endowment, we want to push for habitat protection and acquisition. Alternative 4 would seem to be the most balanced in terms of our interest.

I am in favor of an endowment because it is just smart to put money aside. Alternative 4 seems the better of the alternatives with a few changes.

If you are talking about a return from an endowment, it could take a long time and in the meantime only support administration. Endowments aren't all like the permanent fund.

Regarding the endowment, I am not sure how I feel about it because we don't have accountants to give us numbers. From what I understand, a well-managed endowment should be able to make 3-4% in excess of inflation. Administration cost could be as low as 1-2%. Monitoring programs could benefit from an endowment. I wouldn't want to put money into an endowment if it cost more to manage it.

If an endowment did turn out to be a good deal, you could use the same percentages for the return.

I submitted a proposal urging the creation of a long-term research endowment. I would hope the paper 12/22/92 could be made a part of the record. I have attended a lot of TC meetings and have intensified my support for an endowment approach. It was at the end of one meeting that it was pointed out that a study should be carried on for ten years for a total of a million dollars. We need to take a long view. The monitoring and research activities for PWS, Kenai Peninsula, Lower Cook Inlet, Kodiak Archipelago and Alaska Peninsula have to be coordinated. We talk a lot about improving things and injury. We have never had baseline, so what is the goal we are trying to reach. We should put a minimum of \$100 million in, but it should be ongoing. I don't think we can put an artificial time limit of eight or ten years and expect to do the job. There was a major piece of legislation by Senator George Mitchell a few years ago that set the entire coastline of the United States; Alaska being one of nine regions. The Sea Grant program is working on that. This whole area of the spill is going to be a part of that component. This is a wonderful opportunity to get information for rehabilitation of the area and get the real coordination we need. We make a big mistake by looking at things year by year and not coordinating over the long term. The percentage is too little on the research and monitoring and should be 12 or 13%. I liked the idea of considering a larger endowment so that as you learn, you will have some dollars to make some of the rehabilitation. I will continue to push for that. We don't know the answer of what is possible but I do feel the Trustee Council will come and go, and we don't have the consistency we would get under setting up an endowment.

Regarding the endowment, I think we should pursue it. The basis for that is that the average recovery in years for the injured resources exceeds ten years, so if we were to pursue any type of treatment, it would have to extend beyond ten years.

I am a strong supporter of an endowment and preferably a very large one. Very quickly another \$200 million could vaporize. An endowment is a forever thing. It may not give us \$100 million to blast away. Nature will take care of many injuries in time. There is a tendency to piss away money in this state. I have a problem even with an endowment and putting so much toward habitat acquisition. I agree with Ms. Sturgulewski regarding the monitoring and research maybe to a tune of half the remaining dollars.

I'd like some kind of release of information about how the nearly \$300 million dollars was spent and how much went to administration, and monitoring and research. Especially the money that was spent for the settlement, I would like to see how much went to attorneys' fees and the other ways that it was spent. I think an endowment is very appealing, but what is disturbing is how little pay off there is. I am not very enthusiastic about a big endowment.

I don't want an endowment because it gives too small an amount of money to be spent every year, and it also gives more years that administrative cost can be piled onto. I feel strongly that so much of the clean-up money is going to be spent by administrators.

I support an endowment and research because as oil moved along, it entered the food chain and will affect stocks all over the state. We won't see the end of this for quite a long time.

On your endowment, who would own it? Would it be subject to political change all the time? All of us who have been involved in research know there are highs and lows in dollars. How is this to be handled?

So what you are saying is the management of an endowment is unformed? It is important to have some understanding of how it will be formed before you can ask the public for input on an endowment. It might be more practical to people if they understood who controls it.

FISHERIES

All nations should use more selective fishing gear in all fisheries. We have made this suggestion to the NMFS.

When you get to something like herring fisheries, there seems to be a gap.

The commercial salmon fishery was very much impacted.

It would be nice to see some funding for the hatcheries.

With the deal in 1989 with the boom, our even years have been bad. Even though we might not have that much oil out here, we were still hurt by the boom. That is why we need the hatchery.

Part of the problem is you are looking at commercially-introduced replacement for indigenous wild species. That doesn't help the people that live there that use the resource. If you planted commercial mussels, they don't want to pick them off a beach that was polluted by oil. They want their land back. Why wasn't that mandated under law this entire time. I have a document that says the area is still contaminated with CERCLA hazardous substances. I don't understand how you are going to buy off the people by

bringing some lousy hatchery fish in to replace what has been their source of sustenance, life and purpose for the last 10,000 years. The alternative is to stop the commercial use and clean hydrodynamically-purged oil. Take the fish out of those lousy hatcheries and put the fish on beaches as fertilizer. Give 10% to the state of Alaska to distribute to the people who paid for the lousy fish. Put the rest back in the water. Drift and set nets kill marbled murrelet and all kinds of sea life. I've been out there. I have been a set netter. I've been a drag shrimper in PWS. I have long lined and seined. I see all the dead animals in all of those commercial uses. I have been in logging sites. You stop the commercial exploitation and let the land recover so the people who respect it can get back in there and use it one of these days.

If you shut down the hatchery, you will allow the wild stock to utilize the zooplankton that the hatchery fish get to first. You've got a hatchery expert here.

The entire Cook Inlet has been hit like that by the intercept fishery, which is a direct result of how those were fished because of the oil.

FOOD CHAIN

The species are interlinked to the food chain, and we can't say it doesn't have any relationship to the species above and below it in the food chain. By addressing all the injured species, you leave the possibility that new data may arise.

I think when you consider whether to cease resource recovery, you need to look at the resource in relation to the food source and how the recovery of the species is doing.

After the oil spill we didn't hunt a lot because we didn't know how animal food sources were affected.

We are talking about habitat protection and restoration. For a species to continue, it needs food and I don't see any protection for its food source. Are we going to be able to protect this? You can have the rate of recovery, but if there is no food for them to eat, how are they going to recover. Maybe that is where research can come in. You know the food chain had to be affected.

GENERAL COMMENTS

In the Kenai Fiords you can't even pick up a piece of ice on the beach. That is bad when someone in Washington can tell me what I can eat.

The State has come in and developed picnic tables and wiped out a homestead doing the same thing.

It is too early to close the book on any particular species in the area.

You don't want to make parks because you could overimpact.

We will see when they put in hot dog stands and four-wheeler trails.

There is no definition of "depleted". The working definition is pretty vague.

It seems like we are covering the same ground.

Saying purchase, scares me.

We better get to know the Trustees pretty good if they are making the decisions.

When Exxon brought in the logs, they may have introduced the spruce beetle to our area. They gave the logs to the people to use.

With fishermen on the oil response, some have their boats on the waves over the winter, so it would be nice to see a boat harbor.

The existing harbor is getting old.

The deal has been struck and the dollars are there.

They take species from the oceans and put them in zoos. Can this be reversed?

I took my complaint to the State Ombudsman about the lack of recognition of my copyright which includes the job bill for the whole nation, which would impact restoration of PWS. I am against an endowment because that is what our founding fathers established. An example is the Loussac library endowment. It is being administered by the National Bank of Alaska. That is nothing more than a charade. My address and name are included on my letter. I am against endowment. Pay attention to my copyright.

Hickel and Bush pushed three guys into a ring and Rus Holland tapped them on the head with a wand.

What about quality assurance teams and insuring that goals will be met? There has to be a certain amount of quality assurance.

