

1 EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL

2 October 28, 2013

3 9:30 a.m.

4 4230 University Drive

5 Anchorage, Alaska

6 TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

7 U.S. FOREST SERVICE: Ms. Terri Marceron

8 AK DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME: Mr. Tom Brookover

9 AK DEPARTMENT OF LAW: Ms. Jennifer Schorr

10 AK DEPART OF ENVIRON CONSERVATION: Mr. Larry Hartig

11 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR: Mr. Pat Pourchot

12 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NMFS: Mr. James Balsiger

13 Proceedings electronically recorded, then transcribed

14 by:

15 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen

16 Dr., Suite 2, Anchorage, AK 99501 - 243-0668

- 1 ALSO PRESENT:
- 2 Elise Hsieh, EVOSTC Executive Director
- 3 Catherine Boerner, EVOSTC Science Coordinator
- 4 Linda Kilbourne, EVOSTC Administrative Manager
- 5 Carrie Holba, EVOSTC /ARLIS Librarian
- 6 Cherri Womac, EVOSTC Staff
- 7 Peter Hagen, NOAA
- 8 Katrina Hoffman, PWSSC/OSRI
- 9 Scott Pegau, Prince William Sound Science Center
- 10 Chris Little, The Conservation Fund
- 11 Phil Shephard, The Great Land Trust
- 12 David Wigglesworth, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 13 Steve Aberle, Public Advisory Committee
- 14 Molly McCammon, Alaska Ocean Observing System
- 15 Kris Holderid, NOAA
- 16 Tammy Neher, NOAA
- 17 Gordon Miller, Koniag
- 18 Joe Darnell, U.S. Department of Interior, Solicitor's
- 19 Office

- 1 APPEARANCES (Continued):
- 2 Mitch Ellis, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 3 David Irons, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 4 Dede Bohn, U.S. Geological Survey
- 5 Jason Hartz, U.S. Department of Interior, Solicitor's
- 6 Office
- 7 Mariah Cabrelli, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- 8 Jack Blackwell, Alaska Department of Natural Resources
- 9 Sherry Dressell, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
- 10 ATTENDING BY TELECONFERENCE:
- 11 Michael O'Leary, Callan & Associates
- 12 Samantha Carroll, Alaska Department of Natural Resources
- 13 Bob Mitchell, Alaska Department of Revenue
- 14 Tori Baker, Cordova
- 15 Patience Faulkner, Public Advisory Committee, Cordova
- 16 Ivy Patton, Native Village of Eyak
- 17 Laurel Jennings, NOAA Restoration Center
- 18 Kristen Carpenter, Copper River Watershed Project
- 19 Gina Belt, U.S. Department of Justice
- 20 Erika Ammann, NOAA

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Call to Order	05
3	Approval of Agenda	08
4	Approval of Minutes	09
5	PUBLIC COMMENT MS. BAKER	11
6	MS. PATTON	13
7	Executive Director's Report	14
8	Investment Fund Asset Allocation	18
9	Annual Admin. Budget (APDI)	34
10	Habitat Program Updated Appraisal Instructions	50
11	EVOSTC GLT Habitat Project	52
12	Stewart Parcel	61
13	Beeson Parcel	69
14	Long-Term Programs - Herring	74
15	Long-Term Monitoring (Gulf Watch Alaska)	74
16	GOAK Marine Debris Project	163
17	USFWS Pigeon Guillemot Project	169
18	NOAA Clean Harbor Projects	177
19	Project 14120112-A Eyak-Cordova Clean Harbor	
20	Project 14120112-B Cordova Snow Management	
21	Project 14120112 NOAA Clean Harbor (Admin)	
22	Koniag Master Agreement and Easements Update	221
23	Executive Session	228
24	Adjournment	228

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order.

MS. HSIEH: Can we ask that everyone sign in the sign-in sheet, because there are so many new people here?

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, and if everybody would sign in on the sign-up sheet there if they want to talk during public comments, we'd appreciate that. So let's go -- should we go around and introduce everybody. I guess we can start with the Trustees. Jen?

MS. SCHORR: Jen Schorr, Department of Law.

MR. POURCHOT: Pat Pourchot, Department of the Interior

MR. BROOKOVER: Tom Brookover with Department of Fish and Game.

MR. HAGEN: Pete Hagen with NOAA Fisheries sitting in for about 30 minutes for Jim Balsiger who's with NOAA Fisheries.

MS. MARCERON: Terri Marceron, Department of Agriculture.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Larry Hartig, Department of Environmental Conservation. I'll be the State Chair today.

MS. HSIEH: Elise Hsieh, EVOSTC Executive

1 Director.

2 MS. KILBOURNE: Linda Kilbourne, EVOSTC Administrative  
3 Manager.

4 MS. HOLBA: Carrie Holba, EVOSTC librarian.

5 MS. WOMAC: Cherri Womac, EVOSTC staff.

6 MS. HOFFMAN: Katrina Hoffman, Prince William  
7 Sound Science Center. One of the administrators for  
8 the GulfWatch Alaska Program.

9 MS. BOERNER: Catherine Boerner, EVOSTC science  
10 coordinator.

11 DR. PEGAU: Scott Pegau with the Oil Spill Recovery  
12 Institute.

13 MR. LITTLE: Chris Little with The Conservation  
14 Fund.

15 MR. SHEPHARD: Phil Shephard, Great Land Trust.

16 MR. WIGGLESWORTH: I'm David Wigglesworth, Fish  
17 and Wildlife Service.

18 MR. ABERLE: Steve Aberle. I'm a PAC member.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Molly McCammon, Alaska Ocean  
20 Observing System and (indiscernible).

21 MS. HOLDERID: Kris Holderid, NOAA, National  
22 Fisheries Service and GulfWatch Science lead.

23 MS. Neher: Tammy Neher, NOAA  
24 (indiscernible) and GulfWatch Science Coordinator.

25 MR. MILLER: Gordon Miller, Koniag. I'm  
26 sitting in to observe.

1 MR. DARNELL: Joe Darnell, U.S. Department of the  
2 Interior, Regional Solicitor.

3 MR. ELLIS: Mitch Ellis, Fish and Wildlife  
4 Service. I'm the chief of Wildlife Refuges in Alaska.

5 MR. IRONS: David Irons, Fish and Wildlife  
6 Service.

7 MS. BOHN: Dede Bohn, USGS.

8 MR. HARTZ: Jason Hartz, Solicitor's Office.

9 MS. CABRELLI: Mariah Cabrelli, U.S. Fish and  
10 Wildlife Service, I support the PAC.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Good. And do we have anybody  
12 on the phone?

13 (Indiscernible - simultaneous speech)

14 MR. O'LEARY: Michael O'Leary with Callan &  
15 Associates.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Michael. And who  
17 else did we have?

18 MS. CARROLL: Samantha Carroll from the Habitat  
19 Program in Department of Natural Resources.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hi, Samantha. Anybody else?

21 MR. MITCHELL: Bob Mitchell, Department of  
22 Revenue.

23 MS. BAKER: Tori Baker, Cordova.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Good. I think.....

25 MS. FAULKNER: This Patience Faulkner.

1 MS. HSIEH: Patience.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think I heard Patience.

3 MS. PATTON: Ivy Patton, Native Village of Eyak  
4 in Cordova.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. And Patience Faulkner,  
6 did I hear you?

7 MS. FAULKNER: Yes. You heard me several  
8 times.

9 (Laughter)

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Good. Well, thanks for  
11 joining us.

12 MS. JENNINGS: Hi. Laurel Jennings, NOAA  
13 Restoration Center.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I don't know. Some day  
15 somebody will find a way that we can organize people  
16 answering on the phone like that. Okay. Is that  
17 everybody on the phone then?

18 (No comments)

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It sounds like it. Okay.  
20 Can I get a move to approve the agenda -- motion to  
21 approve the agenda.

22 MR. BROOKOVER: I'll move we approve the  
23 agenda.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Tom.

25 MS. MARCERON: I second.

1 MS. SCHORR: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any changes, additions  
3 to the agenda.

4 (No comments)

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hearing none, the agenda's  
6 approved.

7 Then we have the meeting notes from our last  
8 meeting, the February 21st meeting. A motion to  
9 approve the minutes, or the notes.

10 MR. POURCHOT: I move we approve the minutes of  
11 the last meeting.

12 MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any corrections or additions  
14 to the notes from the last meeting.

15 MS. HSIEH: Do you have an October 2nd?

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I'm going on the agenda.

17 MS. HSIEH: Draft of the minutes. Yes, he did.  
18 Okay. No change.

19 MR. BROOKOVER: So these are the February 21  
20 meeting notes that we're referring to now. I looked  
21 through them. I thought they were complete. I didn't  
22 see anything wrong.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you. So any --  
24 I guess no objections, the minutes of that meeting are  
25 approved, the February 21st meeting.

1 MR. BROOKOVER: I'll move we approve the  
2 February 21st meeting.....

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

4 MR. BROOKOVER: .....agenda.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Meeting notes, yeah.

6 MR. POURCHOT: Didn't we already do that?

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: That's what we just did.

8 MR. BROOKOVER: I'm sorry.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We'll catch up.

10 MS. HSIEH: I don't know if this is the  
11 appropriate time to say we usually have a PAC Chair  
12 comment, but on behalf -- do you wish me to make a big  
13 announcement.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Go ahead.

15 MS. HSIEH: We did have a PAC meeting scheduled  
16 for the 3rd of October, and unfortunately because the  
17 Federal Government shut down, we were required to  
18 cancel the meeting. Also because of the Federal FACA  
19 rule it's my understanding as well that we couldn't  
20 then solicit, once the government reopened, individual  
21 comments from the PAC, because they are supposed to act  
22 as a PAC under those rules. That said, that doesn't  
23 mean that individual PAC members couldn't on their own  
24 time, for example, participate in public comments as  
25 any other member of the public. But as the restoration

1 office, we couldn't sort of solicit them individually  
2 in a way that we don't typically do with other members  
3 of the public.

4           So I just wanted to let folks know that it  
5 wasn't that we -- I mean, we definitely value the PAC,  
6 and we were in a very unfortunate circumstance. Next  
7 year we'll be looking forward to an in-person meeting,  
8 which we usually do every other year, but because this  
9 year was canceled, we'll have an in-person meeting. We  
10 also look forward to the PAC's involvement in the 2015  
11 science workshop in the spring, a session for the PAC  
12 as well, which will be in person. So we look forward  
13 to those gatherings next year.

14           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thanks, Elise. Okay.  
15 Now we'll open it up for public comment. Any members  
16 of the public want to make a comment on anything that's  
17 not on the agenda. Anybody on the phone want to make a  
18 public comment right now.

19           MS. BAKER: Yes, this is Tori Baker. I'd like  
20 to make a comment.

21           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes, Tori. Go ahead,  
22 please.

23           MS. BAKER: Hi. Good morning, everybody.  
24 Yeah. I just wanted to take this opportunity to say  
25 hello to everybody there working so hard. I've stepped

1 in and out of this process myself both as a citizen and  
2 as a member there with the PAC.

3 I just want to say that it's a really great  
4 agenda to see all the work and all of the pivotal times  
5 that you are with most of these projects. I just  
6 wanted to say that both the long-term herring projects  
7 and the long-term monitoring projects obviously have  
8 been built on a lot of many, many, almost decades of  
9 work. And I'm just really glad to see that both of  
10 them are moving ahead with such sharp focus. And I just  
11 wanted to offer up my support for both of those and the  
12 way that they have been presented out to the public at  
13 present.

14 Specifically I wanted to speak about project  
15 120112 or 120112-A, the Eyak-Cordova Clean Harbor project.  
16 That project has been back and forth to you folks now a  
17 couple of times. And I just want to say that I've been  
18 working with the community components of that project  
19 with a long-term -- well, we've called ourselves the  
20 Cordova Safe Harbor Project. And I just want to say  
21 that the Natives of Eyak have stepped forward, and it's  
22 a very -- well, very good at working at these projects,  
23 and that we feel here that they are a good leader for  
24 this particular project.

25 I just wanted to again reiterate that I think

1 that the NOAA staff as a group are helpful for us, to  
2 clarify the things that we want to do under this. And  
3 it has wide community support. And I just ask for  
4 continued support and look forward to working with the  
5 -- with staff on this further as necessary.

6 So thanks for the opportunity to comment, and  
7 stay dry up there.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Oh, it's pretty wet, but  
9 thanks, Tori. We do appreciate everybody in Cordova's  
10 working on those projects and getting back to us on the  
11 questions we had from the last meeting.

12 Okay. Any other public comments.

13 MS. PATTON: Hi, this is Ivy Patton with the  
14 Native Village of Eyak.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, please go ahead,  
16 please.

17 MS. PATTON: I'd like to thank Tori there for  
18 her recognition. And I would like to also have this  
19 opportunity to offer to work with staff on any concerns  
20 that have been raised. And also to offer to stay on  
21 the line to answer questions after the item 11 on the  
22 agenda. And I look forward to working with the EVOS  
23 Trustee Council on this project.

24 That's all.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you.

1 MS. PATTON: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Anyone else, please.

3 (No comments)

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. That sounds like  
5 everybody that wanted to make public comments. Thank  
6 you. And we'll go onto the Executive Director's  
7 report.

8 MS. HSIEH: Thank you. We have two items. As  
9 we've discussed in prior meetings, we've been updating  
10 policies. I think we started about a year and a half  
11 ago, and we keep tweaking them.

12 They hadn't been touched in many years, and so  
13 large formatting changes continue to be made where we  
14 take the former narrative paragraph style and create  
15 citations. Many thanks to Carrie Holba for this really  
16 sort of difficult, time consuming detail work.

17 And also we're trying with the reporting policy  
18 and the financial policies to create policies which  
19 dovetail well with the long-term program so that we're  
20 responsive both to the science panel and the Trustees  
21 and our staff in obtaining information that's necessary  
22 to review the program, but also not burdening the  
23 programs with too much reporting. So I also want to  
24 thank the programs working with us as we continue to  
25 evolve the policies. And I think you'll continue to

1 see that, but I think we're slowly getting closer.

2           We're also -- we'll also be working on some  
3 more guidance on the annual proposals for the long-term  
4 programs to clarify what information would be helpful,  
5 and maybe another discussion on how that dovetails with  
6 the reporting which is due simultaneously at that same  
7 time. So those discussions continue, and the changes  
8 here are sort of -- I guess I call them sort of  
9 administrative in nature. They have been reviewed by  
10 the long-term programs, the staff, et cetera.

11           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any questions for  
12 Elise on the revisions to the financial procedures.

13           MR. BROOKOVER: Elise, I looked through the  
14 redlines and they look fairly innocuous. Inserting the  
15 word project and.....

16           MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

17           MR. BROOKOVER: .....making some changes to  
18 reflect the programs. Have we gotten any -- have any  
19 issues arisen through discussions with the groups you  
20 mentioned?

21           MS. HSIEH: I think we're going to continue to  
22 discuss reporting, because -- you know, sort of trying  
23 it out. We try language out and that sort of thing.

24           But with regard to the financial policy  
25 revisions, there were several made late last week that

1 really were just formatting the program versus policy.  
2 Thanks to Veronica for pointing out some things. We  
3 also talked to Max Mertz and Dede who were very  
4 helpful in looking at our language, because we've  
5 changed fiscal years and looking at end of year  
6 expenses for Federal agencies to make sure people had  
7 enough time to get those numbers in. So that's what  
8 you see reflected there.

9 Another thing is with our policies, for example  
10 the reporting policies that you all adopted, the  
11 version you adopted in February, you know, we worked with  
12 the programs so that if people are sending something in  
13 that's, you know, not quite -- you know, the policies  
14 came in days before the reporting came in, so we're not  
15 applying these in a strict sense at this point, because  
16 these are years of adjustment where we're establishing  
17 the programs, establishing the policies. So I don't  
18 think you're going to see people who are sort of dinged  
19 because they haven't, you know, crossed a T as per the  
20 policy. We're really trying to develop it with the  
21 programs and make it work for everyone. And the  
22 programs have been very responsive, and have worked  
23 very hard to get us information that we're interested  
24 in, and I think we're still -- you're still seeing some  
25 growing pains on that end, because it's all new for

1 everybody.

2           But, yeah, the changes I don't think are  
3 largely substantive or of a concern to the trustees is  
4 my understanding. And you'll probably see them again,  
5 because we keep tweaking some stuff.

6           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So do we need a motion on  
7 that, or.....

8           MS. HSIEH: You do.

9           MS. MARCERON: I move we approve the revised  
10 reporting policies, dated August 29, 2013.

11          MS. SCHORR: Second.

12          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any discussion.

13          (No comments)

14          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Anybody opposed to the  
15 motion.

16          (No comments)

17          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Seeing none, the motion  
18 carries. Okay. So that was the reporting policy. And  
19 we have -- need a motion, too, on the changes to the  
20 financial policy.

21          MR. BROOKOVER: I'll move that we approve the  
22 financial policy. The version I have most recent is  
23 dated October 24th.

24          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: 25th.

25          MR. BROOKOVER: Well, it says 24th on the

1 cover.

2 MS. HSIEH: Our latest draft's October 25th.  
3 There were I think a couple of last minute very small  
4 changes to program projects.

5 MR. BROOKOVER: Oh, okay.

6 MS. HSIEH: Sorry. It was happening in a very  
7 delayed time. I'm sorry about that.

8 MR. BROOKOVER: Well, 25th it is.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Second?

10 MS. MARCERON: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any discussion.

12 (No comments)

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any objections.

14 (No comments)

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Motion carries. Do you want  
16 to introduce the asset fund allocation?

17 MS. HSIEH: We have -- annually the Trustee  
18 Council reviews the investment fund asset allocations.  
19 In some years, such as 2008/2009, it can be a very  
20 substantive discussion with difficult choices. This  
21 year it's a little more straight forward as the markets  
22 have been more consistent.

23 We have on the phone Mike O'Leary of Callan &  
24 Associates, who's our independent investment advisor,  
25 to review in summary the investments presentation which

1 is in your packet. And we also have Bob Mitchell of  
2 the Alaska Department of Revenue on line to answer any  
3 questions. The investment funds are invested through  
4 the Alaska Department of Revenue, and we work with Bob  
5 closely on rebalancing and also the use of funds. I  
6 appreciate both of their support. Excellent team.

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hey, Michael, did you want to  
8 go over the asset allocation?

9 MR. O'LEARY: Yes, sir. For those with the  
10 presentation of that, I'll refer to the page numbers.  
11 And I understand the time allocated is only 15 minutes,  
12 so I'm going to skip more pages than I cover.

13 On Page 4 there are a couple of graphs and a  
14 series of numbers that -- in the lower part of the page  
15 that detail the economy's been growing, but that the  
16 growth has been sluggish, but certainly inflation has  
17 not been a significant issue nor do most -- the  
18 forecast is expected to be over the next couple of  
19 years.

20 If you go on to Page 6, this page contains a  
21 graph of the U.S. Treasury yield curve at three  
22 different points in time. The greenish line for those  
23 who have color copies, it depicts the yield curve as of  
24 the end of June of 2013. You can see that rates rose  
25 significantly from where they had been at the end of

1 March, and from June of 2012.

2           If we go on to Page 7, we'll get into each of  
3 the funds, and as I go through the funds, I'll describe  
4 the various major asset class performance. Page 7 is  
5 simply a comparison of the June 30 market values for  
6 each of the funds in contrast with the 12/31/12 market  
7 values.

8           If we go on to Page 8, you'll see a breakdown  
9 by asset category for each of the funds. And the  
10 appropriate frame of reference is your policy target  
11 which is the same for each of the funds, and that  
12 envisions a 47 percent domestic equity commitment, a 30  
13 percent U.S. investment grade bonds, and a 23 percent  
14 international allocation. You're very close to those  
15 target allocations, and the slight variance is  
16 primarily attributable to the strength of equities and  
17 the relative weakness in fixed income that we've seen  
18 thus far in 2013.

19           If we go on to Page 9, you'll see the  
20 performance for each of the funds for various  
21 cumulative periods, all ended June 30, 2013. And we  
22 also present the since inception returns for each of  
23 the funds. It's important to note that for all periods  
24 of a year or longer, each of the funds has done  
25 slightly better than the target index.

1           If you go on to Page 10, we show the same  
2 numbers in the middle of the page. At the bottom of  
3 the page we show the return numbers for the various  
4 market indices that I used to build the composite  
5 index. And I just note that it was the 12 months ended  
6 June 30 were exceptionally strong for U.S. stocks, a  
7 little bit less strong, largely because of currency for  
8 international stocks, and negative for bonds as a  
9 result of the rise in interest rates over that 12-month  
10 period. That's looking at the one-year number.

11           If we move all -- I'm going to pass over all  
12 the pages until Page 22. And I note that what the page  
13 in between show is the comparative performance of each  
14 of the major portfolio components, domestic stocks,  
15 international stocks, and bonds, relative to a peer  
16 group, an appropriate peer group and the specific  
17 market index. And in all cases the performance has  
18 been very good.

19           And I'm happy to come back to it, if there are  
20 time or questions, but I want to move ahead to Page 22,  
21 and briefly summarize our capital market projection  
22 process. I won't read it to you on Page 22. It is the  
23 same process that we've used for more than a decade.

24           If we go on to Page 23, the take-away from this  
25 page is really the focus on where are interest rates

1 going to go as we're sitting here, sitting in 2013, and  
2 thinking about where long-term interest rates should  
3 be. Despite the fact that they have reason in the 12  
4 months ended June 30, we do expect them to over a 10-  
5 year period to return to a more normal level. And that  
6 suggests that there could be some periods of discomfort  
7 and negative returns as that adjustment takes place.

8           If you go to Page 24, we have a few comments  
9 about equities. And I'd highlight the second bullet  
10 point, which is that equity valuations currently are  
11 moderate, but they're not cheap. And these were the  
12 comments that we made when we developed our long-term  
13 forecast. Subsequently the markets have been strong,  
14 and so at this state we'd say that they're slightly  
15 over-valued, but not by a significant amount.

16           Moving ahead to Page 26, this is a reminder  
17 graph that shows you how radically interest rates have  
18 changed since 2001, and the last plot is as of the end  
19 of 2012. They're not significantly different than that  
20 last plot today.

21           Now, if we go on to Page 28, you'll see our  
22 projections for each of the major asset classes. These  
23 are a 10-year geometric mean return calculations. What  
24 I'd call your attention to is that they're  
25 comparatively modest. They are slightly lower than

1 they were last year. Of course, the equity markets  
2 tend to have greater risk as measured by standard  
3 deviation of returns, annual -- that's an annualized  
4 number, standard deviation of expected returns. And  
5 you'll also note that our long-term bond expectation,  
6 return expectation is two and a half percent. So  
7 significantly lower.

8           If you turn on to Page 29, you'll see that  
9 these projections are essentially the same as those  
10 that were used last year. A slight decrease in the  
11 expected return for stocks, and a more significant  
12 decrease in the expected return for bonds. Our  
13 inflation expectation remains unchanged at two and a  
14 half percent.

15           If you go on to Page 30, this is a very busy  
16 table. Up at the top are the restatement of the  
17 expected returns for the major asset classes. We used  
18 an optimizer driven by those inputs and also a  
19 correlation matrix, which I won't bore you with, to try  
20 to model your current policy and then alternatives that  
21 the optimization model would suggest would be efficient  
22 alternatives.

23           If you just flip to Page 31, you'll see the range  
24 in policies considered from low risk -- the lower risk  
25 to higher risk, but higher return. Your policy is

1 literally on top of mix No. 2. So it appears to be  
2 efficient. So that's your existing policy.

3           If you then -- we can skip ahead to Page 34  
4 where we look at the implications of your policy over  
5 different time periods, and each bar represents -- the  
6 first bar represents the range of returns that would be  
7 consistent with our statistical inputs for a one-year  
8 period. If the policy were maintained, and the long-  
9 term estimates remained unchanged, the bar would narrow  
10 significantly over five years, and narrow further over  
11 10 years.

12           Down at the bottom of the page you'll see  
13 probability that the return would be above seven and a  
14 half percent in a one-year period using our inputs,  
15 would be just under a 48 percent chance, so not even a  
16 majority probability that you would earn the seven and  
17 a half percent return. The probability that the return  
18 will exceed two and a half percent, so exceed the rate  
19 -- or what we expect to be the rate of inflation, is  
20 greater. It's 63 percent in a one-year period, and if  
21 we look at the 10-year number, it improves to 84  
22 percent.

23           So the bottom line is that since our  
24 expectations by major asset class have not changed  
25 significantly, we would recommend that the policies be

1 maintained. I further note that each of the three  
2 building blocks that you use to implement the policy  
3 through the Department of Revenue, the U.S. Stock Index  
4 Fund, and actively managed international portfolio, and  
5 a bond fund managed by the Department of Revenue all  
6 are worthy of continuation.

7           So it's always a pleasure to be able to come  
8 and report that returns were strong, that the policy  
9 doesn't need to be tweaked, certainly not in the near  
10 term from our perspective.

11           And with that I'll conclude and be delighted to  
12 take any questions that you may have.

13           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thanks, Michael. So  
14 the way I read it is we're looking at about a four  
15 percent real return if we stay with the current asset  
16 allocation and don't take on more risks?

17           MR. O'LEARY: That's correct. Four to five  
18 percent, not quite five percent.

19           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you. Let's see,  
20 Pat, do you have any questions?

21           MR. POURCHOT: Yeah. Thank you very much for  
22 the presentation. I was trying to find the breakout in  
23 your probability analysis for just the bond component.  
24 What -- and the question I guess I'm looking for is  
25 what are the probabilities that the bond component will

1 exceed the 2.5 estimated inflation rate?

2 MR. O'LEARY: That's a very fair question. And  
3 let me refer you to Page 28. And you'll see, if you  
4 look at the -- find the B/C aggregate and the projected  
5 return there at two and a half percent, you'll see the  
6 projected standard deviation of 3.75 percent. So one  
7 way of looking at it would be to say that the return  
8 could easily be between two and a half percent plus  
9 3.75, or two and a half percent less 3.75. And, of  
10 course, there's -- that only deals then with two  
11 standard devia -- with a standard deviation, and you  
12 could double the projected risk and have 95 --  
13 basically a 95 percent range of coverage.

14 Does that address your question? Is that  
15 clear?

16 MR. POURCHOT: It may have addressed the  
17 question, not in a way I understood it though.

18 (Laughter)

19 MR. POURCHOT: So what.....

20 MR. O'LEARY: Basically what we're expecting is  
21 that rates will rise sometime in the first five of the  
22 next 10 years. And that then they'll tend to be more  
23 stable. So that's the pattern, the path. There are,  
24 of course, numerous different ways that that could  
25 occur, which would have significant consequence on the

1 five-year return.

2           From a 10-year perspective, it would, and this  
3 sounds perverse, we'd probably be better off if the  
4 rate increase occurred substantially at the front end  
5 of the 10 years, because then we would be receiving a  
6 higher level of income throughout the remainder of the  
7 10 years. So not only do we just have a single point  
8 forecast, but we do a lot of analysis of, I'll use the  
9 term scenario testing, but of arriving at the various  
10 paths, interest rate paths that could lead to that  
11 consequence -- to that number.

12           MR. POURCHOT: So in follow-up, if you looked  
13 at the graph on Page 32, and rather than the mix  
14 that's called current policy where you have identified  
15 a 7.5 percent and a 2.5 percent line through there with  
16 a corresponding 44 and 76 number, if that -- instead of  
17 current policy, if that just said, domestic bonds, or  
18 the B/C aggregate, what would those numbers be?

19           MR. O'LEARY: The median line which in this  
20 graph begins at 6.2 and goes up in mix 5 to 7.4, would  
21 -- if we were just looking at the B/C aggregate, the  
22 median line would be close to two and a half percent.  
23 And the range around it would be -- I don't even want  
24 to guess at it off the top of my head, but we would --  
25 the range would be a much more compressed range around

1 that lower level, and the probability of earning more  
2 than two and a half percent would be much lower. And  
3 it would be essentially no probability of earning -- a  
4 zero probability of earning seven and a half percent.

5 MR. POURCHOT: And the inverse then, what would  
6 be the probability of over the five-year period earning  
7 less than 2.5 percent.

8 MR. O'LEARY: Over a five-year period, that  
9 would be -- it could easily happen in a year. It  
10 already has happened during the year that ended June  
11 30, during that 12-month period. And I --  
12 realistically, I don't think that we could -- we would  
13 not expect anything below a zero rate of return over a  
14 five-year period with our assumptions.

15 MR. POURCHOT: Well, that's not the question  
16 I'm asking. Not zero return. I'm asking about 2.5  
17 percent return.

18 MR. O'LEARY: Well, there'd be a 50 -- there  
19 would be a 50 percent -- basically a 50 percent  
20 probability that the return would be below two and a  
21 half percent.

22 MR. POURCHOT: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Let's see, Michael, this is  
24 Larry Hartig again. And I should remember this. Maybe  
25 Bob would answer this question, how we manage our

1 bonds. I mean, we would be spreading our investment,  
2 reinvestment out over time, so we would be capturing  
3 changes that would be occurring during that 10-year  
4 period. I don't know if the approach we have to our  
5 buying and selling bonds is the right one. I assume it  
6 is, but do you have any suggestions or comments on  
7 that?

8 MR. O'LEARY: It's -- the approach that you  
9 have and that Bob employs, I should let him speak for  
10 himself, is to have a well-diversified, high quality  
11 portfolio, and to the extent assets are not withdrawn  
12 for other purposes, of course, as bonds mature and as  
13 income is received, it is reinvested. And so that may  
14 be advantageous in that it could be -- should rates  
15 rise, be reinvested at higher yields.

16 Bob, have I misspoken?

17 MR. MITCHELL: No, I would echo that.

18 One other comment I would make regarding the  
19 fixed income focus is that I would just comment that  
20 fixed income plays a role in the broader portfolio of  
21 dampening the overall volatility of expected returns,  
22 particularly in the short run. And what the analysis  
23 that you're seeing on Page 32 doesn't factor in is the  
24 fact that this portfolio is -- has cash flows that are  
25 going out each year. And to the extent that there were

1 a dramatic down year -- let's say, you know, at the  
2 extreme, if the fund was invested entirely in equities,  
3 and equities had a very negative return over the next  
4 year, the fund would be experiencing outflows from a  
5 much lower base. And as a result, if we had a big down  
6 year followed by a big up year, the portfolio would be  
7 lower in market value, because of the outflows that  
8 occur during the down period that weren't available to  
9 participate in the up period. So I just want to  
10 highlight that the analysis on Page 32, and, Mike  
11 O'Leary, please correct me if I'm wrong, doesn't really  
12 assume any outflows from the portfolio, but the  
13 portfolio is experiencing outflows. And so I would  
14 just highlight that to the extent that the expected  
15 range of returns or volatility increases for this  
16 portfolio, as it were -- as you become more aggressive  
17 in the allocation of the portfolio, you're also  
18 accepting the risk that the market value over time  
19 could range over a much broader range than what you  
20 might expect by looking at the chart on Page 32.

21 MR. O'LEARY: Yeah. And if I could get  
22 everybody to turn to Page 16 and 17, what this page,  
23 Page 16, demonstrates is the range of fixed income  
24 returns for what we classify as core bond portfolios,  
25 most of which are much more aggressive and return

1 seeking than what your portfolio is. And the return  
2 for your portfolio and the return for the Barclays  
3 Aggregate Index are plotted on Page 16 for all those  
4 cumulative periods.

5           If you turn to Page 17, we see the calendar  
6 period returns. And I call your attention to 2008,  
7 which was, of course, a horrific year for financial  
8 markets. But U.S. Government securities actually had a  
9 very strong return, and since this portfolio has -- is  
10 dominated by U.S. Government-related securities, it did  
11 comparatively well and did better than the index. But  
12 you'll see throughout that whole period, that whole  
13 decade if you would, returns have been comparatively  
14 moderate in their fluctuation. Hence my statement that  
15 it would be highly unlikely, even starting from today's  
16 low level of interest rates, for there to be a  
17 protracted period of negative total returns on fixed  
18 income, but they would certainly be lower than what we  
19 were -- what we enjoyed over the 10-years, and just to  
20 put a -- over the 10 years ended June 30th, 2013, the  
21 index had a return of four and a half percent. So  
22 expect the distribution to -- the index, were that to  
23 occur, would be clearly lower should rates rise, but  
24 the distribution would be comparable to the  
25 distributions that you see there in terms of the range

1 around them from high to low.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions, Pat?

3 No?

4 Well, I think it's very consistent with our --  
5 where we want to be in terms of the risk reward wrap  
6 there, you know. We are interested in capital  
7 preservation. We're not trying to make a killing  
8 either in equity or bond markets, especially these  
9 days.

10 We have a motion here which is basically the  
11 status quo; is that correct, Elise?

12 MS. HSIEH: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And if I could have a motion,  
14 then we can take any more questions on it once we get  
15 the second.

16 MR. BROOKOVER: I'll move we approve the asset  
17 allocation for FY14 as domestic equities 47 percent  
18 plus or minus 7 percent, international equities 23  
19 percent plus or minus 7 percent, and domestic bonds, 20  
20 percent plus or minus five percent.

21 MS. SCHORR: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion  
23 or questions on that.

24 (No comments)

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any objections to the

1 motion.

2 (No comments)

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hearing none, it passes.

4 Okay. Thanks very much, Michael and Bob.

5 Appreciate it as always, and thanks for the good

6 returns.

7 MR. O'LEARY: Yeah. I'll sign off. Have a

8 good meeting.

9 MS. HSIEH: Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you.

11 MS. HSIEH: Would the people who have joined us

12 in the audience who haven't signed in -- Cherri, is

13 there a sign-in form? I don't see it on the table. If

14 you would take a moment and sign in, that would be

15 great. Everyone else introduced themselves at the

16 outset of the meeting.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Should we go on to the

18 habitat program?

19 MS. HSIEH: The annual admin budget.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Oh, okay. Sorry.

21 MS. HSIEH: That's okay. And if Linda

22 Kilbourne would.....

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Go ahead, introduce

24 it.

25 MS. HSIEH: It's our annual admin budget, also

1 known as the APDI, and it's fairly straight forward,  
2 similar to in past years. You'll see the digitizing  
3 proposal that Carrie Holba administrates with ARLIS,  
4 which has been great. We're getting all of our records  
5 digitized slowly. Carrie's been very instrumental in  
6 that, and ARLIS has been very supportive and working  
7 quickly actually getting the projects done, so there's  
8 a year 2 of that.

9           And also you'll see the science workshop for  
10 the 2015, February, for the long-term programs. The  
11 majority of the budget is in here as well, because this  
12 budget runs through January 31st of 2014, right up  
13 against the workshop.

14           So those two things are of note. Otherwise  
15 fairly consistent with what you've seen in the past.

16           Linda, do you have anything to add about the  
17 budget or just take questions or.....

18           MS. KILBOURNE: Some of the numbers are a  
19 little bit higher this year, because of the rolling  
20 over contracts; we're renewing contracts, and that's a  
21 little bit of the increase that you see in the  
22 components.

23           MR. BALSIGER: I'm sorry, would you say that  
24 again? Instead of rolling them over, we're going.....

25           MS. KILBOURNE: We're renewing them. We're

1 starting fresh with them, so that's why your numbers  
2 are a little bit higher this year.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions, Jim?

4 MR. BALSIGER: Well, why didn't we negotiate  
5 them lower I guess.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. BALSIGER: Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead.

9 MR. BALSIGER: Can you remind me how long  
10 they'd more or less been stable, which might make it  
11 comforting to us to know they're only up a couple of  
12 percent?

13 MS. KILBOURNE: Oh, yeah. It's -- like the  
14 science portion of it, excuse me, it's not much. I  
15 didn't figure out the percent.

16 MS. HSIEH: It's the same amount as they've  
17 always been allotted every year, but.....

18 MS. KILBOURNE: Yeah, as it has been, yeah.  
19 We just.....

20 MS. HSIEH: Every two years, we're allowed to  
21 hold a contract with the State for.....

22 MS. KILBOURNE: We can hold it -- they'd prefer  
23 us to hold it yearly, which I didn't know about, so --  
24 and we had so much left over last year, I didn't.....

25 MS. HSIEH: It rolled over.

1 MS. KILBOURNE: I just rolled over what we had,  
2 because of the way things go.

3 MS. HSIEH: With regard to science last year  
4 was a little more fouled than most years, because the  
5 programs had just started so we didn't use up a lot of  
6 the science time.

7 MS. KILBOURNE: That's right.

8 MS. HSIEH: So we rolled over funds.

9 MR. BALSIGER: Okay. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. I mean, people in the  
11 front probably noticed too, but Jim Balsiger did  
12 arrive. Glad you made it up from Juneau, Jim, and now  
13 is seated for NOAA.

14 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Does this budget include that  
16 12,000 that we were talking about for the meeting on  
17 the long-term project?

18 MS. HSIEH: It does not. It can, and we can  
19 add it and amend it today, but there hadn't been any  
20 discussions on top of (indiscernible) or feedback.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We can add it later.

22 MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

24 MS. HSIEH: You can revise your motion for the  
25 APDI and up the numbers that amount, and then we'll add

1 the narrative in there.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: What we're talking about here  
3 is there will be some other items coming up later on  
4 the agenda that may have some budget ramifications to  
5 it. We may still go back and add some other things to  
6 this budget. Probably nothing major.

7 MR. BROOKOVER: Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Tom.

9 MR. BROOKOVER: I was just noticing the  
10 contractual costs on Page 5 decreased by it looks like  
11 a little over 30,000, and I was wondering what that was  
12 due to? I have 177 for FY13 compared to 145 for FY14.

13 MS. KILBOURNE: We removed some of our phone  
14 lines from the building, so that decreased our phone  
15 costs. The Council -- we -- what else did we reduce.

16 MS. HSIEH: Well, last year we moved as well.  
17 That was a lot of it.

18 MR. BROOKOVER: That's right.

19 MS. KILBOURNE: That was a lot, and remodeling  
20 costs.

21 MS. HSIEH: Well, not remodeling last year, but  
22 just the move, so that was a change. I think there  
23 were costs in the last year's budget for remodeling the  
24 space we're in to add a door.....

25 MS. KILBOURNE: right.

1 MS. HSIEH: .....to put us in compliance, which  
2 has not happened yet. Those funds are still rolled  
3 over?

4 MS. KILBOURNE: Yes.

5 MS. HSIEH: And still active.....

6 MS. KILBOURNE: Yes.

7 MS. HSIEH: .....even though they don't show up  
8 on this budget. That would be through USGS and we  
9 still have to add a door to office space and an air  
10 conditioner.

11 MR. BROOKOVER: All right. Okay. I wasn't  
12 thinking moving costs. They were pretty substantial as  
13 I remember.

14 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

15 MS. KILBOURNE: Yes, it was like 35 or so.

16 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Pat.

18 MR. POURCHOT: On the same -- maybe the same  
19 item, the office space. That kind of surprised me,  
20 that figure, and I don't know whether just lease or  
21 whether that's lease and renovations, but.....

22 MS. KILBOURNE: Just lease.

23 MR. POURCHOT: Just lease. My office is about  
24 the same number of people, and we pay half that price.  
25 And I was just wondering what your square footage was

1 that you were paying for.

2 MS. HSIEH: Would that be here?

3 MS. KILBOURNE: I don't think I did. I think  
4 it's in my other folder.

5 MS. HSIEH: I'm asking Dede, too. She doesn't  
6 have it here either. And we did.....

7 MS. BOHN: I can get that to him.

8 MS. HSIEH: And we talked about carving down  
9 the space even slightly, but the numbers would have  
10 been the same, so it didn't help us. We actually  
11 knocked on that door as well.

12 MR. POURCHOT: Uh-huh. We have about 3,255  
13 square feet including a conference room, and we pay  
14 \$2,477 a month compared to about \$7600.

15 MS. HSIEH: And that covers -- I believe the  
16 lease here as well covers mail services, copier,  
17 recycling, all sorts of -- it's all bundled in in this  
18 facility. However, the Trustee Council can't enter  
19 contracts for this lease. So for years it's gone  
20 through USGS. If the Department of Interior wanted to  
21 take us over and offer us cheaper space, then we would  
22 -- we're homeless orphans and we go to who will take  
23 us, so -- although we've been very, very happy in our  
24 space here. It's been a big improvement from downtown  
25 for us.

1           Are there other things in the lease that I'm  
2 leaving out, Dede and Linda? That.....

3           MS. KILBOURNE: Uhn-uhn. (Negative)

4           MS. HSIEH: .....was all the -- okay. Although  
5 (indiscernible - flipping pages) were substantial.

6           MR. POURCHOT: Mr. Chairman. Are we taking  
7 other questions on the budget?

8           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes.

9           MR. POURCHOT: I had another question that  
10 shows up on Page 10. I didn't -- I'm not following  
11 this travel for the long-term -- the workshop, and the PAC  
12 workshop. I mean, I read through it, but I'm not --  
13 I'm still not sure why is it that the 64,500 includes a  
14 lot of travel for the February 15 conference, or the  
15 February conference, when the funding is only through  
16 January 31st?

17           MS. HSIEH: Because those expenditures will be  
18 made in the autumn of 2014 is when we'd actually be  
19 making people's arrangement for.....

20           MR. POURCHOT: The travel is paid for February  
21 travel in advance?

22           MS. HSIEH: Yes.

23           MS. KILBOURNE: Yeah. To get the best deal with  
24 the State, you have to do it at least two weeks ahead  
25 of travel, and so that I can make sure everybody has

1 the flights they need, they have their accommodations  
2 and everything, we always do it at least two to three  
3 weeks ahead.

4 MS. HSIEH: Really we usually do it about.....

5 MS. KILBOURNE: A month.

6 MS. HSIEH: I mean, to get on people's  
7 schedules and get their flights, we usually do it at  
8 least a month or more ahead. We don't wait until 14  
9 days before people arrive.

10 MR. POURCHOT: I guess I understand the  
11 reservation part.

12 MS. HSIEH: Okay.

13 MR. POURCHOT: Our system is a little bit odd,  
14 so that.....

15 MS. KILBOURNE: We're under that state travel,  
16 it's.....

17 MR. POURCHOT: Okay. So it's different  
18 than.....

19 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

20 MR. POURCHOT: .....because some -- when the  
21 transfer actually gets made, it is very close to the  
22 travel time.

23 MS. HSIEH: Oh. No, the State's different. The  
24 tickets are actually purchased and all the arrangements  
25 are made well in advance.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  So is this accrual?

2           MS. HSIEH:  Pardon me?

3           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  Is it an accrual?  I mean,

4  you're recognizing expense when you incur the

5  obligation versus when you actually.....

6           MS. HSIEH:  Correct.

7           MS. KILBOURNE:  Yes.

8           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  .....hand them the cash?

9           MS. HSIEH:  Correct.

10          MS. KILBOURNE:  Yes.

11          CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  Yeah.

12          MS. HSIEH:  If that was called accrual.

13          MS. KILBOURNE:  And we kind of roll into the

14  state fiscal year accounting systems, so all these

15  funds will be their state fiscal year, and that's why

16  it's okay for us to do this.  And it just makes it

17  easier just to top (ph) it now.

18          MS. HSIEH:  I don't think we could do it any

19  other way.  I don't think it's.....

20          MS. KILBOURNE:  No.  It would be a headache to

21  try and get everybody's schedules and plans and make

22  sure.....

23          MS. HSIEH:  The 1st of February for the 15th.

24          MS. KILBOURNE:  Yeah.

25          MS. HSIEH:  I doesn't work.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Travel would be less the  
2 following year.

3           (Laughter)

4           MS. HSIEH: Yeah. Yeah. All right. It's year  
5 three of the five-year programs. It was devised with  
6 the Trustee Council and science program and everyone  
7 when they talked about having five-year programs for  
8 the first time and delegating out administration,  
9 instead of having the trustees review 40, 50 individual  
10 projects every year. And yet the trustees wanted to  
11 have some sort of oversight and scientific gathering so  
12 it was framed at that time to have a year three science  
13 workshop where the science panel comes up, interfaces  
14 with the programs. The trustees attend as desired,  
15 which we hope they will. Also there will be a PAC  
16 session for the PAC to interface with the programs.  
17 And what we'd like to do is get the PAC on computer  
18 terminals and go to the programs' websites and learn to  
19 use the programs' websites, and where they can get  
20 information they can take back to their communities.  
21 So these were ideas, and framing of these five-year  
22 cycles that happened back in 2010. So that's the  
23 background for the year three science workshop.

24           MR. POURCHOT: So if there's a government  
25 shutdown, would be January or February in '15?

1 MS. HSIEH: That would be in January of '15.

2 (Laughter)

3 MS. HSIEH: However, this wouldn't be the  
4 public advisory committee, so we would likely -- even  
5 though we work from home because our office space shut,  
6 we would continue to soldier on, and we would have that  
7 if it has to be in my living room.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Jim, you had a question?

9 MR. BALSIGER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 So can you tell me how many meetings we're  
11 talking about?

12 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

13 MR. BALSIGER: I've lost track a little. A  
14 science workshop, a PAC workshop.....

15 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

16 MR. BALSIGER: .....a long-term science  
17 workshop, the PAC workshop mentioned again, and  
18 then.....

19 MS. HSIEH: Okay.

20 MR. BALSIGER: .....also it also says symposium  
21 up above.

22 MS. HSIEH: Okay. So you all have received  
23 twice now an outline, a separate document, of the  
24 science workshop which outlines the meeting. And what  
25 it is, is it's a one day and a half, two-day science

1 workshop for the science panel, and for the team, for  
2 the long-term programs to get together, have an agenda,  
3 et cetera, so you'll see the details on that workshop.  
4 And then the PAC would come in for three-quarters of a  
5 day at the end of the two days. So it would be almost  
6 a three-day meeting, two and three-quarters. The last  
7 three-quarters would just be the public advisory  
8 committee with the team leads and PIs for that session.  
9 So I had to name them separate meetings, but it's all  
10 one meeting. The word symposium should probably be  
11 taken out.

12 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you.

13 MS. HSIEH: Did that help?

14 MR. BALSIGER: Yes, it did.

15 MS. HSIEH: And I can resend you.....

16 MR. BALSIGER: That's what I thought.

17 MS. HSIEH: .....the outline, too, where it  
18 really goes over who's the participants, who's the  
19 audience, where is it, and actually a rough empty  
20 agenda, because we're letting the team leads lead with  
21 the actual substantive agenda items, but that outline  
22 can help you as well.

23 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you. I had that in mind,  
24 but when it mentioned workshop.....

25 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

1           MR. BALSIGER:   .....I thought it was a series,  
2 so I have it now. Thank you.

3           MS. HSIEH:   Yeah, it gets confusing. Sorry.

4           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   Okay. So are we ready for a  
5 motion?

6           MR. BROOKOVER:   Mr. Chair. You referred to  
7 another meeting for \$12,000 earlier on in the  
8 discussion. Can you refresh my memory?

9           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   I'll let Elise pick up on it,  
10 but we were talking about a way of trying to resolve  
11 some of the questions we had on the long-term  
12 monitoring program from the Science Advisory Panel I  
13 believe.

14          MS. HSIEH:   There's been some informal  
15 suggestions among individual trustees with regard to  
16 some of the data concerns for the long-term programs,  
17 that perhaps it would be helpful to have a meeting with  
18 folks, data folks, from the long-term programs as well  
19 as agency folks who deal with data, and that maybe a  
20 couple of science panel members maybe later in the  
21 spring, perhaps April for example, to get together for  
22 a couple days to review what the agencies and science  
23 panel would like to see from the data from these  
24 programs. We're at the outset of what could be a 20-  
25 year program. There's a lot of discussion about data

1 is now, the value of this sort of scientific monitoring  
2 versus in the past the Trustee Council really looked at  
3 final reports, and were quite focused on that aspect.  
4 So there was some informal discussion with regard to  
5 that. And we worked up a rough number of \$12,000 to  
6 facilitate, to fund a meeting such as that with, you  
7 know, 15 to 20 participants. I mean, if it gets too  
8 big, it becomes unwieldy, and also the need to clarify  
9 -- touch bases with the agencies and science panel and  
10 get real solid questions so the discussions are  
11 focused, because the data issue is so complex and we  
12 want to kind of keep the meeting very focused on  
13 getting an end product of what do folks want from the  
14 programs with regards to data.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. And I think I was kind  
16 of one of the starts of that. And the reason is I  
17 think that there's a lot of people working on  
18 accumulating the data and getting it so it's easily  
19 retrievable. And I just see it as this is a positive  
20 step just to make sure everybody's on the same page and  
21 that we're -- everybody's leveraging everybody else's  
22 resources appropriately, and everybody's comfortable  
23 contributing to it. I mean, just.....