I would like to compliment this. It is a great start and shows how important restoration is. It is something we can work on. I am glad to see the legislature is not making those decisions for us.

The Trustee Council relies a lot on you.

HABITAT PROTECTION/ACQUISITION

Back to ride a little bit on John's comment, but -- what are we doing along the way of habitat protection on the already-public lands to enhance recoveries? If -- if management practices are something like building bird houses and stuff is helping recovery of species -- you want to do it on private lands, why can't you do it on the vast and much more public lands?

A major percentage of this is habitat protection. Who are we protecting the land from? Would the land be under State control?

I wasn't under the impression that there was a cost associated with land values.

I think nothing will be better than habitat acquisition.

Kachemak Bay State Park was not damaged by the oil spill. The acquisition falls under the service category. It doesn't fall under the resource category.

There was not a list of what you could do for acquisition.

I heard that for land acquired under restoration, the State might consider selling it. I would like to see it locked up under some type of sanctuary status. Any land acquired is creating opportunities for human use which is not the case under private ownership. Human use would be a low priority because it would be taken care of anyway.

Is anyone doing correlation with the habitats and what exists now? A habitat may still be affected by hydrocarbons.

You are saying the criminal money is for protection. Of all the things the governor decided on, none of that has to do with protection. What do you need to do to resolve this issue? If they decide to spend a certain amount on prevention, would someone file suit and settle this in court?

On acquisition, you could do major land leases for extended time periods and get more land for less bucks. I understand a lot of the land in PWS is owned by the Natives.

Regarding supporting the money being spent on habitat, we strongly support working within the oil-affected areas. I feel strongly about the impact on Native people and restoration of the subsistence way of life.

I have a real problem buying land that was not impacted by the oil. I would prefer restoration of the habitat rather than purchase of land. It would affect those that are probably not even aware of the impact along the coastline.

You should create a moratorium for the use of affected lands.

I can't figure out why we are going to buy land. What is the government doing buying more land when they own 97% of the state of Alaska. Why buy more land now? Who is doing this? Who owns the land? Why are you letting them buy more land. It should have been a \$15 billion settlement. You have got less than a billion to work with and you are buying land. Buying land doesn't make sense.

I wanted to correct a misconception. The government does not own 97% of the land. Native corporations own 12% of the land in Alaska, including nearly all of the commercially viable timber and forest in this area.

You could spend all the money buying off Native land. It's insane what is going on.

What is the word on buying the land? We got word that Attorney General Cole wants to buy the land and doesn't want to mess with restoration.

Whatever comments we make here tonight, you will go back to the Council and tell them? This is me on what should be done. The government should not own no more land and shouldn't buy any more land. The one exception is Kachemak Bay. The government owns too much land already. Ninety-one percent of the money that we recover in the settlement should be put into an endowment. There are thousands of scientists and consultants, and the money will go down the toilet. As far as DEC's involvement, it is my opinion that the DEC, including Commissioner Sandor, should be reworded the Department of Environmental Corruption. You have to start listening to us because we have seen the destruction.

I favor 80% going for habitat acquisition. I think the Trustee Council will be constrained by the blue line from doing some very good restoration.

One of things I am puzzled about is who actually owns the property that you buy. Who owns this once the money is spent?

It sounds like all this money is going to be spent on buying timber rights. If that is so, in the Kenai Fiords Parks there is a lot of Native land-claim land that should be part of the park. The Natives are willing to sell the land even though it might not be the most desirable timber. What emphasis will be placed on buying that land?

In looking at the map and the amount of private ownership, I wonder why they need one acre more for any kind of habitat protection. They already have an overwhelming amount already owned by the National Forest, Bureau of Land Management and the state. Why not put this into research and prevention? We have millions of acres

already protected. I don't see how they need more to protect. Buying more is not going to do it.

I support looking at the distribution of lands. It is not just a matter of total acreage but geographic location and seeing how much is coast land.

I think what we are concerned with is effects of the oil spill. What difference does it make who owns the land; they still have to follow the same laws.

We have to look at it as a natural renewable resource that my children can see when they grow up. If we cut the trees, they won't grow back as fast because they have nothing to protect them. That is an area which hasn't been addressed because people don't see environmentalists and loggers working together.

I came to say I am in support of habitat protection and acquisition. A lot of the coast land is Native land selected and won't be managed by the Forest Service. If it goes over to Native land, a lot of tourism might decline. It won't be the same. Natives might charge us more to use and view the land. The tours will cost a lot more. The money should be used to acquire Native selected land.

I have been waiting for someone from the forest industry to show up and say something. I noticed you talked to Concord, and I am surprised there is no comment from our local mill, which has just gone back into operation. Is part of the study the impact or the availability of land that was originally planned for the mill that Chugach developed? I know one portion of the land was for the university. Is someone looking at that too?

It seems to make sense that you are concerned about the impact of the fish and then you turn around and put a hurting on the timber industry. The oil affected the waters and that's what we should be concerned with. I think you will find out that all except for the Native lands, everyone else has to abide. Most people support that. Whatever the federal government says, we should abide by those regulations. The timber industry still can survive.

HARBOR SEALS

Harbor seals have not stabilized. I think they are still in decline.

I don't understand why the population has stabilized for the harbor seals and it is taking longer for the murrelets to stabilize.

The bottomfish disappeared. We used to have a lot of harbor seals come here, but after the spill we did not have that many.

The harbor seals are coming back very slowly.

Harbor seals follow the food.

What happened to all the seals in Blackstone Bay? They're not there anymore. Last summer there were zero.

Cathy Frost of Fish and Game took a look at harbor seals and found brain lesions caused by inhalation of hydrocarbons. Has anyone taken a look at the steller sea lions?

HARLEQUIN DUCK

The harlequin duck were a food source for us. We did not use them as a sport. The State should find a way for us to farm them and try to get them to nest in this area. They are a shoreline bird. They were really impacted.

The harlequin duck were just about decimated and all Fish and Game did was take a month out of the season. When do you deal with the State and Federal government to try to stop some of the problems going on today? It is very frustrating. Go to a Game Board Meeting and then come back and talk with us.

HERRING

There were thousands of herring. The majority of sea lions which came in to feed on them were young and females. Where are the others?

The herring season is going on, and it was predicted by Fish and Game that there would be a record herring season, but there weren't enough fish to open the damn fishery. The herring seiners were scheduled to go to work, but there hasn't been an opening.

Three of my friends are making the test sets, and they said Fish and Game are concerned about the number of herring with open sores.

I should have kept a record on the crippled cod I caught. I have seen a big change in the fish species.

Day after day I would set 2,400 hooks for a total of 100 fish. That is a significant change.

I have a newspaper clipping regarding disease in PWS herring. You have to find the answer to that. If herring were affected, salmon probably were too.

The five-year olds were smaller and diseased.

The Pacific herring should have a star on it and is clearly diseased.

HUMAN USE

It is my opinion that we should try to increase the use of the areas in the Sound; especially human use. Subsistence use has decreased dramatically. Sport fishing and commercial fishing should also be increased. We need to develop an alternative resource or service to offset.

We are very concerned about higher human use, and we are proposing co-management.

Regarding opportunities for human use, our children will not get the opportunity to enjoy the types of human use we enjoyed. You are talking about destroying a culture.

Regarding the opportunities for human use, only 4% has gone for habitat acquisition. It strikes me that by adding up these figures \$270-290 million has been allocated. Whatever comes from Exxon has already been committed to putting more money into reimbursing the government. I would like to know the difference between feeding the bureaucracy. The human use in the agencies seems to be pretty lively.