24 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

25 MS. HSIEH: So if we were to do that, we would

1 add \$12,000 to the APDI budget. It would become part  
2 of our science budget, and we would put the meeting  
3 together.

4 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay. And earlier we talked  
5 about we could amend that at any time during the  
6 meeting. And I guess my thought is we may have more  
7 discussion about that under the long-term programs,  
8 would.....

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Uh-huh. That's wat.....

10 MR. BROOKOVER: .....that be appropriate?

11 MS. HSIEH: Yeah. If you make a motion now and  
12 approve the APDI for the number here, then we'll give  
13 you a new number if you're going to add to it with  
14 regard to something else.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. I think it might be  
16 better just to wait for the larger discussions. I  
17 don't know whether \$12,000 is the right number right  
18 now or not.

19 MR. BROOKOVER: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Others may -- haven't been in  
21 this discussion yet. Jim.

22 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm  
23 sorry, I should have apologized earlier for being late,  
24 and so thank you for going on without me. But did you  
25 -- is there -- maybe this number is old, but the number

1 in the motion doesn't match up with the number in my  
2 table notes. Is that because my material's wrong?

3 MS. KILBOURNE: Your APDI should be dated  
4 10/24/13.

5 MR. BALSIGER: So mine's -- I'm probably  
6 carrying an old copy around.....

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

8 MS. HSIEH: We.....

9 MR. BALSIGER: .....because I had some notes in  
10 it.

11 MS. HSIEH: The budget was -- the APDI  
12 increased last week as we indicated in our email to you  
13 with regard to.....

14 MR. BALSIGER: I got it. Thank you. Okay.

15 MS. HSIEH: .....the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
16 Service.

17 MR. BALSIGER: I didn't update this. Thanks.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I don't think we've  
19 had a motion yet, did we?

20 MS. HSIEH: Uhn-uhn. (Negative)

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Can we get a motion on the  
22 budget?

23 MS. SCHORR: I move we approve \$1,756,475,  
24 which includes GA, for FY14 funding of the annual  
25 program development and implementation budget project

1 14120100, revised as of October 24th, 2013.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you.

3 MS. MARCERON: I second.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you. Any other  
5 discussion.

6 (No comments)

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any objections to the motion.

8 (No comments)

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Seeing none, the motion  
10 passes. How are we doing on these? Keep going?

11 MS. HSIEH: Maybe knock this one out.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We'll keep going here  
13 and take a break soon. We'll go on to the habitat  
14 program.

15 MS. HSIEH: We have Samantha Carroll on the  
16 phone to lead us through with regard to the updated  
17 appraisal instructions, and then Phil Shephard is also  
18 here if there's any questions with regard to the Great  
19 Land habitat project, year 2.

20 First, the appraisal instructions, Samantha and  
21 Jen worked on them, so Jen may also want to add some  
22 information. I think the last time they had been  
23 revised, Jen, can you remind me of the date?

24 MS. SCHORR: 1994.

25 MS. HSIEH: Which is typical of the documents

1 we've been looking at. And I believe the changes that  
2 were made, there were references that were updated so  
3 that now they reference the most recent version of the  
4 UASFLA 2000 versus the 1992, and removed the updating  
5 report revision as there's no such thing, with an  
6 update appraisal under the new 2000 UASFLA. There were  
7 general edits. The number of report copies that the  
8 contractor provides at the draft stage was also  
9 revised. And these updated instructions would  
10 supersede the 1994 EVOS appraisal instructions and  
11 supplemental letter from Ms. Judy Robinson. The  
12 instructions were reviewed by the state, U.S. Forest  
13 Service, the DOI solicitor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
14 Service, DOJ, and The Great Land Trust.

15           So thank you, Samantha Carroll and Jen, for  
16 shepherding those updates. We look forward to using  
17 them.

18           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So we should take the motion  
19 up now?

20           MS. HSIEH: Correct.

21           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So we need a motion approving  
22 the update on the appraisal instructions.

23           MR. BROOKOVER: I'll move to approve the  
24 updated appraisal instructions. I believe the draft is  
25 October 28th.

1 MR. POURCHOT: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I've got a motion and  
3 a second. Any other discussion.

4 (No comments)

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any objections.

6 (No comments)

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No objections. Motion  
8 carries.

9 MS. HSIEH: Next on our list is the EVOS Great  
10 Land Trust habitat projects. The year one was reviewed  
11 in February. Again, those who have kept up on Trustee  
12 Council matters will recall that we're adding to the  
13 capacity of our habitat program, and The Great Land  
14 Trust has been very instrumental in this.

15 During year one, using data from the Kodiak  
16 prioritization completed early in 2013, The Great Land  
17 Trust met numerous times with key land owners in Kodiak  
18 and Anchorage. They've also met with our staff and  
19 former Trustee Council staff that has been very active  
20 in habitat.

21 And we have Phil Shephard here in the audience.  
22 I don't know if it might be helpful to have.....

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

24 MS. HSIEH: He can give a very brief update.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do you want to come up, Phil

1 and just kind of tell us -- yeah, give us an update on  
2 how things are going from your perspective.

3 MR. SHEPHARD: So I'm Phil Shephard with Great  
4 Land Trust.

5 And we've been working on this project since  
6 early this spring. We completed prioritization, and  
7 that's in your -- part of the report that's in your  
8 packet. There's some maps that we talked about last  
9 year, and so we've then done outreach to the landowners  
10 in Kodiak and Afognak. That scored high in the  
11 prioritization. And now we've actually started three  
12 appraisals with land owners, and they're large  
13 appraisals. Two of them have a significant timber  
14 component, so they're complex and rather expensive.  
15 But they're really high priority parcels, and so we're  
16 excited to be working with these landowners on these  
17 projects.

18 We've been out to these properties numerous  
19 times. Jen's actually been out on one of our trips  
20 just so that she could see, you know, which project  
21 we're working on, as well as staff from State Parks.  
22 And then we have met, as I mention in the report, with  
23 the realty staff at Fish and Wildlife Service  
24 especially just to kind of keep coordinating with them.  
25

1           And then actually the Conservation Fund,  
2 because the airport is expanding in Kodiak, and it  
3 could be there's some mitigation funding. One of the  
4 things we said in our proposal is that we will do our  
5 best to find other funds to match these funds such that  
6 we could do larger projects. And so in the case of the  
7 Kodiak airport expansion, there's funding available,  
8 and so if we could marry some of that funding with some  
9 Trustee Council -- you know, some EVOS funding, we  
10 could potentially do a nice -- larger projects near  
11 town there.

12           We did apply for funding through Fish and  
13 Wildlife Service, through the Fish and Wildlife Service  
14 program, for a project in northern Afognak, and that  
15 would be another effort to try and match. And then  
16 we're intending to do a Forest Legacy proposal, which  
17 is another federal funding source, to try and match the  
18 Exxon -- EVOS funding as well, probably in Afognak, but  
19 we'll see over the winter how that -- you know, which  
20 one is the best fit.

21           MS. HSIEH: I think they also -- another  
22 important footnote is for the year two proposal,  
23 there's an addition of prioritization for the spill  
24 area.

25           MR. SHEPHARD: Yes. So last year when we

1 presented the prioritization -- or six months ago, when  
2 we presented the prioritization, the Trustee Council  
3 requested that we expand the prioritization to include  
4 the entire spill area. So we are, you know, assuming  
5 that if you do fund this next year, we would do that.  
6 We would expand and, you know, include, you know, the  
7 whole spill area. And there's a number of projects  
8 that we keep hearing little bits about, but, you know,  
9 perhaps didn't work in the past that could come back  
10 up. And so, you know, we want to take a look at the  
11 whole spill area since, of course, that's the  
12 responsibility of these funds.

13 Any questions. Jen, do you want to put in any  
14 comments?

15 MS. SCHORR: No. Thank you though.

16 MR. SHEPHARD: Okay. All right.

17 MR. BROOKOVER: Phil, I remember the discussion  
18 we had last year.

19 MR. SHEPHARD: Uh-huh.

20 MR. BROOKOVER: And, you know, the first part  
21 of the project at that point was to develop kind of a  
22 prioritization.....

23 MR. SHEPHARD: Uh-huh.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: .....model I guess with a list  
25 of some criteria.

1           MR. SHEPHARD: Yeah.

2           MR. BROOKOVER: And I guess I'm just wondering,  
3 has that piece been completed then.....

4           MR. SHEPHARD: Yes.

5           MR. BROOKOVER: .....for Kodiak and Afognak?

6           MR. SHEPHARD: Yeah.

7           MR. BROOKOVER: So do we have kind of a list of  
8 potential parcels that might be available.....

9           MR. SHEPHARD: Uh-huh.

10          MR. BROOKOVER: .....and their rankings, or  
11 does the Land Trust have that now, or what.....

12          MR. SHEPHARD: What we did was we chose to do  
13 the prioritization not on a parcel level, but we just  
14 -- we did a half a kilometer of pixels across the whole  
15 archipelago, and then -- so rather than rank, you know,  
16 parcel A that's 1,000 acres against parcel B that's  
17 20,000 acres, we just did a grid across the whole. And  
18 then we used the, you know, criteria that matched as  
19 best we could with publicly available information to  
20 the priorities for Exxon Valdez funding. And then we  
21 ranked everything. And so the maps that are in the  
22 reports just basically show these gradations of red for  
23 those pixels, those half-kilometer pixels that scored  
24 the highest.

25 And then we went to the ownership maps, and actually

1 that was -- that took a bit of work to get correct  
2 ownership maps for that area, just because there's been  
3 some fairly significant changes in the last few years  
4 as the Afognak Joint Venture dissolved, and, you know,  
5 some other land ownership changes. So anyway we have  
6 as current as we can an updated ownership map. And  
7 then we went to the landowners that were in the areas  
8 that scored the highest, and, you know, talked to their  
9 boards or their staff and said, are you interested in  
10 doing a project? And then if they were, we continued.

11 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

12 MR. SHEPHARD: And then -- yeah, and there's  
13 another report that went -- there's --- because we're,  
14 you know, they're somewhat sensitive negotiations with  
15 private landowners, I was -- we were trying to be  
16 careful and respectful of those landowners and not, you  
17 know, put all that information out there. So we can  
18 talk with.....

19 MS. HSIEH: Right. As with a lot of our  
20 habitat negotiations, we don't necessarily bring it  
21 all.

22 MR. BROOKOVER: Sure. And I don't know  
23 that.....

24 MR. SHEPHARD: And I'm happy to share those  
25 things with you.....

1 MS. HSIEH: Right.

2 MR. SHEPHARD: .....one-on-one.

3 MS. HSIEH: Or in executive session.

4 MR. SHEPHARD: Yeah.

5 MR. BROOKOVER: Sure. You're probably working  
6 with Samantha pretty closely.....

7 MR. SHEPHARD: Uh-huh. Yes.

8 MR. BROOKOVER: .....on this? Okay.

9 MR. SHEPHARD: Uh-huh.

10 MR. BROOKOVER: I don't need to know all the  
11 details. I'm just curious about some of the things,  
12 like what the criteria were that you used in that  
13 in.....

14 MR. SHEPHARD: In the prioritization?

15 MR. BROOKOVER: In the prioritization. Again,  
16 I.....

17 MR. SHEPHARD: Yeah, we.....

18 MR. BROOKOVER: .....don't need the whole list.  
19 I'm just kind of curious of how it ranked. It seems to  
20 me like a good baseline in which to work in the future  
21 though.

22 MR. SHEPHARD: Uh-huh.

23 MR. BROOKOVER: I guess as conditions change,  
24 those -- just the rankings can change.....

25 MR. SHEPHARD: Uh-huh.

1           MR. BROOKOVER:   .....for each pixel on the map,  
2 but at the.....

3           MR. SHEPHARD:   Yeah.

4           MR. BROOKOVER:   .....same time as ownership  
5 changes and so forth, that could be useful in the  
6 future.....

7           MR. SHEPHARD:   It.....

8           MR. BROOKOVER:   .....just to go back and look  
9 at what might be available now that wasn't available  
10 earlier.

11          MR. SHEPHARD:   Yeah. The nice thing is,  
12 because of, you know, GIS, it's very flexible, and so  
13 as the anadromous waters catalog gets updated, we can  
14 add that beach that just got ranked as, you know, with  
15 this species of salmon, we can add it into this  
16 prioritization, and then -- because that is one of --  
17 of course, one of the layers, data layers that's in  
18 there. We used, you know, anadromous streams. We used  
19 anadromous diversity. We used the seabird nesting  
20 colonies. And so as any of those change or get added  
21 or subtracted, we can change that data.

22          MR. BROOKOVER:   Sure.

23          MR. SHEPHARD:   Yeah.

24          MR. BROOKOVER:   Okay.

25          MR. SHEPHARD:   You know, and so as we do the

1 one for the whole spill area, we haven't obviously  
2 started that yet, but I would, of course, be interested  
3 in meeting with those of you that, you know, have a  
4 special interest in certain areas, or I'm sure there's  
5 information that various folks have about these areas,  
6 because, you know, there's a lot of -- there's a wealth  
7 of information and data out there, and we just want to  
8 make sure we check in with the various agencies to make  
9 sure we haven't missed any.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thanks, Phil.

11 And so looking at the motion, the draft motion  
12 and the presentation, is this the right figure,  
13 \$270,789? That's the correct figure we should -- okay.

14

15 So I need a motion on The Great Land Trust  
16 budget here. Proposal. Pat.

17 MR. POURCHOT: Before I make the motion, let me  
18 just declare for the record that I once served on the  
19 Board of The Great Land Trust. I haven't in several years  
20 now.

21 MR. SHEPHARD: Five years, yeah.

22 MR. POURCHOT: Five years. I would move we  
23 approve funding for fiscal year 2014 of \$270,789, which  
24 includes GA, for fiscal year '14 funding of The Great  
25 Land Trust proposal dated September 1, 2013.

1 MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion.

3 (No comments)

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any objections.

5 (No comments)

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Motion passes.

7 MS. HSIEH: The next item is the Steward

8 Parcel. And Samantha Carroll is on the phone. She's

9 usually here in person to present. She under the

10 weather today. I don't know if -- Jen, if you think it

11 -- oh, do you have someone to present?

12 MS. SCHORR: Yes. Chris Little from the

13 Conservation Fund.

14 MS. HSIEH: Thank you very much. There is his

15 name right there, and I will not speak any further.

16 Thank you, Chris.

17 MR. LITTLE: Sure. Great. Thanks for having

18 me. So once again my name is Chris Little. I'm with

19 the Conservation Fund, and I'm here to talk about the

20 Stewart property.

21 We're asking the Trustee Council for \$525,000

22 to support our acquisition of the Stewart property,

23 which is an 82-acre surface estate on the lower Kenai

24 River. If awarded, this would be a one-to-one match

25 deal. The Conservation Fund would provide an

1 additional \$525,000 towards the acquisition costs,  
2 which was negotiated at a price below fair market  
3 value. This is a good deal for the Trustee Council to  
4 support. And importantly, this property contains  
5 important habitat for injured species and resources and  
6 services from the oil spill.

7           This 82-acre property is undeveloped. It  
8 contains about a half mile of river frontage on the  
9 lower Kenai, and it consists almost entirely of  
10 wetlands. It's one of those few remaining large tracts  
11 of undeveloped wetland river front properties on the  
12 lower Kenai River. The property contains habitat for  
13 numerous injured species on the lower Kenai, most  
14 notably pink and sockeye salmon, Dolly Varden, common  
15 loon, bald eagle, barrow's golden eye, river otter, and  
16 harlequin duck.

17           This acquisition also supports the recovery of  
18 injured services, which are important on the lower  
19 Kenai, most notably recreation, largely in the form of  
20 angling, tourism, subsistence, commercial fishing.

21           And also there's several other injured fish  
22 species, such as rainbow trout, coho, and Chinook  
23 salmon which the Stewart property provides habitat for.

24           Though many of these injured services and  
25 resources are considered recovered, we believe it's

1 important to continue to protect these essential  
2 habitats to maintain recovery objectives in the Kenai  
3 area, in the Kenai River area.

4           Threats to the Lower Kenai are real. As we all  
5 know, it's a very popular destination, and river front  
6 property is in high demand. And the Trustee Council  
7 has a long history of supporting habitat projects in  
8 this region, and the need for such support continues.

9           We do have significant support from the  
10 political, conservation, recreation communities for  
11 this award to the Conservation Fund. Both  
12 Representative Kurt Olson of District 29 and Senator  
13 Peter Micciche of District O wrote supporting letters  
14 to the Trustee Council on our behalf. Also Marie  
15 McCarty, Executive Director of Kachemak Heritage Land  
16 Trust, and Andy Loranger, Kenai National Wildlife  
17 Refuge manager, both wrote supporting letters. Also  
18 Ricky Gease, Executive Director of the Kenai River  
19 Sportfishing Association, wrote a supporting letter on  
20 our behalf.

21           Lastly, the Alaska Division of Parks and  
22 Outdoor Recreation identified this property as a  
23 priority property for conservation. When they heard  
24 that it was for sale, they contacted the Conservation  
25 Fund, and we do what we do best, we moved quickly and

1 decisively to purchase the property for protection.

2 That's all I have concerning this property.

3 Thanks for your time, and I'll be happy to answer any  
4 of your questions.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Pat.

6 MR. POURCHOT: This is maybe just a little off.  
7 We're going to have another parcel come up for  
8 discussion.....

9 MR. LITTLE: Uh-huh.

10 MR. POURCHOT: .....and approval next that I  
11 don't think you're involved in. But one of the  
12 questions that may come up on that is the cost of due  
13 diligence, and I know Conservation Fund does a lot of  
14 work in due diligence.

15 MR. LITTLE: Uh-huh.

16 MR. POURCHOT: And I can also appreciate it  
17 probably doesn't always relate to the size of a parcel.  
18 What are some of the activities that the due diligence  
19 would be involved in here on this parcel, and what kind  
20 of things might, you know, affect the increased due  
21 diligence costs?

22 MR. LITTLE: The appraisal would be -- is one  
23 of those due diligence costs. And the Conservation  
24 Fund would be willing to support that cost of the  
25 appraisal. As far as the remaining due diligence

1 costs, I'd have to refer to Samantha or Jen regarding  
2 this.

3 MS. HSIEH: I think there's a breakdown also.  
4 The hazmat, about \$10,000, title insurance, \$8,000,  
5 plus the 9 percent GA which is standard for all of the  
6 funds that the Trustee Council releases.

7 MS. SCHORR: And those due diligence activities  
8 are ones that are required for all Trustee Council  
9 acquisitions.

10 Samantha, do you have anything to add to the  
11 due diligence aspect?

12 MS. CARROLL: No, you guys covered it for the  
13 Council.

14 MS. HSIEH: So this, Jen, you would say seems  
15 to be in line with our typical activities regarding  
16 this.....

17 MS. SCHORR: Yes, with the added benefit on  
18 this parcel that the Conservation Fund is going to pay  
19 for the appraisal.....

20 MS. HSIEH: Appraisal.

21 MS. SCHORR: .....which is often the largest  
22 ticket item.

23 MS. HSIEH: Right.

24 MS. CARROLL: The Conservation Fund is also  
25 picking up the appraisal review, which is another item

1 of due diligence that is typical for our acquisition.

2 MS. SCHORR: Exactly. Good point.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Jim.

4 MR. BALSIGER: So that means the whole due  
5 diligence cost then is well more than the \$520,000,  
6 because the Conservation Fund is paying some  
7 unspecified amount?

8 MR. LITTLE: Sure. For the appraisal.

9 MR. BALSIGER: Appraisal.

10 MR. LITTLE: Yes. We don't know that number  
11 now, but it is something we will pick up in the future.  
12 Correct.

13 MS. HSIEH: It looks like approximately 25,000  
14 plus.

15 MR. LITTLE: Correct.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So -- oh, yeah, go  
17 ahead, Jim.

18 MR. BALSIGER: And so our motion is going to  
19 say 544, the paperwork all says 525 and you said 520,  
20 so do you know how much it is really?

21 MS. MARCERON: I think it's 525 plus the  
22 19,000.....

23 MR. BALSIGER: It seems like it's.....

24 MS. MARCERON: .....for the due diligence.

25 MR. LITTLE: Due diligence.

1 MS. MARCERON: That's why.

2 MR. BALSIGER: That gets to the 540. Thank  
3 you. I understand.

4 MS. HSIEH: 525 is.....

5 MS. CARROLL: Yes, that's.....

6 MS. HSIEH: Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead, Samantha.

7 MS. CARROLL: No, I was just confirming, yes,  
8 that is correct.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So I guess we're ready  
10 for a motion.

11 MS. MARCERON: Okay. I move we approve funding  
12 of up to \$544,620 to Alaska Department of Natural  
13 Resources for due diligence costs associated with the  
14 Stewart parcel, KAP 3011, and to fund the purchase of  
15 this parcel, conditioned upon the fair market value  
16 established by an appraisal falls within the range of  
17 900,000 to 1.2 million; secondly, due diligence reports  
18 are acceptable by the Alaska Department of Natural  
19 Resources and Alaska Department of Law; and, third,  
20 provided that the EVOS Trustee Council executive  
21 director, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, and  
22 Alaska Department of Law find it is in -- that it is in  
23 the best interest of the Council to move forward with  
24 acquisition of the parcel. The authorization for  
25 funding the purchase of this parcel shall terminate if

1 a purchase agreement is not executed by October 28th,  
2 2015.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you.

4 MR. BROOKOVER: I'll second.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion.

6 MR. BROOKOVER: Well, just from my standpoint,  
7 I think this is a good purchase for EVOS in several  
8 respects.

9 Because of the injured services on the Kenai River,  
10 particularly recreation and tourism, and the fact they  
11 depend on some of the injured resources from the spill,  
12 combined with the size of the lot. It's relatively  
13 large, at least in my experience, particularly for an  
14 area like the Kenai River, with a large footage of  
15 shoreline property with what appears to be pretty high  
16 value wetlands. So the purchased property to me seems  
17 like a very good one. And given that we'd be paying  
18 half of the purchase price, that sounds like a good  
19 deal. So that's what my thoughts are anyway.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Tom. Any objections  
21 to the motion.

22 (No comments)

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Seeing none, the  
24 motion passes. Thanks, Chris.

25 MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Appreciate the work with the  
2 Conservation Fund.

3           MS. HSIEH: The second parcel is the Beeson  
4 parcel, and it looks like we have Jack Blackwell from  
5 ADNR here to introduce this parcel. And it's --  
6 Trustees, also if you -- you can also use your meeting  
7 material, you know, that I sent October 2nd, it gives a  
8 summary of the parcel and a breakdown so that you can  
9 see in the narrative what the purchase price is, but  
10 then the total funding request and the breakdown of due  
11 diligence items were sent to you at that time in that  
12 sort of big beefy email that was intended to summarize  
13 items for you in a more overview fashion.

14          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Good. So are you ready for  
15 Jack or do you want to.....

16          MS. HSIEH: Yes. No, Jack, go ahead.

17          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Go ahead.

18          MR. BLACKWELL: Yeah.

19          MS. HSIEH: Sorry.

20          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead, please.

21          MR. BLACKWELL: Mr. Chair. Members of the  
22 Council. My name is Jack Blackwell. I'm with the  
23 Department of Natural Resources, and I'm the park  
24 superintendent for the Kenai Peninsula and Prince  
25 William Sound state parks. I appreciate the

1 opportunity to be here this morning.

2           The Department of Natural Resources supports  
3 the acquisition of the Beeson parcel. This property is  
4 located on the lower Kenai River and includes about  
5 4.59 acres. The owners are willing to sell for \$10,000  
6 plus due diligence expenses. The property's located at  
7 Mile 13.1 of the Kenai River, which is just south of  
8 Honeymoon Cove, for those of you who are familiar with  
9 the river. There's 674 lineal feet of Kenai River  
10 front. There's no improvements on the property, and  
11 most of the parcel is wetlands. The parcel abuts a  
12 small anadromous tributary which flows into the Kenai  
13 River and provides rearing habitat for coho and sockeye  
14 salmon.

15           Injured resources that would benefit from the  
16 parcel include pink, Chinook, coho, sockeye salmon, and  
17 Dolly Varden, bald eagles, harlequin ducks, barrow's  
18 golden eyes, common loons, cormorants, and river otter.  
19 Although many of the species are considered recovered,  
20 continued protection of their habitat is essential to  
21 maintaining recovery objectives of the Kenai River  
22 corridor.

23           The parcel contains wetlands and riparian areas  
24 important to injured resources, and acquisition will  
25 insure protection of these habitats. The wetlands and

1 riparian areas act as filter systems and nutrient  
2 providers for the Kenai River, which is important to  
3 the migration, rearing, and over-wintering habitat for  
4 Dolly Varden, Chinook, coho, and sockeye salmon. The  
5 river bank also supports spawning habitat for pink and  
6 Chinook salmon, and Dolly Varden. Continuous and  
7 intact riparian habitats are more effective at  
8 protecting a diversity of fauna and aquatic systems,  
9 providing good water quality while supporting a food  
10 web of injured resources. In addition, bald eagles,  
11 harlequin ducks, barrow's golden eyes, use the Kenai  
12 River as a habitat corridor.

13 Bald eagles and river otters frequent the area  
14 and utilize the undisturbed habitat on this parcel. And  
15 common loons and cormorants have been known to use the  
16 Kenai River as a corridor, as migration routes along  
17 the corridor.

18 Injured resources -- or, correction, injured  
19 services that would benefit from acquisition of this  
20 parcel include recreation and tourism, commercial  
21 fisheries. In recent years the Chinook salmon fishery  
22 has barely met escapement goals, and now it is even  
23 more imperative to protect Chinook salmon spawning  
24 habitat. As Chinook numbers have declined, injured  
25 services such as recreation that occurs, and the

1 commercial fisheries have become more dependent on  
2 other fisheries, and therefore it is extremely critical  
3 to ensure that Kenai River habitat is protected for all  
4 salmon species.

5 The property is also contiguous to two parcels  
6 to the south that were acquired by the Trustee Council  
7 in 1998. And the extremely low purchase price provides  
8 a very high cost benefit ratio for habitat protection.

9 Do you have any questions?

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Pat.

11 MR. POURCHOT: What actions would there be  
12 necessary to integrate the parcel into the Kenai River  
13 Special Management Area?

14 MR. BLACKWELL: Many of -- we are working on  
15 that at this time. Many -- we've acquired a number of  
16 parcels through the Trustee council over the years. We  
17 take those under our umbrella and park regulations  
18 would apply. So areas that may need some protection  
19 for habitat closures, we would take those actions.

20 MR. POURCHOT: You have the authorization to do  
21 that without further legislation.....

22 MR. BLACKWELL: Correct.

23 MR. POURCHOT: .....I guess that's my question.

24 MR. BLACKWELL: Yes. Yes, we do.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions for Jack?

1 Ready for a motion? Yeah, Pat.

2 MR. POURCHOT: Mr. Chair. It's this one. All  
3 right. I move we approve funding of up to \$36,160 to  
4 the Alaska Department of Natural Resources for due  
5 diligence costs associated with the Beeson parcel, KAP  
6 3012, and to fund the purchase of this parcel,  
7 conditioned upon: (1) due diligence reports are  
8 acceptable to the Alaska Department of Natural  
9 Resources and the Alaska Department of Law; and (2)  
10 provided that the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council  
11 executive director, Alaska Department of Natural  
12 Resources, and Alaska Department of Law find that it is  
13 in the best interest of the Council to move forward  
14 with acquisition of the parcel. This authorization for  
15 funding the purchase of the parcel shall terminate if a  
16 purchase agreement is not executed by October 28th,  
17 2015.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you.

19 MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion?

21 (No comments)

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any objections?

23 (No comments)

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Motion's approved.

25 MS. HSIEH: Thank you very much.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Jack.

2           MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you.

3           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I think we're at a good  
4 point for a break, so we'll take a 10-minute break, and  
5 then come back on the habitat or the long-term  
6 monitoring program.

7           (Off record)

8           (On record)

9           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We'll regroup here and  
10 get started again. We're talking about the long-term  
11 programs. Are you going to introduce that for us,  
12 Catherine?

13          MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Okay. Hello, everyone.  
14 Again my name is Catherine Boerner. I'm the EVOS  
15 science coordinator. I'll just do a quick summary of  
16 where we are to date.

17          We did not issue an invitation for fiscal year  
18 '14. We are continuing with the two five-year programs  
19 as well as some individual projects that came in,  
20 either they are continuations of existing programs, or  
21 they're projects asked for by the Council.

22          The Science Panel met in September to discuss  
23 all the proposals that have been received. They are  
24 very happy with the proposals. They're very engaged by  
25 them. There's a lot of excitement about them, which is

1 a great thing now that we're looking into year three  
2 that there is still that sense of we're on the right  
3 track and we're getting there.

4           There's always going to be a little bit of  
5 revision as we move forward. And the programs have  
6 been very open to that. There's been a lot of  
7 discussion about it. You know, like Elise had said  
8 earlier, talking about more of what might be useful to  
9 receive in proposals in future years, what kind of  
10 updates would truly be the most effective for us to be  
11 able to review the proposals as we move forward. And  
12 again that is an open discussion with the programs, and  
13 we'll continue that discussion.

14           What I'm going to do is instead of kind of  
15 going through a lengthy introduction, I think we'll  
16 start with the herring program, and Scott Pegau is here  
17 with us today to talk about that program. Again, the  
18 Science Panel did review, and they are satisfied, as am  
19 I and Elise with the progress of the project.

20           However, there was one project, and that was  
21 again data management, the Bochenek project that  
22 we've flagged as a potential conditional fund. I think  
23 there's a lot of concerns still about the quality of  
24 the data going into the program, how the data is being  
25 used, and what kind of direction the PIs are being

1 given when entering or accessing that data.

2           So what we'll do first I think before we get  
3 into the discussion, Scott has a very brief  
4 presentation for us to talk about the status of the  
5 program.

6           DR. PEGAU: Thank you very much for your time  
7 today, and I'm going to -- I'm right at that -- my  
8 glasses kind of thing where I need glasses this, and if  
9 I turn that way, I don't.

10           I'm just going to provide you a brief overview  
11 of the herring research and monitoring program that you  
12 have been supporting the last couple years, and it's on  
13 the proposal. This is meant to be just a very brief  
14 introduction with a couple of the highlights of things  
15 that we've had come up over the last two years.  
16 There's a lot of people involved with a lot of  
17 different organizations as you can see.

18           The goals of this is to improve predictive  
19 models of herring stocks through observation, research.  
20 And our primary predictive model that we are looking at  
21 right now is Fish and Game's age-structured analysis  
22 model. It's a program that -- or a model that's been  
23 in place for a very long time in Prince William Sound  
24 with the herring.

25           So there are four objectives. We want to

1 provide information to improve the age-structured  
2 analysis model. We want to inform the required  
3 synthesis effort that's coming up in this next year.  
4 We want to address assumptions in the measurements.  
5 When we went back and looked at all the different  
6 programs, we found assumptions that have been buried in  
7 the different measurement programs that we figured we'd  
8 better get these cleared up early. We also want to  
9 look at developing new approaches to monitoring, and  
10 quite honestly those are the most fun and exciting  
11 components in here. So I'm going to try my best not to  
12 get stuck on those, and they're kind of late in the  
13 presentation.

14           So the design of the program is it builds on  
15 the Sound Ecosystem Assessment Program that ran from  
16 '96 to '99, and '99 being the reporting year. And also  
17 the Prince William Sound Herring Survey Program, it was  
18 a predecessor to this which was 2010 to 2013, with a  
19 synthesis report and final reports that came in this  
20 past spring.

21           The project is focused on the Prince William  
22 Sound area. It's a mix of monitoring and process  
23 studies, and it's very dependent on the GulfWatch  
24 Alaska Program, so the Long-Term Monitoring Program  
25 being sponsored by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee

1 Council. We look heavily to them.

2           The other thing that we tried to do is be very  
3 responsive to the community and their interest as well.  
4 And I throw these pictures on here, the one on the left  
5 is a satellite view of Kayak Island, and it's on there  
6 because this spring I was asked, "can you see herring  
7 spawn from a satellite?" And it was a beautiful spring,  
8 so we went checking, and sure enough, that little spot  
9 on the upper side of Kayak Island turns out to be  
10 herring spawn as visible in the Modis satellite. And  
11 the picture on the right is what it looks like. And so  
12 you have to have a very unique set of conditions to be  
13 able to see the herring spawn, but it turns out that we  
14 had those unique conditions this year, and we observed  
15 spawn on Kayak Island in the satellite imagery on three  
16 days. One of those three days was two weeks after the  
17 primary spawn. And being able to take a look and find  
18 it, we were able to get -- Fish and Game was able to  
19 fly on one occasion to get out there, which is outside  
20 their normal survey area. And we were able to respond  
21 to the second spawn event, get a spotter pilot out and  
22 confirm that it actually was herring spawn.

23           So there are a lot of different projects that  
24 are involved. Some of them are five-year projects,  
25 some of them are one-year projects, and everything in

1 between. I have them color coded, because that tells  
2 me what objective they go do, and I'll kind of go in a  
3 little bit more of how these all come into play.

4           So that first objective is to provide  
5 information to the -- to improve that age-structured  
6 analysis model. And we have some monitoring projects  
7 which is just to provide additional input data.  
8 Disease prevalence surveys is supported under that.  
9 Adult biomass, particularly expanded adult biomass  
10 estimates beyond where Fish and Game is able to survey.

11           Juvenile index and age zero conditions, these  
12 are coming together because one of the big things with  
13 the age-structured analysis model is predicting that  
14 year class that you haven't seen yet. And so that's  
15 what we're trying to do.

16           We've also used aerial surveys. That was part  
17 of the herring survey program. There's a request for a  
18 supplement to keep these aerial surveys going. And one  
19 of the things that we did this year is we managed to  
20 get up there and fly. The very initial observations is  
21 that 2012 may be a very large year class that's coming  
22 down the road. You know, and the number  
23 76/77 was just an amazing year class that came out of a  
24 very small population. '99 was a very good year class.  
25 And right now 2012 looks like it could be somewhere in

1 that ballpark just from a simple count of schools seen  
2 in the month of June. We had been seeing about 150  
3 schools in 2011/2012. And we saw over 2,000 schools in  
4 2012 -- or '13, sorry. So it looks like 2012 is going  
5 to be a very good year. Of course, we have to wait two  
6 more years to find out if we're right.

7 But that's what we're trying to do. We're  
8 trying to get in that's going to help that.

9 MR. POURCHOT: Not to interrupt you, what's  
10 that? Is....

11 DR. PEGAU: Yeah, go for it.

12 MR. POURCHOT: .....is that a drone in the  
13 picture there?

14 DR. PEGAU: Now, that's the acoustic sled.

15 (Laughter)

16 DR. PEGAU: And one of those other projects is  
17 we have a remotely operated vehicle, because we found  
18 that the juvenile herring were hiding under the ice on  
19 us. And so now we're going to go under and try to  
20 chase them down to see if they're using that as a  
21 refuge.

22 MS. HSIEH: That's another agency, Pat.

23 (Laughter)

24 DR. PEGAU: Also to provide information,  
25 there's process studies, and these include determining

1 age at first spawn. You know, what is a maturity  
2 function of these herrings, which is a built-in  
3 component of the age-structured analysis model that  
4 we're trying to actually get a measurement of.

5           Look at the genetic stock structure. Are we  
6 looking at one stock or are there actually multiple  
7 stocks that are in the area?

8           And we actually are doing population modeling  
9 as well. So we've taken the age-structured analysis  
10 model, put it into another framework that allows it to  
11 be run in Abasian (ph) framework to give us more  
12 statistics, so we can take a look at all the different  
13 inputs and try to figure out what are the ones that are  
14 really the most important for being able to get the  
15 best estimates out of that model. And the modeling  
16 component is also working with some of the individual  
17 studies to figure out how to take things like the over-  
18 wintering energetics and then project it into what the  
19 future population might look like.

20           We're informing the required synthesis effort.  
21 There's a couple of different components that I  
22 associate with it, and one is the herring scale  
23 analysis. This is imaging a small portion of Fish and  
24 Game's herring scales and taking a look at growth  
25 patterns over time. So what the graph is, is the

1 growth in the first year of life of herring from 1980  
2 to 2006. So we're taking six-year old fish and looking  
3 at how they've grown each year, and this is the first  
4 year. And you can see there's some very distinct  
5 patterns. It's not very -- it's not random.

6           The other thing is, it's not related to  
7 recruitment. Our high recruitment years often show up  
8 in the lower growth years. So it may be very important  
9 for survival, but not for recruitment.

10           And so we're pulling together all the growth  
11 information, the energetics, along with this historic  
12 look to get a better idea of how all of our pieces come  
13 together. And also the data visualization and the data  
14 components that you have questions. Those are -- what  
15 we're trying to do is pull this together so that we can  
16 see all the different components at once, and how do  
17 they relate.

18           Addressing assumptions and measurements. This  
19 is very important, because there are a lot of  
20 measurements that are out there, and both the sea  
21 programs, the herring survey program, and what we are  
22 looking as we move forward. And we want to make sure  
23 that we're making high quality measurements. So there  
24 are several process studies.

25           The herring intensive looked at energetics and

1 growth throughout a year. So in the past what we are  
2 doing is sampling twice a year, November and March, and  
3 we've been assuming that the period in between was a  
4 period of fasting or no growth. But we wanted to make  
5 sure that that assumption was correct. So what the  
6 graph here is, shows RNA, the DNA, which is a measure  
7 of growth. So when the number is high, the fish is  
8 growing. As it goes down -- and you can see from  
9 November to March those fish aren't growing. So they  
10 are -- we have indications that that they are feeding,  
11 but it's not enough to actually allow them to grow.  
12 It's opportunistic and it's just maintenance level. So  
13 at least now we know we know that, yes, we are picking  
14 the right time of year. SEA program was sampling in  
15 October for the same energetics type issue, and we now  
16 know that you've got to be very careful with that data,  
17 because those fish were still gaining energy, still  
18 growing as they came through that.

19           The acoustic intensive is happening right now.  
20 They're just making sure that three nights in a row  
21 they can get the same estimate of those juvenile  
22 herring populations. And then go back two weeks later,  
23 do I get the same estimate. So how repeatable are our  
24 measurements. Putting a lot of effort into acoustic  
25 validation is, you know, trying to find out, you know,

1 not only we've got a signal, but what fish are  
2 associated with that signal.

3           Disease is another big component where a lot of  
4 the studies are addressing different assumptions.

5           Developing new approaches to monitoring.

6 There's three big one. The herring tagging project,  
7 which is -- the field components are all complete. The  
8 non-lethal sampling, which we were out last week doing  
9 some of the work with remotely operated vehicles, did  
10 some sonars, different camera systems. You know, how  
11 well we could identify the different fish.

12           And then disease forecasting. And disease  
13 forecasting is really important, because that's where  
14 we want to be is we don't want to be tracking what  
15 happened, but we want to be able to take a look and say  
16 what is the potential for a collapse of a fishery in  
17 the future due to disease. It seems much more  
18 important than being able to say, yes, we have 20  
19 percent Ichthyophonus today. You know, it's are those  
20 fish susceptible.

21           The graphic that you have actually comes from  
22 the tagging project. It's fish that were tagged in the  
23 Port Gravina area this spring. They actually put the  
24 detector array down three days after they finished  
25 tagging the fish, so some of the fish weren't observed

1 there, but we were able to follow those fish. You can  
2 see up to 35 fish detected in a day soon after the  
3 array was in. This year was very unusual in that it  
4 was very cold, and it broke up the spawning event into  
5 a number of different spawning events. And so where  
6 you see these peak numbers are associated with  
7 different times that we saw spawning. But we also  
8 found that when we went back six weeks later, there  
9 were still some of those fish in the area.

10           There's also -- we have a large array that  
11 curtains off Prince William Sound, and we found 41 of  
12 the 69 fish, including some that we didn't see in the  
13 Gravina area, because they swam away early, we saw them  
14 reach either Hinchinbrook Entrance or Montague Strait  
15 and be in that area. And they downloaded the data from  
16 those detectors in early September. And there had been  
17 this gap from July to early September where we hadn't  
18 seen fish, and right before we started picking up the  
19 detectors -- or downloading the data off the detectors,  
20 we started picking up fish again, which we are  
21 interpreting as they had gone out of Prince William  
22 Sound and were just coming back in when we did our data  
23 download.

24           MS. SCHORR: I'm sorry, Scott.

25           DR. PEGAU: Yeah.

1 MS. SCHORR: Can you remind me, please, how  
2 long do the tags operate?

3 DR. PEGAU: The tags are still operating,  
4 so.....

5 MS. SCHORR: Great.

6 DR. PEGAU: .....they were put in the first  
7 week of April, and we expect them to die in late  
8 November.

9 MS. SCHORR: Great. Okay.

10 DR. PEGAU: So as we go out on our November  
11 cruise, we're going to opportunistically try to see if  
12 any of the fish are hanging out in the major over-  
13 winter spawning grounds.....

14 MS. SCHORR: Great.

15 DR. PEGAU: .....as we do our surveys.

16 Coordination synthesis, outreach. Those are  
17 also very important components. There's programmatic  
18 synthesis that I'm in charge of. There's the NC (sp)  
19 synthesis that's also a major portion of the work  
20 that's coming ahead. We also are working hard to  
21 continually develop and update outreach materials. Our  
22 website for the herring program is on the bottom of the  
23 page.

24 In the synthesis, one of the things that came  
25 out of the previous work, and one of the things that

1 we'll be taking a hard look at is recruitment. You  
2 know, this is obviously very important to the recovery  
3 of herring in Prince William Sound. It's been shown  
4 that, and has happened many times in the past, that we  
5 can get large recruitments from very small adult  
6 standing stocks. This happened in -- 76/77 is probably  
7 the best known time period. '99 was another good one.

8           But one of the other features is the breadth of  
9 the recruitment, and the importance with other species.  
10 What's plotted in the bottom is the blue line is the  
11 estimated number of age three fish in Sitka. The red  
12 line is the estimated number of age three fish in  
13 Prince William Sound. There have been a lot of  
14 discussion about the fact that, you know, the Sitka and  
15 Prince William Sound cycled together through that 1988  
16 recruitment. And even though it's not as obvious  
17 plotted on this scale, if you look at the number from  
18 Sitka and Prince William Sound, the recruitment has  
19 actually been very close as far as their pattern  
20 throughout the time. You know, '99 was a big year for  
21 Prince William Sound, 2000 was a big year for Sitka.  
22 I'm willing to give them a year, being, you know, off,  
23 but the patterns are very good.

24           And one of the other things that was coming out  
25 like two, three weeks ago was that the recruitment

1 patterns in the herring were matching recruitment  
2 patterns in pollock. That big herring years tended to  
3 be the same years as big pollock years.

4 And so that's another one that is coming into  
5 the synthesis, is how do we pull all this information  
6 not only from Prince William Sound, but the surrounding  
7 geographic areas, and not only herring, but the other  
8 fish that we have knowledge of.

9 And with that, I'll take any questions that you  
10 might have.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Questions.

12 MR. BROOKOVER: Well, I'll start, Scott.

13 DR. PEGAU: Okay.

14 MR. BROOKOVER: First, thanks for the  
15 presentation, I thought that was a good overall  
16 summary, and, you know, I read through the abstracts  
17 and some of the project proposals and so forth, and I  
18 thought that captured it well.

19 I guess one comment I have is that the scope of  
20 the projects looks like it's still in line with the  
21 herring program that we lined out a couple, three years  
22 ago.

23 DR. PEGAU: Yes.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: If I remember right, last year  
25 we didn't have a lot of information on the herring

1 program, because projects were just starting, had just  
2 started several months before and there wasn't much.  
3 So this is the first interval that we have that we have  
4 with, you know, the progress report that you've  
5 provided.....

6 DR. PEGAU: Yeah..

7 MR. BROOKOVER: .....and the new projects and  
8 the draft work plan, so thanks for that. I think  
9 that's good.

10 I guess I have a question, and maybe it's for  
11 Catherine. Reading through the Science Panel comments  
12 on the projects, there were -- you know, the Science  
13 Panel pretty clearly related its priorities in terms of  
14 some of the projects, some of the population dynamics,  
15 the ASA model, obtaining -- what I think the Science  
16 Panel was referring to were estimates of abundance.....

17 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

18 MR. BROOKOVER: .....through the ASA model.  
19 And last week we received the responses from the  
20 herring research and monitoring program.....

21 DR. PEGAU: Uh-huh.

22 MR. BROOKOVER: .....and the long-term  
23 monitoring program. And some of the concerns that the  
24 Science Panel laid out, Catherine, I think earlier you  
25 said you were comfortable with where the projects are

1 right now for the most part.....

2 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

3 MR. BROOKOVER: .....with one possible  
4 exception?

5 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

6 MR. BROOKOVER: I'm not familiar with all of  
7 the nitty-gritty details of the projects, but I guess a  
8 question for you, Catherine, is, is that the case? Is  
9 -- from your perspective, are we still on track with  
10 the herring program as we laid it out and where the  
11 projects are at right now, and have those concerns been  
12 addressed from your standpoint?

13 MS. BOERNER: I believe so. I am comfortable  
14 with where the programs are. I do think that they're  
15 moving along in the original timeline that we had hoped  
16 for for that first five-year program. I think a lot of  
17 the Panel comments, some of them are, you know, things  
18 like attrition of personnel, you know, and Scott's  
19 painfully aware of, you know, we do have a lot of PIs  
20 that are unfortunately retiring and moving on to other  
21 opportunities. And I know that you're in the process  
22 of addressing that currently.

23 DR. PEGAU: Yeah.

24 MS. BOERNER: I think the Science Panel was  
25 overall comfortable with where they were. I think I'm

1 overall comfortable with where they are. I do think  
2 that the comments they've provided will help us  
3 continue to build the program for the last two years,  
4 and especially going into the synthesis year, which  
5 will be an important year for them.

6 DR. PEGAU: You know, from my side, I'm trying  
7 to keep them on the original five-year proposal as much  
8 as I can. I know that we're on that timeline.

9 MR. BROOKOVER: Right.

10 DR. PEGAU: And we're hitting it very good.  
11 You know, this -- we do have the attrition problem, and  
12 sometimes you can predict and sometimes you can't.  
13 When we can predict it, we do our best to try to plan  
14 for it and get it filled in in a very smooth manner,  
15 and when we can't predict it, you know, it's just part  
16 of life, you know. We work around it.

17 MR. BROOKOVER: Right. Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Jim.

19 MR. BALSIGER: Thanks, Scott. So relative to  
20 that attrition problem, was -- did you outline that in  
21 here?

22 DR. PEGAU: I did not outline in my -- the  
23 presentation. It is in the comments, because the  
24 Science Panel had recommended a post-doc program, and  
25 we pointed out like Michelle Buckhorn came in as a post-

1 doc under the herring survey program. So this was an  
2 example of us trying to transition someone into what  
3 Dick Thorne has been traditionally doing.

4           The other attrition was Tom Klein and that was  
5 a sudden departure that was unpredicted. And for  
6 those, you know, my reply is you can't -- if you can't  
7 predict them, you can't really set a post-doc up that's  
8 appropriate to be filling every different project. And  
9 so we do our best where we can, and then, you know, we  
10 work hard to fill in where we have to.

11           MR. BALSIGER: Thank you. I knew I had seen  
12 that, but I couldn't find it paging through here, but  
13 it's in the Science.

14           DR. PEGAU: Yeah.

15           MR. BALSIGER: Thank you very much.

16           MS. HSIEH: I think the Science Panel is very  
17 sympathetic to Scott's situation, and wanted to offer  
18 as much support, contacts and.....