Parks are for human consumption. The first priority in a park is for humans.

It is not necessarily true. It depends on the parks.

Most of what we have talked about so far does refer very much to species that have been injured or damaged in the process. You made reference to services and human-use damage. It is kind of hard to figure out how long it will take for that to recover. If you don't design programs to support those commercial uses and some of the fisheries, how are we going to meld these two together? The human resource has been very damaged.

IMPACT

Yes, a couple of comments. First, about your -- you made comments that '93 population will be indicative of the nature of the impact. I'd say your jury just came back in, and it's not favorable.

INJURED RESOURCES

I don't see deer, shrimp or crab on the list of injured resources.

INJURY

We already know there is an injury to the animals and people.

My name is Charles McKee, and I have a copyright filed with you people but it is not in here. I would like to talk about the

injury to people. From the newspaper quote in the paper today, Exxon is trying to rewrite history and negate long-term damage. After the spill I was doing my own research work and Judge Holland asked for an estimate of damage. I wrote in \$3.5 billion. I am talking about in my copyright the destruction of heritage and historical documentation. They want to destroy history. They want to destroy the heritage of the people in the affected area. That is injury damage and that is why they spilled the oil. I wanted the average person to read my copyright rather than make a book of it. It is part of the record. I don't see anything as far as people injured in your handout. You ignore their historical heritage.

LAND MANAGEMENT

I was wondering if you have in your bag of tricks, land management policy lobbying. I would suggest Ms. Sturgulewski contact her allies. A greater part of PWS was designated a wilderness area. If these lands were removed from commercial exploitation, it would allow the species to reproduce at a faster rate than would be otherwise allowable. Has the restoration committee decided to use any funding for manipulation of land management policies to see that these species are protected to allow for restoration?

LOCAL HIRE

I would really like to see all these scientists and biologists use some of the local knowledge. They have only read about the area in books. Local knowledge in enhancement programs should be utilized.

For habitat protection there is \$300,000. Of this allocated amount, how many people in this region are going to be benefitted from this \$300,000?

In December or January there was a resolution by the Trustee Council to use local hire wherever possible.

Regarding habitat protection, I watched the local people become very involved, and some people had such negative experiences. What are the guarantees for funding in the future for SOS organizations? My son-in-law spent hours on volunteer work. They have the right to any funds which come along. Will some of this money help to fund their activities? Is there some encouragement for local participation? Many of the local people did an outstanding effort of being prepared. During the spill, they were ordered as a group to return to Seldovia, and they refused. There needs to be a change in the manner in which the people in this area were treated by the Exxon officials.

I speak on behalf of the land trust and would like to plug our abilities in the area. We do have a great deal of expertise and experience in working with easements. We are going after the same

things here. Some of your plans to contact land owners are the very same things we are doing. We would like to work with you on this rather than duplicate work. Please keep us in mind if we can do anything to assist you. We have spoken with Attorney General Cole, and he seemed amenable to this.

One of the more honest statements I heard from a Coast Guard person was that the shorelines would not be cleaned during our lifetime. I think we are looking at long term, so an endowment seems appropriate. If you don't want to address the human-use factor, the habitat will be folly. You must include the local villages and towns and empower them to understand the research and involve them in the activities. They will feel cheated if you don't. I hope they will be involved throughout the ten years and beyond.

MINK

It was sad the number of seals, land otters and mink which I have seen this winter. I have seen only four mink tracks on this island. Years before I would catch 30 or 40 with no problem. They are just not here.

MONITORING

Nothing like this has ever been done. No one has ever tried to spend \$1 billion. Understanding ecosystems is rather primitive. Most of this is going to be research. An awful lot of attention should be put into monitoring. A lot can be learned from monitoring. You learn some about response if you perturb a system.

One of the other things not mentioned is who will monitor the long-term effects of the hydrocarbons on human beings. The animals are being monitored.

Streams should be tested every year to see the results.

I favor more monitoring than restoring because monitoring will help us stop worrying about the danger. We should try to bring back what we lost.

OIL

Some things are still dying today because there is oil on the beach still killing them.

There is still oil to be picked up which is hurting the environment.

We have put in pots for shrimp and have only gotten two or three. The oil that came through here was toxic.

I could take you to Sleepy Bay and show that the oil is still at

Bishop Rock.

This has to do with further beach restoration and the amounts of subsurface oiling out there. I understand the current policy is to leave it there and allow nature to clean it. It has been verified that the oil is having affects on resources out there. Something needs to be done. I think a lot of these recreation-oriented people will come out with the same recommendations.

It would really help to mark sites so that kayakers don't come to Bishop Rock. I would like to see something done to funnel kayakers away from the beach. They will move oil all over Sleepy Bay and take it elsewhere.

There was not much oil in this area directly, but we are still finding tar balls.

When we were working at Windy Bay, I noticed how the oil affected the bottomfish.

The seaweed affected by oil is partly dead and turning whitish green. You can tell it has been hit with oil.

The animals up in the woods, such as bears and goats, were affected by oil. They also eat kelp to get salt in their body.

The oil is what added insult to injury and destroyed the spawning grounds and the intertidal zones. When you talk about impact to restore the wild stock, are you considering management policies that are within the domain of the state boards and National Marine Fisheries? We are trying to say will you get these agencies to minimize or eliminate the effects that are further declining the weakened ecosystem that cannot support the same level that was there before. We don't want replacement with hatchery fish or commercially-bred mussels. We need restoration of the land that is still oiled. I can give the specific toxic chemicals that are still in the oil.

On acceleration of restoration, I notice you have three columns that are concerned with removal of oil. What is rapid restoration? Is that like the berm relocation plan? You are willing to spend three quarters of a million on a project, and you don't know what it is. All of this is coming out of the fund for these three projects, and Exxon is liable and Alyeska is liable to pay for this stuff. If it is necessary for recovery shouldn't the state and federal governments mandate that Exxon pay for cleanup and not take it out of the settlement fund? Should I get a decision from DOJ if this is an abbergation of the people's right to pay for oil recovery. You are trying to do it out of our money that was settled on when they are liable to do it. My name is Tom Lakosh, P.O. Box 100648, Anchorage, Alaska, 99510 and my number is 258-5767.

These people don't have control of lobbying. You can't shift anything unless you go through the Senate. Everybody talks about restoration until cleanup has been completed. You can dig down upon layers and layers of oil. After storms there was a fresh layer of oil. It has built up and built up. I have to live in the city because my survival out there is shot.

OPTIONS

You have quite a mix. Suppose you decide to restore all population decline species to pre-spill levels. Would there be any money left?

It might be very efficacious to remove predators. That sort of action has been very valuable in the Aleutians.

I would support eradication of predators. It makes sense.

OYSTER

I never understood how oysters were harmed by the spill.

I heard a proposal for restoration of the Pacific oyster.