19           DR. PEGAU: Yeah.

20           MS. HSIEH: .....resource and networking as  
21 possible, as well as the Science Panel has always  
22 suggested and supported the idea of a post-doc program  
23 for the programs to feed in -- of course, not for the  
24 unexpected loss, but.....

25           DR. PEGAU: Yeah.

1 MS. HSIEH: .....to feed in fresh folks and  
2 young scientists. And that's something that has not  
3 been funded by the Trustee Council, but is very  
4 supported by the Science Panel, and probably wouldn't  
5 be terribly expensive, so it's definitely something on  
6 our horizon. We -- during this five-year period, we've  
7 tried very hard, and the programs have done an  
8 excellent job of keeping to the original FY 12 budgets.

9 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

10 DR. PEGAU: Yeah. But internally both programs  
11 have in place -- we recognize that we have a bunch of  
12 people that are going to retire, and we want to be  
13 bringing even without knowing that there's a bunch of  
14 people about to retire, we want to bring in new people.  
15 So like in our modeling program, it is being run  
16 through a grad student, because we felt very  
17 comfortable that we had a very operational ASA model  
18 that Fish and Game provided us information from. And  
19 so we had a little bit more time to bring in and bring  
20 up a modeler in that respect. And so we've looked at  
21 each of the different projects and taken a look at how  
22 we can develop new people as well as the new tools.

23 MR. BROOKOVER: So at the inception of the  
24 program, one of the ideas we had was to develop a  
25 three-panel -- a three-member panel.....

1 DR. PEGAU: Yes. Oversight group.

2 MR. BROOKOVER: .....herring group.

3 DR. PEGAU: Yep.

4 MR. BROOKOVER: And one of the roles for that  
5 group was to provide guidance to the herring program.

6 DR. PEGAU: Yes.

7 MR. BROOKOVER: And I understand there have  
8 been some changes and now might be a good time, I just  
9 want to introduce Sherry Dressell in the front row.  
10 Sherry works for Fish and Game. And the Council a while  
11 back approved funding specifically to Fish and Game for  
12 assistance in working with the working group, but also  
13 working within Fish and Game to help the herring  
14 program in Prince William Sound in a broader context.  
15 So Sherry's on now. She's getting her feet on the  
16 ground. I believe she's met with you, Scott.

17 DR. PEGAU: Yes. She has provided -- we've had  
18 -- over the last year we've had several different times  
19 where we've been able to work together, both having  
20 Sherry come to one of the PI meetings to see where we  
21 were, and then interacting with me directly to see  
22 where the program is, where we're going, how we might  
23 be able to best help.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: Right. And I understand  
25 there's a vacancy now on the three-member panel, at

1 least one.

2 DR. PEGAU: Yes.

3 MR. BROOKOVER: And a question I guess is how  
4 do we go about filling that seat? Is that something  
5 that, Catherine, you would work with Scott on?

6 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

7 DR. PEGAU: Yeah.

8 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, we would.

9 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

10 DR. PEGAU: Yeah, I need.....

11 MS. BOERNER: I -- oh, I'm sorry.

12 DR. PEGAU: I need to forward Catherine some  
13 names of people that I would recommend filling, and  
14 then have Catherine work also to pick up other names.  
15 The Science Panel had some names of appropriate people.  
16 Not only should I be sending names, but here are the  
17 characteristics. So the person that we lost is Ted  
18 Cooney who unfortunately passed away this year. And,  
19 you know, for me he was great, because he had lead the  
20 SEA Program, and so he had time to think about herring  
21 and salmon, and he knew what it was like to have to try  
22 to run one of these programs. Unfortunately, I can't  
23 name someone with that kind of expertise and time, but  
24 I'm doing my best to say, okay, here are the  
25 characteristics that that person that I really need to

1 help guide the program.

2 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay. Well, I want to say I  
3 still think that that group is important, and I'm glad  
4 we're working on filling that seat. And I'd like to  
5 see that continue.....

6 DR. PEGAU: Okay.

7 MR. BROOKOVER: .....to provide you support and  
8 guidance and also to provide information to the Council  
9 as may be appropriate.

10 MS. HSIEH: It was in your APDI under the  
11 science program for herring is the herring -- it used  
12 to be -- we kept calling it the small group, but it's  
13 the herring advisory.....

14 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

15 DR. PEGAU: Yeah.

16 MS. HSIEH: And it's the three -- I believe  
17 it's Scott, Pete Hagen from NOAA, and also the  
18 academ.....

19 DR. PEGAU: Sherry Dressell.

20 MS. HSIEH: Sherry Dressell from Fish and Game,  
21 and the academic position which Ted Cooney had been in.  
22 Sherry Dressell at Department of Fish and Game, the  
23 Trustee Council. Also in our APDI provides 70 percent  
24 of the funding for her position, and so 70 percent of  
25 her time does work on herring and the programs and that

1 was a position and support which was asked for by the  
2 Science Panel and the community for a long, long time,  
3 so that's a helpful puzzle piece to be added a couple  
4 years ago at the funding of the programs in FY12.

5 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Yes.

6 MS. HSIEH: The herring advisory group doesn't  
7 cycle back and give me feedback which would circulate  
8 to the Trustee Council. Again, all these programs and  
9 groups are new, so I actually have that geeky outline  
10 where I try and outline all the circulation of  
11 information, and where everyone sits, and that's a work  
12 in progress, so we could talk about how that piece  
13 would work as well.

14 DR. PEGAU: Yeah. Okay.

15 MS. BOERNER: I'm also going to make a big  
16 comment. The work plan that you have in front of you,  
17 the fiscal year 13 amount requested is not correct. I  
18 know your other -- on your motion sheets are correct,  
19 but that number should be, and it's right on the first  
20 page, or Page 1, which is the chart, the funding  
21 recommendation chart.

22 MS. HSIEH: Catherine, their motion is correct?

23 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

24 MS. HSIEH: Yeah. Okay.

25 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. And that number that's

1 actually being requested is 1,429,329.

2 MR. BROOKOVER: Can you repeat that?

3 MS. BOERNER: Sure. 1,429,329.

4 MS. HSIEH: And that's on your motion sheet,  
5 it's correct.

6 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, and we'll -- when we  
7 reissue the work plan, we'll update that figure at the  
8 time.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So should we go ahead and  
10 take up that motion now, or one at a time?

11 MS. HSIEH: Catherine, was there any other  
12 detail -- I mean, with regard to the Science Panel  
13 comments for the herring program, I think -- you know,  
14 I think overall things are moving well. I think we'll  
15 continue to work with the programs.....

16 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

17 MS. HSIEH: .....on those specific  
18 comments.....

19 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

20 MS. HSIEH: .....and move some of those ahead  
21 and get information back and forth to the Science Panel  
22 and report back to the trustees after that stage has  
23 proceeded forward.

24 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So the one item that you had

1 expressed some concern about on conditional, do we need  
2 to make that part of our motion or address that there,  
3 or you're just going to address that through yourself?

4 MS. HSIEH: It's.....

5 MS. BOERNER: We're going to want to address  
6 that, because it's something that affects both.....

7 MS. HSIEH: It does.

8 MS. BOERNER: .....this program and the  
9 Gulf Watch program.....

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

11 MS. BOERNER: .....so I don't know if you want  
12 to compartmentalize that and put it to the manager.....

13 MS. HSIEH: Right. I think you could make the  
14 motion, and just reference with regard to data  
15 management any guidance that the Trustee Council gives  
16 for the long-term monitoring program.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

18 MS. HSIEH: In a subsequent motion.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Uh-huh. Okay. So I guess  
20 I'm ready for a motion.

21 MR. BROOKOVER: Well, I'll move we approve  
22 funding of \$1,429,329, which includes GA, for FY14  
23 funding of the long-term hearing program 14120111,  
24 dated August 29th, 2013.

25 MS. SCHORR: Second.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other discussion on the  
2 motion.

3           MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to  
4 support the motion, but I do think just for the record  
5 reflect that we want the comments contained in the  
6 Science Panel to be continued to work on. I wasn't  
7 sure if that's the same thing we talked about earlier  
8 when we're going to refer back, but I just wanted to  
9 make that statement.

10          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. That's my  
11 understanding, Jim, is that there were some concerns on  
12 the -- what is it, data.....

13          MS. HSIEH: Data management.

14          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Data management portion that  
15 we'll address later.

16          MR. BALSIGER: Okay.

17          MR. BROOKOVER: And that discussion can apply  
18 to both long-term management and the herring aspects?

19          MS. HSIEH: Correct.

20          MS. BOERNER: Yes.

21          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right. Okay. Any other  
22 discussion.

23          (No comments)

24          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any objections.

25          (No comments)

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Seeing none, the motion  
2 passes. We'll go onto the.....

3           MS. BOERNER: Yes. Uh-huh. Let's move on to  
4 -- oh, pardon.

5           MS. HSIEH: It's noon.

6           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It's noon now. Noon now.

7           MS. HSIEH: So lunch is ready to be served at  
8 noon, although if you wanted to just do the  
9 presentation part of -- or depending on how the Trustee  
10 Council feels, if you guys want to do the presentation  
11 part for the long-term monitoring and then come back  
12 for the discussion or.....

13          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, we've got three  
14 presenters, Chris, Molly and Katrina. And so I don't  
15 want them to have to wait here through lunch while we  
16 go eat lunch, if they don't want to wait. We can go  
17 ahead and.....

18          MS. HSIEH: No, we can keep going.

19          MS. McCAMMON: It's whatever your schedule is.

20          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No, we can go.....

21          MS. HSIEH: We have these little snack bags, so  
22 we're ready to go.

23          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, it's 15 minutes, so,  
24 no, we won't make.....

25          MS. HSIEH: I think that's.....

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   .....you stay while we eat  
2 lunch.

3           MS. HSIEH:  No, I think that would be great if  
4 we could continue.

5           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  Okay.

6           MS. BOERNER:  So that will be the Long-Term  
7 Monitoring Program, which is also known as Gulf Watch  
8 Alaska.

9           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  Yeah, plus we're all anxious  
10 to hear from the group.

11          MS. BOERNER:  Who wants to go first?

12          MS. McCAMMON:  We thought you were going to go  
13 first, Catherine.

14          MS. BOERNER:  Pardon?

15          MS. McCAMMON:  We thought you were going to go  
16 first.  No?

17          MS. BOERNER:  No.  I will talk about it after  
18 you guys present.

19          MS. McCAMMON:  Okay.  Well, we want to thank  
20 the Trustee for the opportunity.

21          REPORTER:  For my purposes, could you identify  
22 yourself?

23          MS. McCAMMON:  I was just going to.

24          REPORTER:  Thank you.

25          MS. McCAMMON:  For having the opportunity to be

1 here today. My name is Molly McCammon. I'm executive  
2 director of the Alaska Ocean Observing system, and by  
3 default I'm the program team lead for what we refer to  
4 now as Gulf Watch Alaska. We have Katrina Hoffman from  
5 the Prince William Sound Science Center who is the  
6 administrative lead for the program. And also Kris  
7 Holdereid from the Kasitsna Bay Lab in Homer who is  
8 the science lead for the program.

9           What we'd like to do is give you what we call a  
10 20-month status report. So we aren't even through with  
11 two years of the program yet. We're 20 months into it,  
12 and so we wanted to take this opportunity just to  
13 describe where we are with the program, and then we can  
14 address some the comments that came up in the Science  
15 Panel's review.

16           So, Katrina.

17           MS. HOFFMAN: So program summary. For many of  
18 you this will be a refresher. This is intended to be a  
19 20-year long ecosystem monitoring program. And it is  
20 being funded in five-year increments, so we are in the  
21 first five-year program, where we are submitting annual  
22 work plans to you and annual progress update reports.

23           We work as a consortium. Molly just told you  
24 who the program management team is comprised of, plus  
25 an additional person in the room that we should

1 introduce, which is our science coordinator, Tammy  
2 Neher. She's in the back row over here.

3           The funding ceiling across these five years is  
4 \$11.9 million, and the initial focus for this first  
5 five-year program are to study the marine conditions,  
6 injured species, and lingering oil, to promote data  
7 access to all of the data collected through this  
8 program, and to engage in a synthesis to guide the next  
9 five years of the program.

10           There are 20 component projects. There are 31  
11 principal investigators, and with their affiliated  
12 researchers, there are over 40 investigators working on  
13 this program together. And we coordinate and  
14 communicate regularly with the herring research and  
15 monitoring program.

16           There are many sub-goals, but the two  
17 overarching ones of the program are to provide data and  
18 products to support information needs of the management  
19 agencies, the research community, and the general  
20 public, and also to identify and help understand the  
21 impacts of multiple ecosystem factors on recovery of  
22 injured resources.

23           We think of this program as being organized in  
24 multiple ways. All of the research projects fall into  
25 one of those top four theme areas. So the

1 oceanographic and plankton work falls into the  
2 environmental drivers component. We have invertebrate,  
3 algae, sea otter, and seabird work that falls into the  
4 benthic component. Our pelagic component comprises  
5 research on whales, seabirds, forage fish, et cetera.  
6 And our lingering oil component looks at sediments, sea  
7 otter, harlequin ducks, organisms that are affected by  
8 the presence or absence of oil in those ecosystems.

9           Geographically all of these research projects  
10 occur in Prince William Sound, on the outer Kenai  
11 coast, or lower Cook Inlet, and their associated  
12 offshore areas.

13           And programmatically, we work from a point of  
14 integrated program management, administration, and  
15 outreach. And Molly will get into some of that more.  
16 We have extensive data management services being  
17 generated and offered not only to the PIs, but to the  
18 organizations that we collaborate with, and the public.  
19 And we're working on synthesis of this program over  
20 time.

21           This is a highly leveraged and collaborative  
22 program. We regularly communicate with both Federal  
23 and State agencies, and we're also very aware of and  
24 communicative with other large research programs such  
25 as the Gulf of Alaska integrated ecosystem research

1 program, which is funded by the North Pacific Research  
2 Board, and relative NSF funded projects, et cetera.  
3 We've leveraged the assets that have been provided by  
4 the Alaska Ocean Observing System through their data  
5 management portals, and, as I mentioned, we closely  
6 collaborate with Scott Pegau and the herring research  
7 and monitoring program.

8           We'll get into some of those data management  
9 and synthesis portals in additional slides.

10           As far as our team interactions are concerned,  
11 we report to you and the Trustee Council staff twice a  
12 year. We have meetings regularly with the Trustee  
13 Council staff to coordinate that. Our PIs participate  
14 in quarterly teleconferences. They have an annual  
15 meeting. And in addition to that annual meeting, we  
16 often all get together at the Alaska Marine Science  
17 Symposium to discuss our programs. And the management  
18 team, Molly, Kris, myself, and Tammy meet multiple  
19 times per month.

20           As far as this program goes, it is a training  
21 opportunity for young scientists. As you heard with  
22 herring, we also have up and coming scientists who are  
23 being mentored by folks in this program on different  
24 projects, and that's an important part of carrying on  
25 this work over time.

1           MS. McCAMMON: So I'm going to talk a little  
2 bit about the communication and outreach. Katrina  
3 described a lot of the internal communication that  
4 we've had, but we also have quite a bit of external  
5 communication.

6           So our first, kind of the first phase of that  
7 was developing branding materials for the program, so  
8 it was the logo, it was the name. It was a brochure  
9 that I brought copies of for you to have. It was  
10 bookmarks. We've set up a very preliminary website a  
11 year ago that -- just to get it -- to have a site. And  
12 we have the domain, gulfwatchalaska.org is something  
13 that we got right away.

14           Phase two that we started this past year are  
15 improvements to the website and access to data  
16 resources. We've held public outreach events in  
17 Cordova, Homer and Valdez.

18           Phase three we're starting now on radio shows,  
19 the podcasts, community lectures, scientific conference  
20 presentations. We're having presentations at the  
21 Marine Science Symposium this year, at Ocean Sciences  
22 Conference in Honolulu in February, and at AGU in San  
23 Francisco in -- this December.

24           We're working to start developing an agency  
25 managers workshop, because one of the goals of the

1 program is to develop communication for agency  
2 management needs. And so what exactly is it that --  
3 and in what format would agency managers like to see  
4 information, and how can we best deliver that  
5 information to them. In addition, Sea Grant and AS are  
6 co-sponsoring a community-based monitoring workshop in  
7 April.

8           And if you recall, one of our outreach goals  
9 was to work with the communities and with the Public  
10 Advisory Committee to see if there was -- to see what  
11 kind of options there would be for a community-based  
12 monitoring program within the spill area. We don't  
13 have funding in this five-year program to do that, but  
14 there might be in the future. It might be an important  
15 component of a future program or maybe something that's  
16 funded through other sources of funding. And so we're  
17 going to leverage that conference that's being held in  
18 April, which is primarily focusing on lessons learned  
19 and best practices of community-based monitoring,  
20 citizen science, those kinds of efforts all around the  
21 state. Why are some successful and others aren't.  
22 What steps need to be taken if a community wants to  
23 generate it. What steps need to be taken if the  
24 science community wants to generate it. And really  
25 come out with a manual of best practices after that.

1 So we're really hoping that will -- we're going to tie  
2 that in with our goal to work with the PAC and with the  
3 communities in the spill area in exploring what kinds  
4 of community-based monitoring might be applicable here,  
5 and tie that effort together.

6 MS. HSIEH: But that's actually not a component  
7 that was -- like your one side that talked about the  
8 matted (ph) components, that was a breakdown of the  
9 FY12 invitation.....

10 MS. McCAMMON: Uh-huh.

11 MS. HSIEH: .....the pelagic, benthic, et  
12 cetera, but the community-based monitoring, I'm not  
13 sure that was an aspect?

14 MS. McCAMMON: No, but that was -- that was in  
15 our original proposal was to explore the.....

16 MS. HSIEH: Options.

17 MS. McCAMMON: .....outreach program would  
18 explore it. We wouldn't fund it necessarily, but to  
19 explore options for that. So that was in the original  
20 proposal that was approved, one of the activities.

21 And then we're already starting to talk about  
22 peer reviewed publication and special journal issues.  
23 A number of our PIs have been publishing various  
24 pieces.

25 I know there's a lot of -- there was a lot of

1 interest and concern about data, and certainly that's  
2 big on my mind. And as the primary supporter of the  
3 data piece in the long-term monitoring program and in  
4 the herring program. The way we've been addressing  
5 this is by having all of our PIs use something we call  
6 the Research Workspace. And this is a private password  
7 protected site. It's a web application where PIs can  
8 post their data. They can replace that data with  
9 new data after they QA/QC it. They can put in the  
10 second year's data, the third year's data, the fourth  
11 year's data, and everyone who has been given permission  
12 to look at that site has access to it. So everyone  
13 who's a member of the team has access to it. Catherine  
14 has access to it. Elise does. The program management  
15 team, and we can track how PIs are doing in terms of  
16 putting in their data, writing metadata and making all  
17 of that accessible.

18           We developed a data plan early on, like in  
19 month two of our program where all of the PIs were  
20 required to sign what we call the program management  
21 plan. And in that we have a data policy that says, all  
22 of the -- that this is a monitoring program, that these  
23 are monitoring data, that they are supposed to be  
24 publicly available as soon as possible, and no later  
25 than one year after they're collected.

1           And so it's been -- in all honesty, it's been a  
2 culture shift for a lot of the PIs. A lot of them are  
3 not used to this kind of looking at data like this as a  
4 public -- something that should be public. And, you  
5 know, there are some who are a little more reluctant  
6 than others. And we're -- we have our second year PI  
7 meeting planned for I guess it's in a week and a half  
8 or so, two weeks. And we'll have our wall of shame and  
9 our wall of fame.

10           (Laughter)

11           MS. McCAMMON: And hopefully everybody will be  
12 on the wall of fame by the end of that meeting and  
13 we'll be moving along.

14           But I know that the Science Panel was concerned  
15 about the availability of data for synthesis, and this  
16 is where the data will be available for synthesis. It  
17 is all available there, and it will be available for  
18 the Science Panel and for any synthesis efforts  
19 afterwards.

20           The goal with these is that once it's deemed  
21 public, then it gets published to our public site,  
22 which is the gulfwatchalaska.org website. And if you  
23 haven't had a chance to look at it, this is the new  
24 site that went live in early September. And we're  
25 really proud of it. It's still a work in progress, and

1 so I think there's caveats all over it saying it's  
2 still a work in process. But it really is a -- I think  
3 it will be a really helpful site for the public in  
4 terms of giving basic information about the program,  
5 and then giving access to the data that's published to  
6 the public once it is deemed public.

7 MR. BALSIGER: Could I ask? So within one year  
8 that's to the research worksite that the data's  
9 available to the other researchers, but not necessarily  
10 the public? That one year deadline.

11 MS. McCAMMON: After one year, then it's  
12 supposed to go public to the general public. So within  
13 that one year it's held confidential, and then after  
14 that it goes -- it's supposed to go public.

15 MR. BALSIGER: Then go out.

16 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

17 MS. MARCERON: And it's posted on.....

18 MS. McCAMMON: But not all.....

19 MS. MARCERON: .....that particular site?

20 MS. McCAMMON: .....not all of them are. And  
21 then it gets into the question, too, the challenge is  
22 metadata, because you want good metadata accompanying  
23 it. And in all honesty, metadata is required by  
24 federal law for all federal projects, and this is  
25 considered part of a federal project, but there -- and

1 you can talk to any of your agencies here and know that  
2 that's an issue internally is getting your  
3 investigators to write metadata. And we've been  
4 working.....

5 MS. HOLDEREID: Molly, can I have.....

6 MS. McCAMMON: .....closely.....

7 MS. HOLDEREID: .....one slight thing on that?

8 Can I have one point, slight thing on that?

9 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

10 MS. HOLDEREID: One of the advantages of the  
11 integrated program is that we're having assistance  
12 across the program to all the PIs for things like  
13 metadata. So Tammy, for instance, has been helping the  
14 PIs actually write metadata and get it down. And you  
15 know the advantage of having a draft written to start  
16 with that you can then just, you know, tweak and QA/QC.  
17 So the integrated program is really helping make that  
18 piece happen, which I think would be hugely more  
19 difficult if it were all separate projects.

20 MS. McCAMMON: Well, and I think our data  
21 team's approach had been, let's do some tools and see  
22 if we can just make it easy, and the PIs will just do  
23 this themselves. And I remember rolling my eyes and  
24 saying, we'll see. And the next approach now we have  
25 10 of our data team who will be at our PI meeting, and

1 will be hand-holding and walking each one. Each PI  
2 individually has to go through this process where they  
3 sit down and they can't leave the PI meeting without  
4 getting their metadata written and their data uploaded  
5 and in place and all under way. It takes a lot of  
6 hand-holding, and, you know, I think -- I say this, I  
7 think younger investigators are a little more open to  
8 doing things a little more easily than some of those  
9 who are a little older and set in their ways.

10 MR. BALSIGER: Why did you look at me?

11 (Laughter)

12 MS. McCAMMON: I didn't. I wasn't. Because my  
13 eyes were just there. I was looking at the doorknob.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I don't know if this is for  
15 you or Kris.....

16 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. Yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....but is it that they're  
18 just not used to doing it, or is there kind of an  
19 economic hurdle for them, too, there.

20 MS. HOLDEREID: Both.

21 MS. McCAMMON: I think there's -- it's both.  
22 They're not used to doing it, and it's one of those  
23 things that it's, yeah, yeah, yeah, I know I need to do  
24 it, but I really -- it will take me -- I just have to  
25 sit down and focus and do it, and I just don't have

1 time. I'll do it next week.....

2 MS. HSIEH: It's like taxes.

3 MS. McCAMMON: .....or next month, and it just  
4 keeps getting avoided. So I think it's a combination.

5 One of the issues that we've also run  
6 into is because we have two data projects. The one  
7 with NCEAS and the one with AOOS. The NCEAS one is  
8 focusing on the historical data set, data salvage. And  
9 so they're working on a lot of the historical EVOS  
10 ones. But those kind of merge into a lot of them are  
11 also doing current acquisition. And so there's a  
12 little bit of, I wouldn't say confusion, but we haven't  
13 totally smoothed out how that all works and how we  
14 operate and how we merge those two things together. So  
15 that's been a little bit of it, too.

16 MS. HOLDEREID: And on the finance side, these  
17 are very leveraged projects, so people in many cases  
18 are not getting actually a lot of salary time for doing  
19 it, so, you know, you have that challenge of people's  
20 time as always. But it's a requirement. We're just  
21 trying to figure out ways to help get that done through  
22 -- the nice thing is once we get the big lift done on  
23 getting all the metadata for all the projects, the  
24 annual updates in that is much more straight forward.  
25 So it's the big lift right now.

1 MS. McCAMMON: Right. Yeah.

2 MS. HOLDEREID: And tools to automate different  
3 aspects of that which will be really helpful.

4 MS. McCAMMON: And the historic data sets, I  
5 think there were -- I think Matt Jones' team identified  
6 about 370 data sets that they were deemed of value and  
7 wanted to go back and salvage and put into our data  
8 system. They have managed to -- they have 49 of those  
9 after two years. They have 49 of those. So -- that  
10 are all consolidated and, you know, have good metadata,  
11 QA/QC'd and ready to be publicly published.

12 There's probably another 120 on the list of  
13 where they've contacted the investigator and the  
14 investigator has said, yes, I will support you. Yes, I  
15 will help you. I will get that to you next week or  
16 next month or after my field season, or, you know,  
17 whatever, but then, you know, it's just -- it's another  
18 one of those things that just kind of lags.

19 And then there are probably another -- well,  
20 there have been some outright no, no way, you will not  
21 get it. And we may end up coming back and talking to  
22 you individually about some of those later. And then  
23 there are some who are just -- they're just gone, you  
24 know. It's people who retired, and the data's just  
25 basically -- it's gone.

1 MS. BOERNER: I don't mean to interrupt, but we  
2 have.....

3 MS. McCAMMON: Yes.

4 MS. BOERNER: .....NCEAS has already has come  
5 to us about some of the projects and -- where people  
6 have come back and just said abs -- you know, outright  
7 no.....

8 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

9 MS. BOERNER: .....and to help work -- help  
10 them work through that, because that is something that  
11 when they originally took their funding, they are  
12 required to provide that data. So we're going to  
13 continue to work as best we can to try to salvage some  
14 of that.

15 MS. HSIEH: I'm not sure that really -- you  
16 know, the ex officio, the Science Panel did know that  
17 you guys were uploading data into the Work Space and  
18 things will be public. They're very sympathetic. A  
19 lot of -- some of the Science Panel's been involved for  
20 25 years, and they're very aware of a lack of data  
21 accessibility over the years and that backlog.

22 I think that their comments, and it's hard for  
23 me to speak eloquently about it, because is it so  
24 technical, but I think their comments consistently  
25 since FY12 have really more to do with, you know, is --

1 will the data from these programs be handled and  
2 processed in a sophisticated manner to be used for hard  
3 core science purposes and synthesis in a way that is  
4 really up to a national standard. And I don't mean  
5 bare bones standard. They have -- they are really  
6 supportive of the program, and they want to see  
7 sterling, you know, stuff come out that is looked at.  
8 You know, it's a great opportunity for these long data  
9 sets and they're just really excited about that. And  
10 so I think a lot of their comments come from that  
11 desire, to have the data come out and be looked at by  
12 Ph.D. scientific peers, not just community outreach.  
13 That's a very different audience. They're really  
14 looking at it from the scientific community, to be  
15 useful.....

16 MS. McCAMMON: Absolutely.

17 MS. HSIEH: .....and sophisticated enough for  
18 synthesis.

19 MS. McCAMMON: Absolutely. Yeah.

20 MS. HOLDEREID: And I can speak to that.....

21 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

22 MS. HOLDEREID: .....because I think that is  
23 one of the primary goals within this program is to do  
24 that, because that's the true benefit of the monitoring  
25 program and the accessibility, not just that data's out

1 there, but you know where it came from, you know how it  
2 was collected, you understand everything you need to  
3 know how well you can use it or not, you know, to  
4 understand what the realities are about that. And it's  
5 been a focus for us to make sure that like we have  
6 sampling protocols for all the projects. That was a  
7 requirement for all the PIs.

8 MS. McCAMMON: Uh-huh.

9 MS. HOLDEREID: I think it's -- one of the  
10 interesting things that comes up in the PI meetings is,  
11 and again part of this collaboration, is there's a lot  
12 of discussion within component projects about protocol,  
13 and there's back and forth about, oh, you're doing  
14 that, oh, you're doing that analysis. Oh, I haven't  
15 tried that. Maybe I should try that. You know, again  
16 that's one of those these folks might have seen each  
17 other at a conference or something, but now they've got  
18 a couple days together and they have those side  
19 conversations, so -- but it's geared at exactly that,  
20 it's how do we make this useful. How do we document it  
21 so that it can be used well in the future?

22 So we would completely agree with that side of  
23 it, and also with connecting with the agencies on that,  
24 too, because, you know, those archives are equally  
25 important.

1 MS. McCAMMON: After we do -- well, we did the  
2 website and then kind of our collective decision among  
3 our program management team and our science  
4 coordinating committee was that the data, once it is  
5 deemed public, then goes into the Gulf of Alaska data  
6 portal that's hosted by AOOS, and so it's there for  
7 long-term archive and curating. So it gets tagged in  
8 here, so it would -- it will be highlighted as special  
9 EVOS Gulf Watch projects, and we'll also have tagged in  
10 here all the historical EVOS data. But it will also --  
11 you can look at it, if you're just looking for herring  
12 data or, you know, seabird data, or whatever, just --  
13 it will be with all the other ancillary data that's  
14 collected in the Gulf of Alaska.

15 And with that I'll turn it over to Kris.

16 MS. HOLDEREID: I hope we're okay timewise. I  
17 know we're running.....

18 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah. Yeah.

19 MS. HOLDEREID: .....long. And I will go  
20 through -- what I'd like to do first is just take you  
21 through the site where we're monitoring, because I know  
22 there's some new folks, and sometimes a visual -- I  
23 know you guys go through a lot of paper in terms of the  
24 abstracts and everything, so just a quick visual about  
25 where the monitoring is happening. Again, as Katrina

1 said, we're in the Sound, we're in lower Cook Inlet,  
2 we're on the outer Kenai coast.

3           Within the environmental driver's portion, on  
4 the outer coast there's measurements both from the  
5 continuous plankton recorder on the left there, as well  
6 as the gapline mooring and the Seward line on the  
7 right. Go ahead. Also within environmental drivers is  
8 monitoring for oceanography and plankton within the  
9 Sound and within lower Cook Inlet as shown on those two  
10 slides.

11           And, again, if anyone has questions about this  
12 later, just, you know, during lunch or something, just  
13 ask me and we can come back to it. Go ahead.

14           So within the pelagic section we have two whale  
15 projects, one for humpback whales. Distributions are  
16 up on the upper right-hand corner, and then the lower  
17 graph show on the left the killer whale survey tracks,  
18 and then from 2012 the encounters that happened. So  
19 that's within this lower part of the Sound and Kenai  
20 Fjords National Park. Okay.

21           With the pelagic, marine birds -- we're lucky  
22 to have Dave Irons here today, so that more questions  
23 can go to him. But the summer surveys are on the upper  
24 right, so distributed across the Sound, and the fall  
25 and winter surveys tag teamed with the herring

1 programs, and those are in the SEA, the sound ecosystem  
2 assessment base.

3 Forage fish surveys are done throughout the  
4 Sound, and it's a combination of open water surveys as  
5 well as shoreline. One of the things that we're going  
6 is to move into more shoreline measurements, and also  
7 to do some change sampling with targeting. I'll talk  
8 about that later, but there's a distribution across the  
9 Sound.

10 And then these are all the benthic program  
11 sites between the projects. That one project is  
12 looking in the Sound, and in Kenai Fjords and Katmai  
13 National Park, and the other one is in Kachemak Bay and  
14 lower Cook Inlet.

15 That's just a quick -- and then lingering oil,  
16 this is -- this graphic is from the sites that were  
17 originally surveyed for sediments. So we're going to  
18 be doing that survey, resurveying a subset of those.  
19 Those sites have yet to be determined. They'll be  
20 determined this year and then surveyed in FY15.

21 So now shifting into some highlights from the  
22 projects. As we mentioned, we have 20 projects and a  
23 lot of PIs, but just some things that have come up,  
24 there's more information in our six-month report that  
25 was submitted at the end of August.

1           So 2012 interest -- and the graphic there is  
2 from nearshore at the bottom, which is one up on the  
3 vertical axis, so it's nearshore to offshore stations  
4 on the Seward line, and then years across to the right,  
5 and this is the average temperature in the upper 100  
6 meters. So just get a sense for patterning and the  
7 type of information that we can get from this data.

8           For 2012, it was cold. The surface layer, the  
9 upper 100 meters, was about .7 degrees Celsius, lower  
10 than the 15-year average, had a delayed phytoplankton  
11 bloom, and slow zooplankton development. So starting  
12 to make the conic -- you know, the connections. A nice  
13 thing about the Seward line, we have a long time series  
14 there. We're building on that.

15           An interesting thing this year in Kachemak Bay,  
16 we had two very strong discolored water over nearly the  
17 entire bay. Separate events. One red which turned out  
18 to be misadinium (ph) bloom, and one brown which we  
19 think is gimadinium (ph). We're still working on that.  
20 Both nontoxic.

21           The advantage of this program, having this  
22 program, is, one, we have collected the environmental  
23 data to be able to go back and figure out what might  
24 have initiated these blooms. Two, we had the plankton  
25 monitoring going on so we were able to quickly, within

1 eighteen hours in the one case, come up with an  
2 identification, and reassure the community that, hey,  
3 this is a non-toxic species. So it was measurably  
4 helped by this program.

5           Go ahead. Within the benthic program, one of  
6 the interesting things again about having an integrated  
7 program is that we're able to quantify variability  
8 noticed both within project sites, so say within  
9 Kachemak Bay or within the western Prince William  
10 Sound, but also between sites, and to look at the --  
11 like what's noticed for the mussels is a very strong  
12 site-to-site variability at relatively small scales,  
13 and also between sites. So, for example, the folks in  
14 the Sound were finding that reduction in mussel  
15 abundance over the sampling that's been done over about  
16 the last six years, that's not been seen in the  
17 Kachemak Bay site. So, you know, you start to be able  
18 to pull together this type of information.

19           And I'd just -- the picture down on the right  
20 there is six-year-old introduced oyster species that  
21 was found in western Prince William Sound. Just kind  
22 of an interesting, just maybe disturbing discovery.

23           Go ahead. So also within the pelagic group,  
24 I'd mentioned the forage fish sampling. So the forage  
25 fish sampling project is designed to improve sampling

1 methods. So it's slightly different than some of the  
2 others as for being straight monitoring on protocols  
3 that have been established. It was intended to look at  
4 different things and see if you could evolve that to do  
5 it better. And one of the things based on the 2012  
6 where they realized that they needed to do more  
7 targeted -- figure out ways to do more targeted  
8 sampling with the shipboard survey, maybe incorporate  
9 some aerial surveys working in conjunction with the  
10 herring program to improve the effectiveness of the  
11 shipboard surveys. So there was some work done with  
12 that this year.

13           Also have publications coming out. Craig  
14 Mackin has one published this year, and there's a  
15 couple in press, which is exciting to see. And  
16 presentations, of course.

17           Lingering oil, very significant result here in  
18 that the biomarkers, the P-450 (ph) biomarkers within  
19 the harlequin ducks for the first time came up with no  
20 oil exposure. And so that, you know, was a very  
21 significant result.

22           One of the things I mentioned earlier with the  
23 sediment oil sampling that we're looking to delay  
24 incorporates information from some of the other  
25 lingering oil projects that the Trustee Council's

1 funding, to then do the -- incorporate that into the  
2 sampling design, so while it was proposed to set --  
3 resample the sediment sites this year, FY14, will e  
4 doing that -- doing planning for that this year, and  
5 actually doing -- or proposing to do the sampling FY15.

6           Within science coordination, I have to say  
7 Tammy has -- she came on early this year, and has just  
8 taken us this huge leap forward in terms of integrating  
9 information across the program. A lot of -- I  
10 mentioned the metadata before. A lot of the help in  
11 getting the PI information into the work space and on  
12 the website is this connection between science  
13 coordination, the data management and the PI. And it's  
14 been really fun to see that work well.

15           We're also coming up with some new tools. So  
16 the graph down there is what you call a trend card. So  
17 the top -- it's comparing -- just a way of comparing  
18 different anomalies across different data sets. The  
19 one on the top is zooplankton, is annual zooplankton  
20 data from the continuous plankton recording. We're  
21 comparing it to environmental drivers. The Gap 1 data  
22 is there, as well as the lower 3, 4 series are  
23 different indices. So we've got the Pacific decadal  
24 oscillation, the southern oscillation, a couple  
25 different indices there. Just ways to be able to

1 visualize information and test hypotheses and come up  
2 with new ones.

3           We're going to have a time series data  
4 discussion in our PI meeting, that's going to be the  
5 focus this year in November, so we're really looking  
6 forward to that. And we've also got some folks coming  
7 from other agencies as well as from the NPRB program.

8           And with the conceptual ecological modeling, we  
9 took the results of a workshop that was done with PIs  
10 at our last meeting in November, developed a linkage  
11 rating tool, and a generalized -- the first starts of  
12 the generalized ecosystem model. The actual -- the use  
13 of the rating tool as a way to assess expert opinion  
14 around linkages within a model, so what's most  
15 important out of it. There's actually some pretty new  
16 work, and they just did a talk on it at the Pisces  
17 conference this month. And they got some -- they  
18 actually got a lot of people coming up and wanting to  
19 know more about what they were doing, the tool, and  
20 that whole thing, so that's pretty exciting.

21           And that's the highlights.

22           MS. McCAMMON: We wanted to conclude by just  
23 again expressing our appreciation to the Trustee  
24 Council for supporting this program. Because I think  
25 as Chris has indicated, it really is starting to get a

1 lot of play in the region. And just by having it as a  
2 core program, there are a lot of other activities that  
3 have been able to be leveraged with it. And one of our  
4 goals this coming year is to actually document better  
5 how much that leverage amounts to, because my guess is  
6 it's really high. There is just -- this is -- what  
7 we're looking at here is a \$45 million a year program  
8 that you are spending just a little over 2 million for.  
9 So you are getting a lot out of this. And it's always  
10 a challenge to make sure that we're all, you know, have  
11 our feet to the fire here to make sure we're all  
12 producing the way you and the Science Panel and others  
13 want.

14           And with that, I'd like to make just four brief  
15 comments about the Science Panel comments.

16           You have in front of you our final response.  
17 It's not too different from the one you have in your  
18 packet, but when we originally submitted that one to  
19 Elise, the shutdown was still going on, so there were a  
20 few PIs who hadn't been able to review it, and so  
21 there's a few tweaks, but it's substantially the same.

22           It also includes all of the appendices which  
23 has all the tables. It has all of our information  
24 compiled into the data management plan that was  
25 requested by the Science Panel. The tables of all the

1 data sets that have been added. And a lot of that  
2 additional activity.

3           But one thing, as Elise noted, this has been an  
4 evolving process. And as I said, we've been in 20  
5 months. Every reporting process and the proposal  
6 process, we've had a different format to use, a little  
7 bit different. And we anticipate the next one will be  
8 a little different, too. And that's -- I think that's  
9 fine, because we are an evolving program. And the only  
10 thing we would ask is that we have that as early as  
11 possible, because we need to get any new formats and  
12 new requests for information out to our PIs as early as  
13 possible. A lot of them are on other projects, or out  
14 in the field at various times. But we stand ready to  
15 do whatever in terms of the project reports, the annual  
16 proposals, whatever you would like and how you would  
17 like to see it, and the Science Panel. We've worked  
18 really closely with Elise on that. And it will  
19 probably continue to evolve over the five years.

20           We also note that the Science Panel has a lot  
21 of new members on it this year, and we really welcome  
22 the fresh eyes I think, and fresh energy. And one  
23 thing we would recommend is that it could be helpful is  
24 that at the next Science Panel meeting if our science  
25 team leads, maybe Scott and Kris, could meet with the

1 Science Panel at the beginning or mid way through or  
2 something, just to answer any questions that might come  
3 up through the review. It might solve some of this back  
4 and forth and stuff, too, so we would recommend that as  
5 a possible addition to their science -- to their annual  
6 meetings.

7           Several of the Science Panel comments were  
8 recommendations to make major changes in the monitoring  
9 plans. And when we first submitted this five-year  
10 proposal, the intent was this is pretty much we're  
11 going to do for five years, and the synthesis and  
12 review we do with it will help inform is this the right  
13 set of monitoring components, and what should be  
14 changed for the future. So we really didn't anticipate  
15 making major changes in the program kind of mid stream  
16 unless, you know, something really became obvious and  
17 this kind of fell apart, which it hasn't. But rather  
18 it was to guide the future. And so if there are  
19 additions that the Science Panel wants and that you  
20 want to see happen, it would have to be -- there would  
21 have to be some kind of addressing budget issues,  
22 because we're pretty maxed out here in terms of funding  
23 for the program.

24           And Elise has been very good about really  
25 telling us, strongly discouraging us from coming up

1 with any additional wish list for additional projects  
2 or additional little add-ons to it.

3           And I guess just lastly, I know that the Panel  
4 and the Council staff have recommended that three  
5 subprojects be approved fund conditional, and we have  
6 submitted progress reports on those. And we hope those  
7 answer the questions, and we're just very willing to  
8 work with Elise and Catherine and the Science Panel,  
9 and ourselves and whomever have additional questions  
10 for those to resolve any issues that may still be  
11 outstanding.

12           And with that, I just want to say thank you  
13 again.

14           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Great. A great presentation.  
15 Thanks, everyone.

16           Should we take our lunch break and come back  
17 or.....

18           MS. HSIEH: Yeah. Did you want Catherine's  
19 comments, or did you want to take a break and come  
20 back?

21           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, I think let's.....

22           MS. HSIEH: Yeah, maybe take a break and.....

23           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I think we ought to  
24 start getting into the.....

25           MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

1 (Off record)

2 (On record)

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Well, I guess we'll go  
4 ahead and get started again. We left off with the  
5 long-term monitoring program, and we're having a bit of  
6 discussion about the Science Panel, and kind of  
7 courting everybody's idea.

8 And the Trustees had met at our pre-meeting  
9 last week and I think that kind of our approach was in  
10 looking at the Science Panel's concerns and realizing  
11 it's a new program here, is that it's probably good  
12 just to make sure everybody's talking with each other,  
13 and that we want to make sure that we get the leverage  
14 out of the program, and everybody's cooperation, and we  
15 didn't look at it as a big negative or anything like  
16 that since some people had other ideas and other people  
17 are -- we discussed it.

18 So one of the things that we talked about is  
19 how do we get the people together on this. And you  
20 heard it in terms of our budget discussion earlier. We  
21 talked about, oh, we could set aside maybe some money  
22 here and put it in our budget, a little travel money to  
23 get the right people together just to check with each  
24 other and see, well, what of these questions need to be  
25 considered and what can be answered, and other ideas

1 need to be considered. And not necessarily going to  
2 have NCEAS change, but how do we make sure this is  
3 going to get us where we wanted to go, and everybody's  
4 happy with it.

5 MS. HSIEH: With regard to data?

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, to data management.

7 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Yeah. I mean,  
8 data is something -- it is certainly definitely not  
9 unique to us. I think every program throughout the  
10 world is -- struggles with data. If you go through the  
11 scientific literature, there is a lot of discussion.  
12 How do we get the best data? How do we make sure it's  
13 usable? How do we make sure it's scientifically  
14 rigorous? So we're certainly not the first, but it  
15 would be nice since we're starting these big programs  
16 to get us on a good.....

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

18 MS. BOERNER: .....footing from the beginning.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. I just wanted to say  
20 that a lot of good things are happening.

21 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We didn't want to come across  
23 as negative, but we do want to -- it seems like an  
24 early time for people to check in and get their  
25 thoughts on the table.

1           Do you have -- do you want to talk about what  
2 we discussed, and your idea of.....

3           MS. HSIEH: We talked about, and I don't know  
4 how fast we can couple it together, but perhaps having  
5 a meeting in April, for example, with team leads and  
6 then probably Rob Bochenek and folks from the data  
7 project, someone from NCEAS, Matt Jones I assume,  
8 two or three Science Panel members, Catherine, and then  
9 some agency folks who deal with their data, and coming  
10 together.....

11          MS. HOLDEREID: Michael Shephard with the Park  
12 Service is one of those guys.

13          MS. HSIEH: Right. And actually before that  
14 really working up on paper, you know, asking the  
15 agencies, asking the Science Panel, what kind of things  
16 do you want to talk about, so we can really define what  
17 the discussion is for like a two-day meeting in  
18 Anchorage. And what do we want out of that tail end of  
19 the meeting? We want to know what products, what data  
20 products should be coming from the program, and what's  
21 involved in getting those products to the point of  
22 sophistication that people would like to see.

23          So I think that that's, you know, some of --  
24 generally what we talked about.

25          MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah, the thing I would just

1 caution is when you say data products, that can be very  
2 wide. That can be the analytical product. That can be  
3 the.....

4 MS. HSIEH: Right.

5 MS. HOLDEREID: .....original data. That can  
6 be the -- you know, there's a very big scope there.

7 MS. HSIEH: Right. Well, I.....

8 MS. HOLDEREID: You probably want to scope it  
9 fairly.....

10 MS. HSIEH: .....think we should start with the  
11 original data.....

12 MS. HOLDEREID: Yes.

13 MS. HSIEH: .....and making sure that it's.....

14 MS. HOLDEREID: Really close.

15 MS. HSIEH: .....handled in a way which makes  
16 it useful into the future.

17 MS. HOLDEREID: Yes. I mean, for an example of  
18 one of the things that we're looking at is how do you  
19 do the publication of the DOI, how do it so the data's  
20 citable, so a data record is citable. And then you  
21 have a time series that you're adding to every year, so  
22 then how do you do the citable record for that. So  
23 those are the kinds of things we're, you know,  
24 wrestling with right now.....

25 MS. HSIEH: Right.

1 MS. HOLDEREID: .....with -- NCEAS does a lot  
2 of that, so that's been -- that's been helpful there.  
3 But then how do you put that in with a continuing  
4 program?

5 MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh.

6 MS. HOLDEREID: So that -- those kinds of  
7 issues I think would be really good to, you know, get  
8 more conversation about.

9 MS. HSIEH: And originally I think around FY12  
10 the trustees, you know, funded the NCEAS project with  
11 an idea of some hybridizations on the cross  
12 pollenization to bring their outside information about  
13 how they've seen so many other groups deal with  
14 heterogenous data to the program. And I think, you  
15 know, we haven't heard -- and maybe the new materials  
16 which I have not had a chance to digest bring that more  
17 to the forefront. So, anyway, there's -- if there was  
18 to be a meeting in April, I think we work together to  
19 make sure that it's very defined as to what folks will  
20 be talking about so it doesn't range outward onto  
21 footnote issues.

22 MS. HOLDEREID: Yes. And I would also say just  
23 because I think there's a little bit of a communication  
24 issue, you know, with the way that we figure that out,  
25 but that what, for instance, the information -- the

1 type of information the Science Panel really wants to  
2 see, that we have -- we're clear about that, and we can  
3 make that flow.

4 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

5 MS. HSIEH: Right. Right. I think.....

6 MS. BOERNER: And that's something actually I  
7 would like to talk about, but I know we're still in  
8 data, but I do want to discuss the Science Panel's  
9 comments, so I don't know if you want to.....

10 MS. HOLDEREID: Yes. So I think that would be  
11 very useful on that part.

12 MS. HSIEH: Yes. To identify that. What are  
13 they looking for so people can speak apples to apples.

14 MS. HOLDEREID: Uh-huh. Right. Exactly.

15 MS. HSIEH: Okay. That's my lay person's take  
16 on it.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Jim.

18 MR. BALSIGER: Sort of along this -- sort of  
19 along this line, but many of the propos -- and Molly  
20 talked about lev -- how we leverage other programs,  
21 NPRB and others were mentioned. And the proposals  
22 identify many of them, not EVOS funds, but it's  
23 difficult for me to tell where those funds came from,  
24 so you don't get an appreciation of whether all the  
25 money's from NPRB or whether that other funds

1 includes, for example, if the USGS person's working, is  
2 that that person's salary that's showing up there? And  
3 so it's.....