POPULATION DECLINE

I have a couple of problems. This population decline, you know, you're -- there's a lot of separation on this sea otter and harbor seal population all the way from Kodiak down to Cordova. You're putting us in a real bad position here with the reauthorization of the Marine Mammal Act and everything else that's coming up. If they take this as a gospel right here, off that population decline, which I'm not totally convinced from looking at the numbers and the studies of the sea otters in Prince William Sound are on a decline -- or that the harbor seal -- since I spend, you know, ninety-five percent of my time on the water. You know, there are certain areas that certainly might have some population decline that we're not quite certain of in the western part of the Sound, but as far as the Copper River Flats, I'll tell you, there's lots of harbor seals. That's the same problem that they're having with the Marine Mammal Act is that they can't go around saying Cordova's high in harbor seals, Kodiak's not, Washington isn't. You could get us in a lot of trouble with the way you put this in here. The other part of this is on the human services is the commercial fishing, and then you have down here recreation, including sports fishing, sport hunting, and other recreation use. Well, a lot of the damage that's done -- I really don't point to just the commercial fishing damage -- it's common property fish that belong to all the state residents. You know, they all have an interest in the common property fish damage, not just things going back to commercial fishermen, that includes the subsistence fishermen and everybody in the state -- has some kind of interest in that common property

fish. So I -- I really have a problem with this population on this side here, and there might be some qualifiers or something on that.

Yeah, and the reason -- well, all the way up and down the coast. I'm just being a little touchy about (inaudible). I know you're trying to identify the population decline for restoration, but also on the other hand there's a lot of uncertainty about a lot of this stuff, so we should have a little something in there also about that, you know.

You have to look at how you're going to describe that decline. You see this is where we get into a big problem with the Marine Mammal Act. Is that population that's in the Copper River also the same seals that you see in the western side of the Sound, or not? Or do you break it down by Copper River and Prince William Sound? You see, this is where it gets really complicated, you know, and I want, you know, just to make sure that we're talking on the same lines here. There's a lot of populations that go from Kodiak to Prince William Sound, that go to the western Sound, that show back up in the Copper River. So, not necessarily that you see today, that the harbor seals might not be there in the western part of the Sound, does that mean there's a decline in the population?

Mr. Chairman, looking at the resources that were showing population decline or differences of opinion about regarding injury, if restoration projects were approved based on population decline or the Restoration Team's thoughts about injury, why when the species were undecided or there were a lot of differences of opinion, such as in some of, you know, cutthroat trout or pink salmon, why weren't they just given the benefit of the doubt, saying if there is a block of people among these scientists that believe this, let's proceed, instead of saying, no, there's a difference of opinion so let's cut them out. What was the conversation that led to maybe not pursuing restoration projects on resources where the injury was in doubt or undecided or, you know.

You were asking if money should address populations which experienced a decline and those which did not. It seems that there is not enough money to do both and only those which were severely affected should be funded. Do we get more bang for our buck by funding projects for overall restoration or just those which were severely impacted?

I don't think the spill money should be targeted for those with measurable decline. I don't like the blanket yes or no, and it should be decided on a case-by-case basis. They should be prioritized for which can do the most good.

I have a concern about tying everything to the populations when in fact it was the overpopulation which caused the decline. I hope you weigh understanding and whether it was a behavioral decline or a genetic change in the copra pods. A lot of research goes into

understanding. Otherwise bringing up the population to pre-spill levels will not do any good.

PORPOISES

The Dall porpoises have disappeared. On the 25th of March I went to Valdez and in an 11 hour run, I saw only 6 porpoises.

PROPOSALS

There are nearly three hundred projects. What's the total price if we go ahead with all of this?

I assume you're aware that -- especially under services -- several of these categ -- these potential projects -- seem to relate to more than one restoration option. Is that important at this point? I assume that they would try to be put under what was needed for major restoration option.

Just glancing at this, it looks like some of these maybe somewhat overpriced and -- how do you arrive at these -- these are just ideas, so we might comment on the price too?

How -- you didn't break it down to how who submitted what projects, so it's kind of hard to tell, you know, which ones were identified by the Chief Scientist, and which ones had peer review, and which ones didn't, and which ones are -- so (indecipherable) just lumped a bunch of projects in here, and have to go through here and ... It would add a lot of weight to me if it came from the general public or it came from the Chief Scientist or the Restoration Team, or it came from -- you know, that has a lot to do to me, when I'm studying a sheet like this, as to what has priority in what areas, to me. You know, I like to know what the public did say and on what projects they would like to see down over what maybe Bob Spies says should be done. So I think -- you know, that would be very valuable on a chart like this to me, anyway. I don't what everybody else feels about it, but --.

I agree with that. I wonder if -- if maybe an addendum couldn't be found. If these -- if these are projects -- all two hundred and eighty-seven or however many there are -- can be traced back to some source. Maybe that's not possible to do. But probably if we could tell if it came from a public source or the Chief Scientist or whatever, and just send out another list and attach this, and say, number one, so-and-so, number two, such-and-such.

For once I tend to concur with the Trustee Council. I think a lot of the ideas that were submitted by the public and even by the agencies were not subjected to a broad sweeping public comment at the time they were submitted, and this is really the first opportunity for some of those to be done. So, this is a broad, sweeping set of possibilities, with options for additions, I

believe, if I remember the last page, yeah, out to a broad section of the general public, and it's without the filter of the Chief Scientist and the Restoration Team. I think it's a great idea.

I wasn't speaking about filter. In fact, specifically non-filtered, but I think it would -- would be helpful to know where -- if the idea came from the public or from the Chief Scientist or from some other group. Again, I also think this is the kind of thing that next year, it would be so helpful if the Public Advisory Group, who is asked for its opinion, to get a chance to ask to comment about things before they go out, just in case there might have been a germane point. I realize it couldn't happen this year, and so also with this very brilliant brochure we've discussed, I think we could have had some input on that too. I just -- I always feel a little bit, I guess, at sixes and sevens, when the Attorney General says publicly that he doesn't get any input from us, but we're always given this to approve or to take after, you know, it's out. Now, that's not a critical comment; it's just maybe a procedural matter for the future.

Well, it's going to be a little difficult to respond to this, you know, I mean, like Prince William Sound video program. Am I supposed to know what that means? I mean, that's -- you're going to go out and take a bunch of videos, and then that's -- the public can look at that or --?

Understanding some of this through looking at this (inaudible -- simultaneous talking) of going through this thing here would have a hard time understanding what some of these would mean to their area or what it even means to what the project is, and I know you can't just spell out every little project down here, but this -- this format by May 21st is very -- is an extremely difficult, I find.

I just got to follow up on what Gerry was saying. I would hate to have to review and comment, you know, and pass judgment on this many projects of any type, you know, with no more information than I have here, especially if I was relatively uninformed about the '93 work plan and hadn't seen some of the information that we've -- you know, that we've taken the time to look at as individual Public Advisory Group members. But when you get this information back from people, how much weight are you going to be able to place on their opinions saying, yes, fund this, don't fund that? How is that process going to work? Is there going to be -- are you going to base your opinion just on -- on sheer number of yeses for each -- for individual projects -- or -- or -- how are you going to weight that as compared to, say, what the working group thinks about projects you discuss on an almost daily basis those which they believe have merit and should go forward? Is -- do you anticipate that the public opinion is going to provide, you know, is going to be meaningful in the decision-making of bringing these projects forward to the Trustee Council?

I would just like to say that other than information on each project, I like the idea of grouping it under each resource. And when we were going over the '93 work plan last year, that long slug-out process, I think some of the comments that we came up with at the end of that process was we'd like to have going forward a running tally for each of these resource or services on what has been spent in the past and what is spent, you know, we propose now, so that we kind of had an idea of whether we were spending way too much on the bald eagle or whatever, and that is missing here certainly.