4 MS. HSIEH: That's in the budget sheets.

5 MR. BALSIGER: Well.....

6 MS. BOERNER: No, it's not.

7 MR. BALSIGER: , , , , , t's not easy to find them.

8 MS. HOLDEREID: It's not, yeah.

9 MS. HSIEH: It's not in the budget sheet?

10 MS. BOERNER: Matching funds are not.

11 MR. BALSIGER: Because I was trying to make a  
12 story for.....

13 MS. HSIEH: Oh, okay.

14 MR. BALSIGER: .....how well coordinated and  
15 interwoven this is with all Alaska sort of science, and  
16 I wasn't able to see it easily, so.....

17 MS. BOERNER: Agreed. All it is is just a  
18 number. So that's a good -- you know, I think that's  
19 definitely something that would be incorporated.

20 But like I said, that is something I wanted to  
21 talk about was the Science Panel comments, and as they  
22 were just discussing, what is it that they're looking  
23 for. But it's not even just what they're looking for.  
24 It's what we're all looking for. When we sit down and  
25 review these proposals, you need to have a certain base

1 level of information we're to assess. Have they met  
2 their goals? Are they continuing to meet their goals?  
3 What's the plan for the next year coming up? We  
4 struggled this year with doing that. And it's  
5 something that will be part of our larger discussion,  
6 But when we looked at the proposals, and then also  
7 looked at the reports that came along since fiscal year  
8 12. So we were trying to look at it as a package. But  
9 it was frustrating, because in reading the proposal,  
10 the proposal was a cut and paste from fiscal year 12  
11 where we don't know even if did they complete those  
12 tasks? Did they not? And then trying to go back and  
13 reference that against the reports, that didn't always  
14 provide that information, so a lot of the comments were  
15 just that discomfort level with where is this project?  
16 What is happening? Have they met these goals? Have  
17 they not? And for something, specifically the Hollmen  
18 project, which was a fund contingent by the science  
19 panel and myself and Elise, which is the conceptual  
20 model, we went back and looked at the reports, looked  
21 at the -- we had -- there was absolutely no sense of  
22 where that program was. Had they developed anything?  
23           What was happening? In fiscal year 12 we had  
24 made comments, we're concerned about the lead PI on  
25 this project. Do they have experience with conceptual

1 modeling? Those proj -- those comments are actually  
2 reiterated again this year in fiscal year 13 -- or  
3 fiscal year 14, because there's still that discomfort  
4 level. You know, what is happening here?

5           So I think some of the Science Panel comments  
6 that seem lengthy and some of them maybe seem like  
7 there was a lot of changes recommended, but a lot of it  
8 was just from that discomfort level. We could not  
9 piece together where in time some of these projects  
10 were, and what progress had been made. In some cases,  
11 the additional information that's been given that you  
12 have in your packages has certainly helped to  
13 illuminate where they are. But that's why we said we  
14 need to work extensively with the programs to what do  
15 we collectively need to see in order to be able to  
16 efficiently review these proposals.

17           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So, but on funding the -- for  
18 this year this -- these projects, there's some that  
19 have contingencies around them, but how do we get that  
20 into motion, you know?

21           MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

22           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We had the same problem, just  
23 more so than you just described, is some of the lack of  
24 specificity in where some of the programs are at.

25           MS. BOERNER: Right.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  It's one thing if you came  
2 back and said this program isn't going to deliver what  
3 we thought it was; we might as well cut the funding now  
4 and save ourselves some time and money here.  But  
5 that's not where we're at I don't think on any of  
6 these, but.....

7           MS. BOERNER:  I don't believe so, no.

8           CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  I think it's more of we need  
9 to get back to the PI and get more information.....

10          MS. BOERNER:  Yes.

11          CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  .....and make sure this is on  
12 track, and maybe next year revisit it or something.

13          MS. BOERNER:  Uh-huh.

14          CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  I mean, that's -- I think  
15 that's where we're at.

16          MS. BOERNER:  Absolutely.  You can certainly  
17 direct Elise and myself to work with those PIs to try  
18 and get that additional information, you know, to  
19 provide -- that's either now or at the meeting next  
20 year.

21          MS. HOLDEREID:  I'd just point out the response  
22 actually has a lot of that information in there, so  
23 it.....

24          MS. BOERNER:  Right, but what we're saying is  
25 it was -- we couldn't review it.  We didn't have that

1 response when we sat at the Science Panel meeting, so  
2 -- or when we individually did it.

3 MS. HOLDEREID: And I'll just actually echo  
4 what you had said. One of the things that was  
5 confusing between the reports and the work plan format  
6 was where do you want what information? You know, what  
7 information where, and so there's status information of  
8 what's been completed to date in both places, and then  
9 there's milestones to be accomplished in the work plan,  
10 but it's kind of a mix and match. So it would be  
11 great, I totally agree.....

12 MS. BOERNER: Well, yeah, we'll develop  
13 something more comprehensive.

14 MS. HOLDEREID: .....on getting the -- yeah, so  
15 it's just easier to read and easier to put together  
16 for.....

17 MS. BOERNER: Yes. Absolutely.

18 MS. HOLDEREID: .....Science Panel.

19 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

20 MS. MARCERON: Well.....

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead, Terri.

22 MS. MARCERON: Thanks. I know there was some  
23 discussion earlier about this, Catherine, and I  
24 know.....

25 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

1 MS. MARCERON: .....maybe this is an option,  
2 too, maybe as part of the motion, but talking a little  
3 bit about a description of how Axion and NCEAS are  
4 working together to create that sort of -- you know,  
5 the synthesis and the integration part. I know that's  
6 come up a number of times, and last year I know we  
7 tried to tackle that. Or was it last year or two years  
8 ago?

9 MS. BOERNER: Two years ago. Uh-huh.

10 MS. MARCERON: Anyway, I guess what I didn't  
11 see in this either was sort of how those are integrated  
12 and how they're working together in the end for a  
13 product that's usable for individuals.

14 MS. BOERNER: Yes. Absolutely. I think that's  
15 something that I would like to see even before we  
16 continue on with some of the data products.

17 MS. HOLDEREID: Could I ask clarification that  
18 what you're looking for is just a description of the  
19 integration that's been done to date, more on.....

20 MS. BOERNER: To date and I think the future  
21 planning.....

22 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah.

23 MS. BOERNER: .....as well, because it seems  
24 like there's a report from Axion and I assume there's a  
25 report from NCEAS, but we can't see, was there any

1 conversation going on between the two, what from NCEAS  
2 is incorporated.

3 MS. HSIEH: So, you know, for example,.....

4 MS. HOLDEREID: Actually there's a lot.

5 MS. HSIEH: .....maybe like what sort of.....

6 MS. BOERNER: We have the data.

7 MS. HSIEH: .....what sort of value? You know,  
8 has there been any value, you know.....

9 MS. BOERNER: Right. Exactly.

10 MS. HSIEH: .....added. Any lessons learned.

11 Any nuggets of information that NCEAS has been able to,  
12 you know, lend to the programs to help.....

13 MS. HOLDEREID: All right. I mean, it's been a  
14 very integrated process of working.....

15 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

16 MS. HOLDEREID: .....particularly given the  
17 challenges. I mean, a lot, a lot, a lot of work has  
18 been done around metadata.....

19 MS. BOERNER: Right.

20 MS. HOLDEREID: .....and getting citable data  
21 products. And, you know, that whole availability  
22 access piece, that's been done completely jointly. A  
23 lot of back and forth, and some targeted meetings where  
24 we all got -- where the project man -- program  
25 management team and the data management team from both

1 Axiom and NCEAS got together, special meetings just for  
2 that. So there's been quite a bit of.....

3 MS. BOERNER: And that's amazing and we're  
4 happy to hear it.....

5 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah.

6 MS. BOERNER: .....but it's not reflected  
7 anywhere. And I think that's the frustration, we  
8 can't.....

9 MS. HSIEH: So I think what Kris is describing  
10 is the proposals in some places either had cut and  
11 paste things from FY12, boiler plate language that  
12 they'd already seen, or just a void of detail. And so  
13 what happened was the Science Panel started saying,  
14 well, what about this? What -- you know, so then they  
15 kind of go off on these really detailed comments that  
16 might not be tracking on where you guys are going.....

17 MS. HOLDEREID: Sure.

18 MS. HSIEH: .....with your five-year plan,  
19 because they don't know, and even without guidance for  
20 proposals, you know, I think that it goes without  
21 saying that some of that could have been added. That  
22 said, I think this year we're going to have a lot of  
23 discussions, and I think next year's proposals are  
24 going to be -- I think there'll just be a much clearer  
25 understanding of what needs to be in there to give the

1 Science Panel your story.

2 MS. BOERNER: All of us.....

3 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah.

4 MS. HSIEH: So they.....

5 MS. BOERNER: .....not just the Science  
6 Panel.....

7 MS. HSIEH: Yes, all of us.....

8 MS. HOLDEREID: (Indiscernible - simultaneous  
9 speech)

10 MS. BOERNER: .....all of us, yeah.

11 MS. HSIEH: .....yeah, because I'm not a  
12 scientist, but I read through them and I was like this  
13 isn't telling me anything, you know. And I'm not  
14 technical and I'm not a scientist. I think there  
15 definitely was some room for improvements, and I think  
16 also we can be -- the reporting process runs on its own  
17 cycle.

18 MS. HOLDEREID: Uh-huh.

19 MS. HSIEH: And we have said you can copy and  
20 paste. It has -- we have to have reports separate,  
21 because of the way we.....

22 MS. HOLDEREID: Right.

23 MS. HSIEH: .....administrate our paperwork.  
24 We can't just pull it out of your proposal and make  
25 things up. So, you know, I think that those voids --

1 I'm not concerned. I think next year that there will  
2 be some detailed proposals that the Science Panel can  
3 bite their teeth into.

4 I'm still sitting on the idea of having, you  
5 know, a couple of the team leads come in on a  
6 teleconference in the Science Panel. I feel that the  
7 Science Panel is an outside third-party peer review.  
8 They're not involved, you know, even peripherally. We  
9 do have some Alaska people who are involved with  
10 Trustee Council for many years, but -- and I think that  
11 outside review's important, and also I think that it is  
12 important for the programs to present themselves on  
13 paper in their proposals fully and not rely on having  
14 teleconferences a couple times a year with the Science  
15 Panel to fill in the gaps.

16 MS. HOLDEREID: Uh-huh.

17 MS. HSIEH: Of course, some kind of exchange is  
18 natural, and I think after every Science Panel meeting  
19 there's -- you know, there will be this exchange of  
20 information. Things that couldn't have been  
21 forecasted, but I think with fewer voids and boiler  
22 plate language that we've already seen in the proposals  
23 next year, I think that's going to take a bump up, and  
24 then also just more detail. It will help the Science  
25 Panel really dig into where you guys are at.

1 MS. HOLDEREID: Uh-huh.

2 MS. HSIEH: And then their comments will -- you  
3 know, won't end up far afield in a void.

4 MS. HOLDEREID: Right. Yeah. I think the  
5 challenge was that for our assumption, and in our  
6 discussions really that had to put this together, is we  
7 put a fair amount of the progress stuff in six-month  
8 report, and did not repeat all of that in the proposal,  
9 because those are submitted on the same day like. And  
10 so it was, okay, let's not repeat everything in this  
11 document. We can do that.

12 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

13 MS. HOLDEREID: The other piece though  
14 specifically about the cut and paste comment, I have to  
15 say the work plan -- is if you're not changing anything  
16 in your work plan from your original proposal, one  
17 would actually expect that.

18 MS. HSIEH: No, but it was FY12 milestones.

19 MS. HOLDEREID: They saw -- there was one  
20 project that in FY12 to 16 milestones. There were a  
21 couple that did FY14 through 16, because they wanted to  
22 show the future progress. Most of them just did FY14.  
23 So that's -- I mean, there was I think one project that  
24 showed all of the milestones from the entire program,  
25 but the rest of them were set up mainly for FY14. So,

1 I mean.....

2 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. I mean -- and I don't want  
3 to get into the.....

4 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah. Yeah. But that's.....

5 MS. BOERNER: .....he said/she said, but.....

6 MS. HOLDEREID: .....but that's -- and I think  
7 that just comes out in terms of if we're clear on how  
8 much information should be.....

9 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

10 MS. HOLDEREID: .....in there, we can do that.  
11 That's no problem.

12 MS. HSIEH: Yeah. And the Science Panel really  
13 -- they were total there like, you know, it just -- I  
14 think in fact they talked quite a bit amongst  
15 themselves about, well, maybe they didn't want to make  
16 a lot of work for you, so they said, well, maybe they  
17 could, you know, have -- they were trying to figure out  
18 ways for you to have sort of your boiler plate and the  
19 CVs or whatever, you know, and then have just the FY14  
20 chunk. So they're looking at that, too, from your  
21 perspective of let's just isolate the next FY15, which  
22 is.....

23 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah.

24 MS. HSIEH: .....one of the chunks. So they're  
25 really enthusiastic. They want to make it easier for

1 you, and they don't -- in fact, they said, dump the  
2 reporting they have to do in two.....

3 MS. HOLDEREID: Well, yeah.

4 MS. HSIEH: .....but we can't do that, because  
5 we also have.....

6 MS. HOLDEREID: That's -- yeah, we can't do  
7 that, yeah.

8 MS. HSIEH: .....this official record and all  
9 sort of stuff. So I think we're close.

10 MS. HOLDEREID: And we totally understand.

11 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

12 MS. HOLDEREID: It's complicated.

13 MS. BOERNER: It is.

14 MS. HOLDEREID: And, you know, appreciate  
15 actually working with you guys on figuring this out as  
16 we go, because.....

17 MS. HSIEH: Yeah. I think that's.....

18 MS. HOLDEREID: .....you know, that's been  
19 really -- it's worked really well I think.

20 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, it has. And I will say the  
21 -- you know, looking at the reports, the annual that  
22 was -- we know a lot of projects in there had literally  
23 two or three sentences about it. It's impossible to  
24 tell, did they meet any of their objectives? Where are  
25 they on the timelines that they had proposed for the

1 previous year? And that's something that I think we'll  
2 start to think about and work through. I mean, even  
3 with all those documents together, it was impossible to  
4 tell where some of these projects were in time.

5 MS. HOLDEREID: We can have it on.....

6 MS. BOERNER: But we (indiscernible -  
7 simultaneous speech).....

8 MS. HOLDEREID: .....the table, I mean, the  
9 whole thing.

10 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, exactly, something like  
11 that.

12 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah.

13 MS. BOERNER: So it's -- you know, we're  
14 working -- like you said, these are not negative  
15 comments. It's just some growing pains of the program.  
16 These are large, complex programs, and as long as we  
17 all keep working together, it shouldn't be a problem.

18 MS. HSIEH: And the Science Panel wanted to  
19 reiterate that as well.....

20 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

21 MS. HSIEH: .....that they're really excited to  
22 have long-term integrated programs. They're really  
23 excited about the folks involved, and they had a lot of  
24 energy to try and, you know, how can we make it work  
25 for them, and how can we get what we need. So we're

1 hearing the same thing from all folks.

2 MS. BOERNER: Okay. So I'll -- I don't know if  
3 we want to discuss the data, but the -- all the  
4 projects were recommended for continued funding, except  
5 again for the data, which we have spoken at length  
6 about, and the Hollmen conceptual model. We definitely  
7 -- the Science Panel had recommended that we get some  
8 additional information on that before we proceed. I  
9 know some information has been provided as part of the  
10 update that you received.

11 MS. HOLDEREID: Yes. And I will say  
12 specifically for those two projects, in the appendix  
13 there are -- in the appendix to the comments there are  
14 two progress to date reports that provide supplemental  
15 information.

16 MS. MARCERON: Which pages are those on, just  
17 quick questions.

18 MS. HOLDEREID: The one is Appendix A. I  
19 thought these were numbered. So it's Appendix A, it's  
20 the data management plan, which there was a comment  
21 about some more details on that, which have been  
22 provided in a couple different places, but it's -- it  
23 was all put together in one appendix, in Appendix A.

24 Appendix B is progress to date for the data  
25 management support and the collaboration with NCEAS,

1 in that group. And then, oh, which appendix. It's the  
2 last appendix.

3 MS. McCAMMON: The herring data.

4 MS. HOLDEREID: The herring at C. And D is --  
5 I think D is -- let me look at that. No, C is Hollmen,  
6 it's on the conceptual ecological modeling. So the  
7 biggest one is C, which is the data management progress  
8 to date, and the integration between Axiom and NCEAS.  
9 And you can see those PIs took seriously the need to  
10 provide supplemental information. It -- so --  
11 partially because they're frankly proud of what they've  
12 done.

13 I would say one of the things that Tula ran  
14 into when she was presenting at the PICES meeting a  
15 couple weeks ago was the number of people that were  
16 saying, wow -- and this is actually compliments to you  
17 guys. Wow, we can't believe you guys are integrating  
18 so much as 18 months into a program. And like, well,  
19 they see it up as an integrated program, right? You  
20 know, you get kudos for that, but she just had people  
21 just shocked that -- you know, the PICES. I mean,  
22 it's been doing that stuff for a long time, but that it  
23 was moving forward. So that was good to hear.  
24 Absolutely. Yeah.

25 MS. HSIEH: So the Hollmen is on Page 16, and

1 the data is on Pages 5, 6, 7. And then go to Appendix  
2 C regarding the modeling, which must be attached to C.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, it's at the very end.

4 MS. HOLDEREID: It's at the very end.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

6 MS. HSIEH: Okay.

7 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, that's the last three  
8 pages.

9 MS. HOLDEREID: What Hollmen's summarizing  
10 there is basically the work that they did with the PIs  
11 all together at our November 2012 PI meeting. And then  
12 she's been working with Dr. Sway's (ph) study with  
13 developing the linkage tool for basically how do you  
14 capture information regarding an ecosystem, and the  
15 connectivity, and the important components, and what  
16 matters to what, actually used expert opinion to do  
17 that. So that's some work that he's been working  
18 actually with Fish and Wildlife Service on. So -- and  
19 following up with that, applying it to this program,  
20 and then we'll be coming back for a day on that in a  
21 couple weeks. Looking forward to that.

22 MR. POURCHOT: Mr. Chairman. To go back to  
23 your question here a little while ago, which I think is  
24 a good one, It seems that if we don't have the specific  
25 conditional language. We don't have an opportunity to

1 go back to check to see if that additional information  
2 completely addresses the Science Panel's original  
3 recommendations, that we need to move on and hopefully  
4 continue to work with -- between staff and the PIs, and  
5 to see if the next -- our next go around the proposed  
6 -- or that additional information that has been flagged  
7 and requested is forthcoming.

8 MS. HSIEH: That would be my recommendation,  
9 because we could create a condition that's empty, but  
10 really this is substantive work. Everyone's involved  
11 and excited about it, and I look forward to -- I think  
12 -- I'm sure they'll -- everything will -- we'll see  
13 step-ups and improvements in communications already,  
14 and so I have confidence in that.

15 MS. BOERNER: And I don't think any of the  
16 conditions were of such great concern. I wouldn't say  
17 you shouldn't proceed.

18 MS. HSIEH: I would like to footnote though,  
19 you know, that the data issue that was -- so I'm  
20 talking about the generalized Science Panel comments.  
21 I think the data issue is one that has been flagged  
22 from the outset, and so I don't know -- you know, Larry  
23 discussed, you know, having potentially this meeting,  
24 if that would help clarify a mutual understanding  
25 amongst agencies that could use it.

1 MS. McCAMMON: Could I ask a clarifying  
2 question on that, Elise, because -- Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead, Molly.

4 MS. McCAMMON: Okay. Because I think that  
5 there -- it seems like there are a couple different  
6 issues. One is when you get data from a PI and how you  
7 put it into a data system and get metadata for it, and,  
8 you know, have it available for use. But it sounded  
9 like from your discussion that there was a different  
10 concern, that there was more concern of how it was  
11 actually collected, and that whether it was quality  
12 data, and whether it would be useful, and whether it  
13 was sophisticated and scientifically accurate enough.  
14 And that goes back then to looking at all the PIs and,  
15 you know, again looking at their sampling protocols and  
16 the calibration, and how they do that work. And I get  
17 the -- it seemed like you were more emphasizing that  
18 piece of it as opposed to the other piece. And it  
19 would help us to clarify what.....

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think I heard something  
21 different.

22 MS. McCAMMON: You heard something different?

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes.

24 MS. McCAMMON: So actually having that --  
25 because I look at what the Science Panel, and what you

1 said was a little bit different than that, and so  
2 I.....

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think we were talking -- my  
4 understanding is we were talking about the tool  
5 itself.....

6 MS. BOERNER: I can summarize that. Uh-huh.

7 MS. HSIEH: Yeah, Catherine.....

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....you know, what you --  
9 what's produced for them to use. And it's not so much  
10 the data and metadata that went into that -- the  
11 concern is that you're giving me the right tool that I  
12 can use then for my research, and everything's there  
13 that I need, and I can use easily.

14 MS. HSIEH: Catherine, can you summarize?

15 MS. HOLDEREID: That's.....

16 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. I think the general  
17 comments were that -- what guidance are we providing to  
18 the PIs when they're gathering their data. Is anybody  
19 looking at the data when it arrives for, you know,  
20 quality control purposes. And I also think about they  
21 were -- there was a lot of discussion about the  
22 usability of the data, who's using it, how, and where  
23 type of thing. But I think the main concern was, is  
24 what types of quality measures have been put into place  
25 and had been -- have been given to the PI to say, when

1 you prepare your data, you know, these -- this needs --  
2 you know, these conditions need to be met, and somebody  
3 on the other end of that, when the data does come in,  
4 looking at that and saying, yes, these conditions have  
5 been made. So I don't think it was like somebody -- I  
6 do know some of the comments did kind of get down into  
7 calibration and all of that. But I think we can pull  
8 it up. I think they were just digging a little -- you  
9 know, digging down at that point in time. But it's  
10 really just about the quality of the data coming in and  
11 going out.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And I think what we're  
13 talking about is more just convening the right people  
14 to have a discussion and seeing what's.....

15 MS. McCAMMON: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....what needs to be  
17 addressed, and what is part of your work, and.....

18 MS. McCAMMON: I think that would be great.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....part -- and somebody  
20 else's problem, not yours, you know.

21 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah, I think that's a great  
22 idea.

23 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, everybody's open to that,  
24 we're happy to do that.

25 MS. McCAMMON: Yeah.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I mean, rather than try to  
2 write a bunch of contingencies in here, and fine tune  
3 it, we're not in a position to do that and do a good  
4 job. We're just saying, you know, we trust everybody  
5 here. They're all doing a great job, and we just want  
6 you to keep going, but have this discussion. And if we  
7 need to provide some funding for it to make sure it  
8 happens, we can.

9           MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh. Yes, you'd want to amend  
10 your prior motion regarding the APDI to add \$12,000,  
11 and then Linda would -- you know, we'd have a new total  
12 and a new date on APDI which we would go back and add  
13 it in and issue it as of this date with that little  
14 piece in our science program section.

15           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Is that right budget, or do  
16 we need to have a discussion on that? You're pretty  
17 confident? That's a yes?

18           MS. HSIEH: That's a yes.

19           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So any other questions  
20 on the long-term monitoring?

21           (No comments)

22           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I'd just ask one question on  
23 the lingering oil. Maybe -- I don't know who's the  
24 right person to ask, but I was curious you brought that  
25 up, because lingering oil, there's -- I guess I haven't

1 really thought about this. There's maybe two broad sets  
2 of issues. One is where is there a lingering oil  
3 problem, and is -- how long is it going to persist?  
4 And, you know, we are looking at the weathering,  
5 whether there's things we can do in the meantime to try  
6 to speed it along and all that.

7           But the other -- the first question of how much  
8 is there out there, how much of the habitat still --  
9 these tidal areas and the gravels and stuff still have  
10 lingering oil in them. We've used the models to do  
11 that. We didn't go out and sample every beach in  
12 Prince William Sound.

13           MS. HOLDEREID: Uh-huh.

14           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We did this sophisticated  
15 model, and we're using that to say how much lingering  
16 oil is still out there. Is what you're -- what we're  
17 doing in -- under this work plan, would it be refining  
18 that model or is it just kind of separate from that?