I hate to take more than my share of time, but I'd like to hitchhike on that idea. I think the Public Advisory Group should also respectfully request that we get some kind of fiscal note on each of these activities that have been implemented since the 1991 and '2 and '3 and '4, so that we can see how much money is going into a specific kind of project. I think would be really helpful to us assessing, I guess, the -- the success of the remediation that's ongoing. So, I think that's a part of the financial information that we ought to have. It doesn't need to be detailed, but if we could know how much money has been spent on each project as it tracks on through, I think that would be a tiny bit of information that we could use.

We have tried to develop project proposals on our own, but we get behind the agency power curves every year.

I would caution the Council to be very aware of dealing with proposals coming from agencies and municipalities outside the spill area. That big pot of money must be very tempting for agency budgets. My eyes fell out of my head when I saw the proposal for the Fort Richardson Pipeline. I would not like to give carte blanche to proposals. If there is nothing that can be done in the spill-affected area, only then should you look at proposals outside the spill-affected area. The scientists should be able to sort out the flim-flam from the real projects.

I am appalled by some of the proposals put to the criminal settlement.

I read the list of possible projects. It is beyond me where these ideas come from and seem to enhance bureaucracy. I am amazed at the ass backwards things going on. It does not inspire faith when projects like this get written down.

The thing I am disappointed about is that there have been no priorities. I have never heard anyone say that is on the top of our list to achieve some parity. Let's not do any capitol projects.

The oil spill has not affected some of the proposed projects, such as the Fort Richardson project. Why include all those if oil has

not affected them?

I am concerned about how useful is what we submitted and if it will be taken into consideration. If we were to write up a proposal on mariculture, where would we go to?

I speak on behalf of Chugach Regional Resources Commission, which has been providing technical assistance for fisheries and development projects. We are interested in focusing on the loss of economic opportunities that occurred as a result of the spill. Some of these projects have been started because we can't wait for funding. For example, the cannery shut down. Port Graham has started a hatchery. They also own the cannery and are renovating it. They are marketing it on their own. This provides subsistence, jobs, and fish for commercial fisherman. They have already started things to go beyond subsistence because they can't wait. They have tried to pick up with other funding. It would be nice if the Council could have some type of matching project.

I would like to commend you folk for hard work. I would support at least a 50% endowment and about 25% for monitoring and research. You should expand the blue line. This spill has had a tremendous effect on the fish in the Susitna Drain and it should be included. The fish are a mixed stock fish. The Susitna fish were hammered. It has had a disastrous affect. Project 26 speaks to this and if it doesn't, I have a proposal that would address this. The Susitna fish were intercepted. The run was closed for two weeks during the height of the run. This has both a socio and economic effect.

How will these numbers come back regarding the accelerated rate? Can you send me some of these proposed projects that are listed here? If these are designed to clean specific beaches, I would like to see who proposed cleaning what proposed beaches.

I am primarily interested in all the clean-up activities and restoring injured beaches. All these other habitat recovery projects that have to do with species enhancement is what I am interested in and accelerated beach recovery, i.e., beach cleanup. I want the replacement of the harvest opportunities or species enhancement. If I put these numbers down in the column, will you send me the proposals? So somewhere in this building, there has to be the proposal information.

The Sea Life Center's direct birth came out of rehabilitation. The facility is not a recreation facility. It is a three-fold marine research facility for mammal, sea matter and also fish. I wonder about your classifications and how that fits. It covers more than just the facility. There is more to this. It is also an enhancement of some of the information. The experts that put this together made it a multiple of the three areas.

I would like to speak to the rehabilitation portion as someone who

has been involved for many years with the harbor seals and sea lions. The rehab facilities were set up under less than desirable conditions. Although volunteers were absolutely wonderful, they were people literally off the street with no professional training. We know that the harbor seals and the sea lions were in decline before the spill. A lot of decline could be attributed to other man-made disasters. We have an opportunity to collect some valid data to try to answer some questions. Although I support habitat protection 100%, you can do all the habitat protection you want but if we don't figure out the decline in these animals and help the species get back on their feet and put them in a professional facility with professional scientists, habitat protection won't give you anything. We don't have a place to put them in a professional facility where there are professional rehabilitators and professional scientists that can get this information so we know better how to preserve our resources. If we had had that during the spill, we wouldn't have the herpes and parvo problem. We need to be better prepared. We need something like the Sea Life Center. It is important to address this to your biologists and have them think long term. The rehabilitation centers already out there are very successful. We have a chance to put together a better facility than anything in the world right now. (Note: The above comment is a professional opinion by Dr. Joyce Murphy.)

An on-going research program is needed. More emphasis should be put on a facility and associate it with an on-going program.

I have something to add to that. The public paying the fees will be paying for long-term research and long-term habitat. Once the facility is built, the admission fees and the gift shop will pay for everything else. It is another way of having some long-term baseline information.

I think it has been mentioned that the Sea Life Center will provide research and rehabilitation, but it will also provide education for the public. If we don't keep the public involved in our environment, then we won't build for the future. This also will help our children to prevent the problems we should have prevented by looking at Exxon and saying where is the double hull and things like that. This center will keep the public eye there as a watch dog for our kids and for outsiders who come to see it. They will realize that Alaskans are truly involved in our environment. Right now all they do is spend their money and take our fish, but they need to realize we want to preserve our environment for our future as well.

Regarding the Sea Life Center, I know a lot of local people would benefit. This meeting is not reflective of the town's opinion of the Sea Life Center. A lot of people who perhaps have a close interest are the big supporters. Whereas if you get a little bit farther removed from the actual activities of the Sea Life Center and possible employment, there might be less enthusiasm for it.

The issue was brought up whether or not the Sea Life Center is a matter of importance to Seward. On Easter Sunday we staffed a booth at the sportsman's show in Anchorage and were asked about the Sea Life Center and what was the status. We started a petition and got over 500 people from all over the area indicating support for the concept of educating the public and having some means of doing research on Alaska area sea life and mammal issues right here in the state. The state would benefit. I do believe it is far more important. This was sent out to the governor's office.

Nobody has said the Sea Life Center has to be in Seward, but Seward has a great water and food source, and we already have great zoologist. The food source is an important reason why the sea lions and harbor seals are declining. If we don't figure out a way to get a research station that can support this, we will second guess this for years to come. Those 100 years might turn into 500. We have an opportunity to figure out what is going on.

In part of the restoration program, I noticed one of the projects is the shellfish hatchery around Tatitlek and Chenega. The oyster farm sounds like a good deal as an alternate. I know the villagers are working hard to get it in. As an alternate for an income industry, I would think that would be an excellent project.

PUBLIC INPUT

What about those people who are not -- wouldn't have the ability to be at those meetings and are interested in this project? How do they know? How will you get their input?

Are you sending this printout to say, for instance, Ketchikan where they're not going to have a public hearing. I guess I'm concerned about the silent majority and what they have received. Because there's a lot of people who are interested, who might not be on the mailing list, who haven't participated, but have some strong feelings about some of the issues. How do they exercise their input into the program without being provided with something they can read, at least.

When you get your comments out, do you hold them or do you make them available to the public during this period? Bu till you ... use that in conjunction with comments that you'll get on the draft restoration plan? For the final restoration plan -- since this information you won't be using for the draft restoration plan?

I guess what bothers me a little is that the weight that they're going to put upon the results of this poll, I can see, for example, a well-organized group taking one of these copies and run them off on the Xerox, hand them out by the hundreds, sign their name, send it in. Now, how do we know that it's not happening out there? So, it's sort of ridiculous that ...

This is supposed to be a public process, and that's what every group should be doing. That's why we've only got -- if we're not doing that, and we only get five or ten public comments at most of our public meetings. I mean, that's the problem. We aren't going out and mobilizing the groups that are seriously interested and seriously impacted. I mean, John and Gerry and I were talking about this earlier in terms of lack of comments from -- from commercial fisherman. I don't think that it's that they don't care about the process; they don't think they have an influence on the process, I think is the problem.

In response to that though, John, I have to say I think every person really wants to have public process. What we don't want to have is a jimmied-up public process, where I who have a special project I'd like to do, Xerox it, take it to a whole bunch of buddies, go down to the bar and out to church or wherever, and get them all signed -- that's not public process. And I think it's that kind of thing that we'd like to avoid, and we certainly -- nineteen hundred copies of this went out. Hopefully, there would be nineteen hundred people who would have something to say about that. Hopefully, it would not be a little gaggle of people that run and send us back eighteen hundred of it all saying the same thing.

The plan for public input sounds real good. That's the only way to go. Well not the only way but one good way. You mentioned something I found quite interesting. How and where did the idea of criminal money come into the picture? On the dollar bill it says in God we trust. So how do you compromise this ying-yang principle in your analysis? In other words the name was chosen because of the type of results it was related to. Well it's good. You should have called it positive money in my view.

Folks have been around to these communities. The Trustee Council did the opposite of what the communities requested. You are not even taking names and addresses if people wanted direct responses. The last response was absolutely negative. The PAG was set up just the opposite of what the public suggested.

I have been to Trustee Council meetings, but there are public here who can't go to meetings. In the 1993 Work Plan only a couple hundred responses were received. You have to convince all six Trustee Council members a project is a good one. People get discouraged and think what is the point. It would be nice to have a way of weighting what people here say so their voice is heard.

I would be interested in seeing what the children's responses are to the spill.

You mentioned that the Trustees wanted to know what we think, and it will be directed to the Council. Will you give the briefing behind the projects and then will the feedback go to the Council?

To clarify my thinking, it is my understanding that there are 207 potential projects, and our task is to voice support or opposition to these project, and we also have until May 27th to submit additional projects.

I would like to go around the room and get people's ideas.

Are you taping this? How do you identify who is speaking? Are you simply taking public opinion. I don't have any scientific background. Some of the scientific people should be identified when they comment.

Everyone has alluded to Kenai Fiords National Park. What were Port Graham's comments?

REIMBURSEMENT

RESEARCH

RESOURCES

Out of all the resources, the ones with asterisks should be the ones most studied in the past (Injured by the Oil Spill Table). The other species have not had any real study prespill.

Just using the term "sediment" is misleading.

RESTORATION

On the issue of restoration and ongoing -- ongoing efforts at restoration -- we, in one effort through the legislature was trying to establish an endowment for educational grants, and it seems that, you know, ignorance and complacency are two things that prevent ongoing restoration or being informed about how to do -- I think some of it, I think, could even fit in with what John was talking about in terms of having school kids involved in learning, you know, what some of those ecosystem needs are as far as protection, and I was wondering if there's some place we could mention that kind of opportunity or option for people to see if that is something they would be interested in, an endowment for educational purpose, particularly for primary and secondary children.

Restoration needs to be in balance. What if you get the population back to 600,000 and then find there is no food for them.

Some of the restoration will be easy to do.

A lodge is not restoration.

I don't think there is all that much you can do for direct restoration. I don't think anyone sent the scientist out to get

the projects that can be done for direct restoration.

I would question restoring something that exceeds pre-spill conditions because it might have effects on the overall ecology.

I would only enhance to replace.

For habitat enhancement, you could end up with overescapement.

I am wondering what inter-agency dialogue you will have as to deciding what to restore. It is pretty hard to distinguish what the oil spill did.

I just got back from shooting a special for CNN. The impression that I got is the Sound is still very sick. Before the Trustees make any decisions, they should maybe spend a week in the Sound. You will get a sense of what the Sound needs. It doesn't need more buildings but restoration.

Who is going to do the restoration has a big effect on how effective it is going to be.

Restoration is more important than the Fort Richardson project. Restoring stuff back is important. We lost a lot of ducks that come here in the winter. The year after the oil we didn't get that many back. We didn't get that much bottom fish after that. A lot of that oil sunk to the bottom and did some damage to all the fish. This year I haven't watched the ocean much, but I think they are starting to come back now. It is a slow process. I don't know why the money was put into the Fort Richardson project and should be left to those areas to be used for the food people get.

I feel that if restoration were to occur to the subsistence species in my area, that would enhance it. I support going beyond prespill.

You are going at it piece meal. It doesn't make sense to have restoration for each species when there was damage to the entire ecosystem.

My concern is with restoration. Obviously there is on-going damage. Have you thought about taking that into consideration when talking about damage?

What do you mean by restore a resource? I see this all the time. The extent of the damage and injury just boggles the mind. Is this species by species?

Before we leave restoration, I have a general observation. It is interesting to try to quantify species by species. Basically, there isn't enough information to go at it bit by bit. The strategic approach of trying to piece meal it together is fundamen-

tally flawed. In a strategic way, it is better to just acquire habitat and basically say God knows best. We know a little bit, but we don't know enough and should try to get a big hunk of what is out there. It might be better to just bite off big pieces of habitat and let it restore itself. We have to admit that all the queens horses and all her men just cannot put it back together again. There are some excellent ideas out there, but I believe habitat acquisition is the best way to spend the money. I favor habitat acquisition. I didn't come here to argue about specifics of categories or to give you a general idea of what I think an endowment should be. The one thing I would like you to record and the one thing that I'd like for you to understand is that I believe that habitat acquisition is the best way to go.

I am amazed at how little you allotted for restoration. This is the right place and time. You allotted darn near as much for administration. You ought to take a look at this.

RESTORATION PLAN

Well, this is supposed to be a draft -- a summary of the ... of the draft, and yet, you know, it's supposed to be a restoration plan, and the only thing in here on your category for restoration -- general restoration -- it's a mere three or four inches. You've dedicated most of the bulk of this whole plan to habitat protection and acquisition.

SALMON

There was one injury, the chum salmon, which was never addressed because it was never studied and was a huge component. We were expecting to see what the four-year old component would be and it was 0. It has never appeared on the list. We are very frustrated with the approach on the outer coast because it is unstudied. We are so far along with this, and it seems we are seeing a lot of the projects over and over again. The chances of introducing something now are slim.

We had a boom across the bay and that killed off a lot of fry. They didn't have the curtain down. After we took it up, we had a whole bunch of salmon fry caught (millions).

Not only were the pink fry caught but also the herring.

Windy Bay was also affected. English Bay complained about the killing of small fry of reds. The current was too strong for them to fight.

I noticed on the list you left out bottomfish. Also the silvers and kings were left out. We don't have a way of testing them, so we don't know if there was injury. I know those fish go through the whole Cook Inlet. You only have the reds and the pinks.

I have been watching fish, and I have noticed the dog salmon have gone down too. There weren't that many silvers either.

My point was, for example, if it takes ten to fifty years for sockeye to come back to a pre-existing condition, the uses of that resource will have changed substantially from what it is today. These guys will be behind the eight ball.

I am surprised by the lack of other sea life on your list of injured species and only one species of salmon. I am wondering if this is being treated as gospel.

The fish that the hatcheries are releasing, the ecosystem cannot support. Is the money going for restoration of streams for wild stock salmon? What will be done about this imbalance? They are releasing too many pink salmon. It is so badly destroyed that it can't support the release.

We have seen zero returns in our silvers. There are a lot of components. An endowment has to be part of this because the more we find out, the less we know.

SEA LION

Sea lions were not included as injured.

Sea lions should have been studied.

I have been watching the sea lions. Their haulout wasn't hit; they were hit when they were having pups. The oil was six inches thick when it came through the passages. There are 200 animals where there should be 700. There is a significant change since 1989.

I notice since the spill, they want a five-mile buffer zone. You can't just stop a whole area. The problem is the draggers are killing the sea lions, at least nine per day. We have to stop them. Don't stop everyone else from using the area, but stop the ones that are killing the animals. That is cutting out subsistence, commercial, sport and every day usage.

You might want to be careful that if you develop something for sea lion recovery and the regulatory agencies develop something also, you might get total overkill.

I feel that it is not time to close the book on the sea lions because it will affect the local fishermen.

I don't see the steller sea lion on the list of injured resources. Why isn't it on the list? I know of a sea lion which died that we buried. It is hard to believe there wouldn't have been some impact.

SEA OTTER

I don't understand why they don't come and walk around our beaches and study for a week. All they want to study are the sea otters and the birds that the tourists see. I could care less about the sea otters because we can't eat them. We need to go somewhere that is 17 miles away that shows how things were before the spill.

The oil spill killed thousands of sea otters, and I still see some out there.

Some of the marine mammals were hit very hard such as sea otters, especially in PWS. There is now increased hunting on some of these species. Is there any movement through your council to try to get the Marine Mammal Protection Act to develop some regulations because of the decline?

SERVICES

The other is the general perception of the item on page three where it's talking about injuries, the column on services kind of looks like it was added as an afterthought. It may not have been intended to read that way, but that's the way it looks to me and probably was to most readers. My personal feeling is that the damage to services is just as important as the damage to natural resources, but the bulk of the document and the bulk of the discussions that we've had with the Restoration Team about the restoration plan previous to this have all indicated a relative disregard for services, and I think that is a serious oversight.

SHELLFISH

SHRIMP

The market for shrimp has leveled out since the spill.

SPENDING

The money should be spent in Chenega Bay.

I strongly support spending in PWS and the immediate affected areas. I can't see spending it outside.

The only way this money should be spent outside is if we wrap some of the otters and send them outside.

When you get to spending these monies, I agree with Mr. Cole on what has happened to our clams.

We have a good biology station out here that could be increased. That is money well spent as compared to buying large chunks of land.

I think when the Council considers restoration actions which provide some improvement or modest improvement, I would urge you to proceed with caution. I would hate for the funds to be a deep pocket for research. I wrote a letter saying I am appalled at the amount of money going to general restoration off the top. It could greatly be scaled down unless there is a very good chance of species improvement.

I think it is a very delicate balance to accommodate both arguments regarding monitoring and spending.

It doesn't sound like there is enough money to restore things. How would you even consider going beyond that?

I have a problem understanding how for an overall endeavor, you can make a determination on how the funds would be divided. It is clear in some cases habitat protection might be the most important in some endeavors and not in others. You need to prioritize the resources and decide if there is enough money to go around.

I don't understand the connection between the policy questions and the percentages.

I would hope that a lot of money doesn't go to pay management staff.

The effects of the oil spill will last several decades. We should not spend up all the money right quick. If you have a big pile of money, you will attract all kinds of people. That was a phenomenon during the oil spill. People did as much damage as good during the oil spill because of the money. The damage from the oil spill will last throughout my children and grandchildren's life times, and funds should be available because they might have more wisdom on what to do. You can't replace the environment instantly but as you learn more, you should have money available to make things back right. I feel strongly that a large part of the money should be tucked away. There will be every carpetbagger in the world trying to get a piece of the action. If you take the avarice out of it, you will get a better quality product.

You say that \$50 million was allocated to Exxon for cost incurred for cleanup, etc. They spent \$39.9 million. What happened to the other \$10 million?

I would like to comment to the Trustees that I would hope their decision for spending the funds weighs heavily in favor of habitat and protection of habitat in the areas affected by the spill and that they give the lowest priority to construction projects, especially roads to Whittier and those kinds of make-work projects that really take the emphasis off the habitat preservation and protection in the area impacted by the spill.

I just tuned in and I heard a couple of references to there being \$900 million to spend. I would like to hear what happened to the 1/3 of the money that has already been spent to reimburse the State and Federal governments and Exxon. What in real dollars do we have left to spend in the pot? Is there interest associated with that or does the pot of money get smaller because of inflation? It would be useful to address the differences between the terms for spending the criminal settlement money that is being discussed in the legislature right now and the civil settlement.

There is a fear that a lot of money will go for things like reimbursement, and there won't be anything to show for it. I have heard that at meetings that I have gone to. Maybe we will have something concrete like acquisition of habitat.

If you add up all the numbers, obviously they are way in excess of what funds are available.

Money for parks might be for damaged resources. The opportunity to repair a damaged resource is there. It seems that any dollar spent on habitat acquisition is worth more than another \$100 million spent on planning and reimbursement.

I am dismayed by funds for public information because it doesn't get much beyond groups who attend these meetings. I object to dollars building tourism centers. We are trying to preserve wilderness areas and not increase pressure on wildlife by building roads. It does not embody the spirit the funds were set up for. It violates the ideals people had when allocating the funds. I agree on the issue on allocating any funds that would put any increased pressure on resources or damage them any further. I can see doing something to mitigate and lessen damage. This money is for restoration of an area and helping the damaged wildlife population. I think there should be some real consideration of not doing projects which are extremely intrusive, such as the one for common murre. The murre are nesting on steep cliffs and you would have to hire mountain climbers. I would strike the \$50,000 for this project.

There is no such thing as the right thing to do. Somebody has to make the decisions. Unless you have a better decision-making process to work full time on this, we will run out of money before we do much restoration. The principle we use in the construction business is to do something even it is wrong because you will run out of money.

I would support spending money on whatever is the most effective thing to do.

You need to sketch out how much you are going to spend. You need to establish some ratio between what you are trying to do and what you are going to spend. Is the sky the limit on some of these

things because they were damaged? We should come up with some realistic dollar amount.

I am very concerned about administrative costs. Are we creating with this Restoration Plan a whole new bureaucracy or are we going to utilize the services of some of the agencies we are already paying for?

Prioritizing is very important so that the money is used appropriately.

I am not so sure what the best approach is. My real concern is that the state got much less than it should have from Exxon in the first place. An incredible amount will be eaten up in administrative cost. That is my real underlying concern of the whole process. Too much money will never be spent on things it needs to be spent on and will go for administrative cost.

I assumed the money was going to be used to repair damage.

SPILL PREVENTION

Spill prevention should take a piece of this pie.

I would like to vote strongly for spill prevention.

It sure would be nice to use some of this money to have prevention capabilities in Cook Inlet, maybe some money to buy a tractor tug. I guess it will be up to the attorneys.

We have a bureaucratic mess and the bottom line is still going back to prevention. If we can't get tugs out there to get people and their tankers through dangerous areas, we are losing out at the start. If we don't have every single ocean-going oil tanker doubled hulled, we might as well kiss the whole program goodbye. We have to do that. If we don't do that, then they shouldn't be out there sailing around. I'd love to have Kachemak Bay be pretty, but it is a little bit empty if we don't stop the damage from the start. Get those tankers off the ocean if they aren't safe. We have proven they aren't safe. I want them double hulled. I want tugs every place they have to go, whether it is Cook Inlet or Shelikof Straits.

The Cook Inlet RCAC and different environmental groups might be where energy could be focused in trying to accomplish tugs in the inlet and double-hull tankers.

How about prevention? It has not been addressed.

I think it is up to the oil companies to spend money on prevention.

OPA 90 will spend money on prevention.

I would like to see them be cautious on spending money on prevention. I would hate to see all this money get sucked up in lawsuits.

I submitted some projects. We need to know how we will be prepared if there is another accident or spill. How will we protect ourselves?

I would like to see the money spent in the future for oil spill prevention.

We had five boats involved in spill prevention in Seldovia.

I asked what kind of boom material we had left and we don't have any to protect streams.

There have been complaints from the men who had the training that they weren't called. They had the boats and training and weren't utilized.

I am not up to speed on this, but it seems no matter how much habitat we acquire, if we don't do some prevention it is all for naught.

I would like to second Carol's comment about prevention. If we don't work on prevention all this is useless. Regarding Alternative 5, if we haven't worked on prevention, increased human use will make it more likely we will have problems like these. It may be smaller but we will still have more damage to the habitat. I support Alternative 2 and habitat protection and acquisition. The Kenai Fiords would be a great choice.

Prevention is really very important and is the key to the whole thing. I ask that you not overemphasize just changing ownership on land because I don't think that is going to solve the problem. I don't see a direct tie in to just acquiring the land and helping everything out. You could spend a lot of money doing that, and I think there are some holdings in the Kenai National Park that would be good to include in the park to make that a contiguous unit. I hope you don't overemphasize habitat protection. It is part of ongoing research and keeping a proper balance.

SPILL ZONE

The map shows the spill zone goes all the way up past Kenai.

The area of the spill doesn't include Perryville. Tar balls were found on the beaches there. There are a lot of theories of where they are coming from.

I want to emphasize that restoration stay inside the spill-affected areas.

The map is pretty limited when it comes to migratory birds.

The link could easily be the species and where it nests or has habitat elsewhere.

I listened to all the other villages. We are from the Alaska Peninsula. Your map doesn't show us. I would like to find out what our village can do to get on this map. Our beaches were well oiled. We didn't even get our beaches partially cleaned and were shut down. How can we get some money these people are talking about to clean our beaches? There are a lot of dead animals.

I can bring you federal documentation that the State of Alaska Fish and Game got information from us about cleaning our beaches before we were shut down, but yet we are not on this list.

If habitat outside the spill area would protect a species, it should be eligible.

I made a connection of the inter-relationship because of where the species go. I think the Susitna drainage area has to be considered. Is that line a firm line by Trustee Council action? Every time you see a line it takes on its own validity. I hope there will be a serious look at that.

PWS was a migratory path for all kinds of species clear up to the North Slope. Species were disrupted by the oil being there. Migratory species and their ranges should be included on the map.

SPORT FISHING

STUDIES

Studies should be independent of the University of Alaska.

Recently in the news there have been disputes by Exxon about the veracity of the scientific studies that have been conducted by a few agencies. They boycotted a recent scientific symposium about Exxon Valdez damages held in Anchorage. When you decide what projects to fund or how to spend the money, whose figures are you looking at? There is a lot of distance between Exxon's assessment that damages are not long lasting and everyone else's.

This is a year to catch fish and see if they are affected. This might be the year we find out things.

The studies should include protecting streams for wild stock.

Where did you get the baseline data? There were a lot of populations that weren't studied at all.

In terms of research, we have had an oil spill. Letting the

opportunity go by for research would be a big mistake. If it isn't done now, it can't be done in twenty years.

We have research on the genetic effects on the liver and kidneys, and we know that will be a problem for future offspring.

SUBSISTENCE

And the other thing I would suggest -- I thought that, you know, the thing about subsistence, especially what it was really like for the impact that, like the village of Chenega got hit with, I mean, (indecipherable) subsistence, and there's oil all over the place, and, you know, the impact of any (indecipherable) that really got zapped, it's got to be Chenega. The oil went right in there, and those people really are subsistence users who have to use it all the time, and so I think that those are the two comments that I would have on -- as far as habitat protection and restoration actions.

In regards to the subsistence resources, I can assure the PAG that the populations are still in decline or have not recovered yet.

I am curious about our subsistence rights because it varies between what the State and Federal government allow.

If we want to restore subsistence, I would start with the seal and sea lion.

We as Native people have not had the privilege of being involved in something like this, and we thank you for this opportunity now. What we have to say is very important and should be taken into consideration. Those of us who live along the coastline have been seriously affected. This was the time of year when entire families would walk the beach digging clams, and it was a yearly, seasonal thing. Since the spill, those clam beds were contaminated. These beds have not been tested, and so we have not used them. Every time they have gone to gather seaweed, they have come up with oil. Someone found those tarballs. Subsistence means us taking our children and being able to have fellowship on the beach. Once you have collected those things, sharing them plays a very important role with us as Native people. Sharing is very important. We have always taught our people that the first thing you catch, you give it away. We were impacted culturally. Because of the fear of losing another part of our culture, there is a need to do things. Last year they built a kayak to revive some of the tradition.

During the entire year, Native people do different subsistence things. We have had to go up to Kachemak Bay or purchase mussels. Early in the spring and on into May, the snails are collected. They have returned and are available. People are also just beginning to collect seaweed. They are preserved and used year round in cooking food.

One of the things our people have traditionally always done is eating the liver of the cod fish. I am concerned about the hydrocarbons collecting in the liver of those fish.

When a Native person catches a fish or seal, there is very little that is thrown away. All of it is used in one form or another.

Salmon should be number one because it is used for commercial fishing as well as subsistence.

It is more important to restore what we have lost in the villages and in the oil-spill area, especially the food source.

I feel very strong about funds being spent on restoration because so often the villages are left out. I would like to see our subsistence resources restored. I would hope that when my three children are grown, there would be food for them to subsist on.

The people, that use the land, own the land by right of heritage and have the right to use that for their sustenance. If they are sacred, then the only thing you can touch are the commercial exploitations of the land.

TOURISM

I can't understand the difference between helping the pink salmon and helping commercial fishing. If you help the resource, the service will have plenty to do with it. If you help the resource, you help the fishermen. I am in tourism. I think you have destroyed the service. By building me anything new, will not help my tourism. If you restore the land, that would help it but the services part of it I have a problem with. We have already given a lot to recreation and hunting. You don't need the services column on the table. You plan to help the resource by destroying another resource.

UNCERTAINTY

Well, in the future, you know, since there is uncertainty about pink salmon, there's uncertainty about harbor seals, maybe there should be a sentence down there that says this is not the gospel, because a lot of people will read this, and they're going to look at that and say this is the gospel for Prince William Sound, and we're going to be right in the middle of negotiations on all these reauthorization acts. So, you know, some people are going -- I know that paper's going to come out somewhere and somebody's going to say, look, right here. So --

WORK PLAN

Regarding the 1994 Work Plan, I feel awkward voting on something based on just a title. Having looked at the 1993 Work Plan, some

titles sounded crazy but when you reviewed it, you got a better understanding.