19           MS. HOLDEREID: I think it helps in that, but  
20 it's a piece of extending that weathering and the  
21 change in the oil, you know, over time, other  
22 constituents. I mean, it's Mark Carl's.

23           MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

24           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But it won't give us any I  
25 guess closer air band, or whatever it would be on how

1 many -- how much area is still above water quality  
2 criteria for aquatic life?

3 MS. HOLDEREID: I would have to check with Mark  
4 on it. It's not something that they brought up in that  
5 proposal. I would think that it probably would be into  
6 the model in terms of, you know, weathering and  
7 persistence of the (indiscernible) the watershed. But  
8 we'll find that out.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Yeah, I'm just  
10 curious.

11 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah. Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I'm not suggesting changing  
13 anything.

14 MS. HOLDEREID: Yeah. And I know they're very  
15 interested in taking in the goals of the other funded  
16 project and incorporating that into the planning for  
17 that piece. They're pretty excited about actually of  
18 that all fitting together.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion?  
20 Otherwise we can go to a motion.

21 (No comments)

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do you want to take a crack  
23 at it?

24 MR. POURCHOT: Sure. Before I start this  
25 complicated motion, do you want me to roll in the

1 budget amendment at the same time?

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes, please.

3 MR. POURCHOT: I'll try. Mr. Chair. I would  
4 move that we approve funding of \$2,994,400, which  
5 includes general administration, for fiscal year '14  
6 funding of the long-term monitoring program 14120114  
7 proposal, dated August 30 of 2013. And to address some  
8 of the issues raised in the Science Panel and staff  
9 review, amend -- I move -- also move to amend our  
10 adopted FY14 budget by an additional \$12,000 for travel  
11 and associated expenses for a meeting of concerned  
12 staff and PIs and Science Panel members during this  
13 fiscal year.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: To look at the data  
15 management issues.

16 MR. POURCHOT: To look at the data management  
17 issues.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. And I think the other  
19 thing that we talked about, Pat, was having Catherine  
20 and Elise work with the Science Panel and others on  
21 some of the other questions that were designated as  
22 conditional funding in the recommendations that we got  
23 just to see if they can clear up any miscommunications  
24 and try to avoid the same kind of issues for next year.  
25 Our expectation is we would fund it, but they would go

1 back and have those discussions.

2 MR. POURCHOT: Then, Mr. Chair, I would further  
3 move that staff continue to work with the PIs in  
4 addressing some of the other issues that have been  
5 raised by the Science Panelists.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right. Thank you.

7 MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

8 MR. BALSIGER: Would you repeat back, Pat?

9 MR. POURCHOT: Yeah.

10 (Laughter)

11 MR. BALSIGER: Could you repeat the motion.

12 (Laughter)

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other discussion.

14 (No comments)

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any objection to the  
16 motion.

17 (No comments)

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hearing none, it passes.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. BOERNER: The next item on your agenda is  
21 discussion of Project 14120116, which is the marine  
22 debris removal program with the Gulf of Alaska Keeper.  
23 This project is actually a continuation of the fiscal  
24 year '12 work that they had proposed. They put on hold  
25 the work in fiscal year '13 in order to address the

1 tsunami debris, which they've -- obviously there's a  
2 lot more work to be done, but they've done the work  
3 that they had planned to. And this then, we're now  
4 picking up the original work that as going to be done.

5           This project was recommended for funding from  
6 all bodies, and they were, you know, very pleased with  
7 the work and the continued work. I don't think there  
8 were any issues or concerns from any of the parties.

9           MS. HSIEH: I think they were also pleased with  
10 the proposal and the amount of detail.

11           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

12           MS. BOERNER: Yeah, they were pleased with the  
13 proposal and the updates that we've been getting  
14 periodically, so we really do have a better concept of  
15 where this project is and what's happening.

16           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Pat.

17           MR. POURCHOT: Yeah, I was real impressed with  
18 the total volume and tonnage picked up this last  
19 summer. It was incredible.

20           It was also interesting that about half of the  
21 68 tons I guess of debris came from a very short  
22 stretch at the -- near the entrance of Hinchbrook.  
23 And even though there was many, many miles of beaches  
24 covered, the whole -- most of the path at least of the  
25 debris came from a couple of miles near the entrance to

1 Prince William Sound. It's interesting, and probably  
2 could inform the kind of prioritization of future clean  
3 ups.

4 MS. HSIEH: Chris Pallister is here.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Chris, do you want to  
6 join us up here.

7 MR. PALLISTER: Oh. Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, come on up, please.

9 MR. PALLISTER: I was just going to say on that  
10 stretch of coast out there on outer Montague Island  
11 we're getting close to 30 tons per mile now, plastic  
12 debris. That doesn't include any steel drums,  
13 shipwrecks, or creosote logs, and there are hundreds if  
14 not thousands of creosote logs out there, too, which  
15 are pretty nasty, but beyond our capacity to work with.  
16 But the tonnage is -- we estimated 20 tons per mile on  
17 the outside of Montague Island, and it's closer to 30  
18 tons per mile. It's absolutely staggering.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Is that just because of the  
20 way the currents come in that side and out the other?  
21 I mean, is it just the direction.....

22 MR. PALLISTER: Yeah. That -- you know, that  
23 side of Montague faces the -- everything, the  
24 prevailing winds and currents.

25 But I just wanted to thank the Council for the

1 funding, because with that funding we were able to  
2 start showing what was going on out there. And then  
3 the legislature stepped up and gave us some funding,  
4 too, so it's been a big deal.

5 But out costs now are approaching 120 to  
6 \$150,000 a mile on that outside of Montague piece.  
7 It's really overwhelming.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I agree with Pat. I thought  
9 your report was excellent, and just really appreciate  
10 everything you did this summer.

11 Jim.

12 MR. BALSIGER: Is there any progress -- or what  
13 is the progress -- or how are you planning to find out  
14 what are the unidentified chemicals in these drums that  
15 are reported here? Would that -- are they just being  
16 stored forever or.....

17 MR. PALLISTER: Well, what we're doing now is  
18 just consolidating them, and then we'll pass them on to  
19 DEC. The fact is I was just out there a couple weeks  
20 ago and a new 55-gallon drum of unknown chemical washed  
21 up. I have no idea what's in it, and turned it over to  
22 the Coast Guard. So we haven't identified anything  
23 ourselves. We just know that there's a drum full of  
24 something, so really don't have an answer for that.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. There's a protocol

1 there where they notify either Coast Guard or DEC and  
2 then we have contractors that.....

3 MR. PALLISTER: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....if they're not ready to  
5 deal with it, we have contractors that will deal with  
6 it. Other contractors.

7 MR. PALLISTER: And as we expected the  
8 lightweight stuff we think, we're pretty confident, is  
9 pretty much over. I would say probably 90 percent of  
10 the lightweight stuff is here already. But now we're  
11 starting to see the heavier stuff like they kind of  
12 anticipated, so now we're getting the chemicals.

13 MS. HSIEH: Thank you, Chris, also. Chris  
14 sends me -- you got to see the latest updated report,  
15 but Chris -- I don't even know how you do it, but  
16 somehow out in the field I'm getting these emails from  
17 Chris with tonnage and where they are and what they're  
18 doing.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. We have one committed  
20 contractor here, I'll say that.

21 (Laughter)

22 MR. PALLISTER: I never took a day off from the  
23 1st of March until two weeks ago.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I believe it.

25 MR. PALLISTER: I took a day off to get

1 married.

2 MS. HSIEH: Oh, congratulations.

3 (Laughter)

4 MS. HSIEH: Does she know what you look like?

5 (Laughter)

6 MS. HSIEH: Only because.....

7 MR. PALLISTER: We got married, she went to  
8 Virginia and I went to a conference in Hawaii.

9 MS. HSIEH: Because you've been in the field  
10 for.....

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So we've got a motion there,  
12 too?

13 MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh.

14 MS. SCHORR: I move we approve funding of  
15 \$445,919, which includes GA, for FY14 funding of the  
16 GoAK marine debris removal proposal, Barren Island  
17 amendment, dated September 10th, 2013.

18 MS. MARCERON: I second.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion.

20 (No comments)

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any objections.

22 (No comments)

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hearing none, the motion  
24 passes. Thanks again.

25 MR. PALLISTER: Thanks.

1 MS. HSIEH: Thank you, Chris.

2 MS. BOERNER: Back to work.

3 (Laughter)

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Take a break first.

5 MR. BALSIGER: Yeah, no break.

6 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Say hi to your wife.

8 (Laughter)

9 MS. BOERNER: Okay. The next project for your

10 discussion today is Project 11100853, and it's

11 amendment 8/29/13. This is an amendment to the pigeon

12 guillemot restoration research in Prince William Sound.

13 This project was originally funded in fiscal year '07

14 as a two-phase proposal. Phase 1 was going to be some

15 research and an EA, which is in your package. The EA

16 has been signed by Fish and Wildlife Service and APHIS,

17 but there's also a Forest Service environmental

18 assessment that is rounding the bend I believe on

19 getting signed and completed, because it is part of the

20 Chugach National Forest. So Forest Service has been

21 involved deeply in production of this assessment.

22 This proposal -- or this project would be the

23 culling of mink around pigeon guillemot nesting areas

24 on Naked Island in an effort to help restore them to

25 the health -- I was trying to get you the actual

1 number, and I don't want to pull it up if I can. So to  
2 restore them to a healthy population. This funding  
3 requesting is for beginning of the phase 2, which is  
4 the control of the mink.

5           This project was recommended for funding by the  
6 Science Panel and Elise. I had a few concerns  
7 regarding funding of the project. David has responded  
8 to some of those concerns, and that information is in  
9 your packet. And Dr. Irons is here as well in case you  
10 have any direct questions.

11           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Pat.

12           MR. POURCHOT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13           I know that there was -- I mean, there some  
14 were concerns and questions just on the whole biology,  
15 you know, if you're not exterminating every single  
16 mink, what could be accomplished, and is there a  
17 danger. And I know Fish and Game raised some issues  
18 with, you know, treating it as an introduced population  
19 versus a native population that was feeding on  
20 something different perhaps earlier.

21           Some -- I don't know -- I mean, we're not going  
22 to answer those questions now, but I thought that the  
23 revised program, you know, tried to address the  
24 concerns raised -- or the questions raised, and  
25 specifically I think Fish and Game's concerns in trying

1 this, if you will, a two-pronged approach. You know,  
2 trying a selective culling around where the pigeon  
3 guillemot nests, and seeing where we are in two or  
4 three years, and I think as indicated, at least in  
5 correspondence, Fish and Game, Tom can speak to this,  
6 but, you know, they seem willing to look at that  
7 approach and look at it and see where we were in two or  
8 three years.

9           So, I don't know, I think that it really seems  
10 to be a restoration project in the truest sense of the  
11 word. I mean, here we have, you know, an identified  
12 species in sharp decline, a breeding area that used to  
13 have the majority of the population breeding there.  
14 Now, you know, it's looking pretty grim. And, you  
15 know, it's not necessarily the perfect solution, but it  
16 seems like there's some obligation to pursue something,  
17 you know, instead of just looking at dwindling  
18 populations year after year.

19           MS. BOERNER: I was going to say, and for those  
20 folks that may need a refresher on the beginning of the  
21 project, they were looking at the genetics of the mink  
22 on the island to determine whether or not they were  
23 introduced or a native population. The genetics were  
24 I'll say mixed, but I know at the time ADF&G felt that  
25 it was not an introduced population, which is why we're

1 going from what was originally intended to be a  
2 complete cull of mink on the island to a limited cull.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Which raised that question  
4 whether you suppress the mink population the right  
5 amount in the right area and not have them reintroduce  
6 themselves and take away all your success, but I think  
7 what Pat's point is, is it's restoration. We don't  
8 have any other options, and we should give it a try I  
9 guess, but watch it closely.

10 MR. BROOKOVER: Well, and we support it. I  
11 mean, I concur with Pat. It is -- it's a restoration  
12 activity that can be done and has a good chance of  
13 success to restore an injured species that's not  
14 recovered.

15 And we did have concerns with the genetic  
16 analysis on mink, and we to be careful. I mean, we  
17 want to -- we have a responsibility for the fish and  
18 wildlife in the Sound, recognizing the situation the  
19 pigeon guillemots are in, but we've got a  
20 responsibility for the mink as well. So we do support  
21 this project as a good attempt to reduce the predation  
22 pressure and restore pigeon guillemots, but stop short  
23 of eradicating mink, which, you know, we wouldn't want  
24 to do on a natural population anywhere even for a  
25 restoration effort like this. We'd want to look at all

1 possible scenarios first. So this does that. It gives  
2 us we think a good start.

3           And I think everybody that's been involved in  
4 the project agrees that we'll, you know -- we'd like to  
5 reassess after several years and see the results. And  
6 if this isn't working like the project leader and  
7 people expect, then we step back and say, okay, you  
8 know, what other options exist.

9           But we think this is a good start. We think it  
10 will be productive. My understanding is efforts like  
11 this, reducing predation pressure around nesting area  
12 for birds has been successful in other areas. So we  
13 think it's got a good chance of success. It's a matter  
14 of degree, and we'll see where we are in a few years.

15           MS. BOERNER: Was there -- I guess I believe as  
16 part of the proposal there was a small addition for  
17 funding to look -- I believe it was at a -- to get a  
18 count that I thought ADF&G had requested from Dr.  
19 Irons; does that sound accurate?

20           MR. BROOKOVER: I don't know.

21           MS. BOERNER: I'm trying to remember.

22           MS. HSIEH: Do you want to ask David?

23           MS. BOERNER: You or Barry. Did they -- ADF&G  
24 had asked you for -- to add something to your project?

25           DR. IRONS: Yeah, we have -- yeah, it's in

1 budget.

2 MS. BOERNER: Okay. And it was for?

3 DR. IRONS: To look at the sex and age and  
4 (indiscernible - away from microphones).....

5 MS. BOERNER: There we go. Thank you.

6 MS. HSIEH: I think the trustees' comments echo  
7 the Science Panel sentiments, and my own, that's that I  
8 also appreciate -- I often put Catherine in the  
9 position of being highly critical, because that's the  
10 sort of information that we ask of her and the science  
11 panel, but I think that there was also support and  
12 interest in this project with the cautionary advice  
13 regarding, you know, the funding, you know, checking in  
14 after several years, and.....

15 MS. MARCERON: Mr. Chair. Can I add a few  
16 comments?

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead, Terri.

18 MS. MARCERON: So on behalf of the Forest  
19 Service, we too support the project. Again, it's  
20 defined as a five-year effort, so I think after three  
21 years we'll have a chance to see the effectiveness of  
22 it, and still have two more years to determine if  
23 there's some change in terms around the island. We're  
24 in support of that. My decision will reflect that  
25 five-year purpose.

1           And I appreciate the fact that Fish and  
2 Wildlife Service is working with us on the permit  
3 terms.

4           We do have a lot of public use around some of  
5 those Naked Island groups in the summer, and I  
6 appreciate the fact that David has done a good job of  
7 recognizing that the timeframe is in a time period when  
8 we can sort of mitigate and allow both activities to  
9 happen.

10           But we'll be working closely with Fish and  
11 Wildlife Service on those terms to make sure it's  
12 successful on behalf of the public and on behalf of the  
13 actual restoration work.

14           MS. HSIEH: And I don't know if I can also add  
15 this comment. We didn't have a PAC meeting in advance  
16 of this meeting because of the shut down; however, in  
17 past PAC meetings they've been extremely supportive of  
18 any sort of active restoration, which is a rarity. So  
19 I just wanted to bring their comments to the forefront,  
20 even though it's also relevant seeing that they.....

21           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So I guess we're ready  
22 for a motion.

23           MS. MARCERON: Okay. I move we approve funding  
24 of 396,000 -- oh, wait. Yeah.

25           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

1 MS. MARCERON: \$396,656, which includes general  
2 administration, for fiscal year '14 funding of the  
3 pigeon guillemot restoration research in Prince William  
4 Sound, fiscal year '14 amendment, dated August 29,  
5 2013.

6 MR. POURCHOT: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion.

8 (No comments)

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposition to the motion.

10 (No comments)

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hearing none, it passes.

12 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman. Before all the  
13 experts leave, what's the population estimate of mink  
14 on Naked Island, do we know, just out of curiosity.

15 MS. HSIEH: David.

16 DR. IRONS: Yeah?

17 MR. BALSIGER: What's your best population  
18 estimate of mink on that -- it's not for the record or  
19 part of -- just a curiosity, and I saw you were going  
20 to leave, so.....

21 DR. IRONS: This is 80 to 200 about.

22 MR. BALSIGER: Thousand?

23 DR. IRONS: No. Mink on Naked Island, 80 mink  
24 to 200 mink on (Indiscernible - away from microphones).

25 MR. BALSIGER: Thank you. That was probably in

1 there, but I didn't -- I couldn't see it.

2 MS. BOERNER: It wasn't. That's all right.

3 So we'll move on? Are we.....

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

5 MS. BOERNER: .....ready? Okay. To the last  
6 set of projects, the NOAA clean harbor projects.

7 So a very brief refresher. In fiscal year '12,  
8 the NOAA Restoration Office was given funding to help  
9 establish a harbor protection program. In fiscal year  
10 '13 they brought to us the five proposals that they had  
11 received in response to their invitation. Of those  
12 five, two of the projects were of particular interest  
13 to the Trustee Council, and those are the two projects  
14 we're looking at here today. We provided them Trustee  
15 Council comments, Science Panel comments, and some  
16 legal comments regarding their project, and they've  
17 come back with these revised proposals.

18 And I will start with the first one, which is  
19 project 14120112-A, and this is the Cordova clean  
20 harbor project that's being proposed by the Native  
21 Village of Eyak. I'm trying to think how to fast  
22 summarize it. They've -- I will say they've asked --  
23 they made a good effort in trying to address all of the  
24 issues and concerns that were brought up. The Science  
25 Panel was supportive of the community-based projects

1 and the amount of work that had gone into this to date,  
2 but there definitely was some concern, but right now,  
3 and as part of the proposal, there's going to be three  
4 antifreeze disposal options that would actually be  
5 implemented, and they're concerned, saying, you know,  
6 we should be able to cost-estimate that prior to the  
7 implementation. And it's definitely something I would  
8 concur with.

9           Actually to step back, and I do apologize, we  
10 did actually also make sure that they have -- I can't  
11 reach that myself, I'm sorry. I'm already ahead of  
12 myself. We made sure that they had assistance from the  
13 appropriate departments within Alaska to make sure that  
14 they could get some help trying to identify with  
15 leveraging these projects, making sure that they in  
16 some case could even connect with ongoing projects, and  
17 they have done that in some cases. But this is one  
18 thing that continued to remain outside were these three  
19 antifreeze disposal units, which are a large proportion  
20 of the project.

21           So I would say right now I think we have a fund  
22 conditional for all -- for myself, for Elise, and for  
23 the Science Panel. They were hoping that they could  
24 get a little more information on that prior to funding.

25           MS. HSIEH: Also, Catherine, we have Scott

1 Pegau here.....

2 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

3 MS. HSIEH: .....who actually had some  
4 information which could relate to both the substantive  
5 projects and since he is.....

6 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, since Scott is part of the  
7 Cordova clean harbor program.....

8 MS. HSIEH: .....so that would.....

9 MS. BOERNER: He's right behind me.

10 MS. HSIEH: That might be helpful.....

11 MS. BOERNER: Thank you.

12 MS. HSIEH: .....as well before.....

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. If you can come up  
14 here, Scott, if you would, please.

15 MR. PEGAU: So I can help answer questions with  
16 the Cordova clean harbor program. It's -- actually  
17 this would -- we're looking at year three of the clean  
18 harbor kind of project. It's been a coalition of local  
19 peoples and local groups for the past two years.

20 Actually the antifreeze concept was from the  
21 very first year when we asked the boaters, you know,  
22 what is the most important thing for helping keep the  
23 harbor clean. They identified antifreeze disposal,  
24 because right now you have to take it a mile away from  
25 the harbor, and a lot of the people are not willing to

1 go that far. So that came out of that portion.

2 As Catherine said, the original proposal had  
3 three different components. It got cut down to two,  
4 because of your concerns last year. We were trying to  
5 address things as best we can.

6 I know that there was some questions about the  
7 injured resources. You know, we emphasized the  
8 commercial fishing, essentially harbor users. So in  
9 the injured services, the commercial fishing,  
10 subsistence fishing, recreational and tourism are  
11 all listed. And those are the most obvious.

12 There are also injured species in the area.  
13 It's -- Cordova harbor is my primary herring research  
14 grounds, because I can walk through the harbor on my  
15 way to the office. And, you know, we use that quite a  
16 bit for actually collecting samples. It turns out that  
17 the disease prevalence within the harbor is about three  
18 to four times that of outside the harbor. So we've  
19 been using the fish in the harbor to do some of our  
20 disease work as well. And we -- you know, there are  
21 several other species, both birds, fish, mammals, that  
22 are in that area that are impacted.

23 I'm not sure if there's specific questions I  
24 can address associated with that project. Yeah.

25 MS. SCHORR: So you're seeing disease among

1 several species?

2 MR. PEGAU: You know, what we're looking at is  
3 the disease in the herring. So we're looking at  
4 disease prevalence. And the one that was most  
5 noticeable when we were sampling was Ichthyophonus,  
6 which I have learned is an old fish disease.  
7 Basically, you know, if you have it, you'll have it for  
8 the rest of your life, so it accumulates. And where we  
9 normally in the 15 to 20 percent range, we were  
10 shooting -- you know, our sample in Prince William  
11 Sound, I can look up the exact number, but it was  
12 closer to 70 in the harbor. So, you know, we were  
13 taking a look at what the impacts were. And so in some  
14 ways it's good for us in that when we need disease  
15 work, we know where to go, but it's kind of unfortunate  
16 that it's our own harbor that we're using.

17 MR. POURCHOT: But as an old scientist, that  
18 you -- that there's no link to causation there, right?  
19 You're just.....

20 MR. PEGAU: No, but I'm also -- when I'm down  
21 there, I'm looking at the amount of oil and debris  
22 that's in the harbor. And there is -- you know, we  
23 can't link it. We just know that the fish in the  
24 harbor are having a much rougher time than the fish  
25 outside the harbor. And we know that we have water

1 quality issues inside the harbor that we can address.  
2 And so, you know, like I said, we've really focused on  
3 the commercial users, because that harbor reflects the  
4 commercial fishery, and it reflects the town, its  
5 recreational capabilities, and everything else. And  
6 when you go down and you see diesel oil on the surface  
7 in the harbor, it's a negative impact. So -- but we're  
8 trying through a variety of methods to just clean up  
9 our own back yard and get it in better shape, primarily  
10 for the fishermen, and how it reflects on them, but  
11 recognize it may also have an impact on the organisms.

12           The Cordova harbor also has been used as the  
13 positive test control for pH sampling in the  
14 hydrocarbons of mussels in the past. And so that is  
15 one of the components where we're going to go in and  
16 try to use that as a way to see if we are having an  
17 impact on the quality of the harbor is to see if we  
18 can't drive that level down and be in better shape.

19           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Jim.

20           MR. BALSIGER: Thanks. So you've done a nice  
21 job identifying damage to the services.

22           MR. PEGAU: Yeah.

23           MR. BALSIGER: And you started on the resource,  
24 but you mostly talked about the harbor herring. So can  
25 you tell us that the harbor herring are the same as the

1 outside harbor herring? Is there an interchange of  
2 animals?

3 MR. PEGAU: There's definitely an interchange  
4 of animals. You know, it's -- my focus is on the  
5 juvenile herring, and so I watch them through that  
6 first year, and they tend to stay -- you know, I know  
7 where the herring are going to be in the harbor, and I  
8 know that I'll be able to follow them for several  
9 months in the harbor, but they will disappear on me.  
10 And when they disappear, I find them outside of the  
11 harbor, quite often they're mixing, and then they'll  
12 reappear in the harbor. So there definitely is an  
13 exchange, but it's sporadic, you know, they're -- and  
14 I'm not tagging these little fish, I'm just knowing  
15 that if I go down today, I can tell you which part of  
16 the harbor to go, what time of day, you know, and the  
17 odds are you will see juvenile herring in this  
18 location. So.....

19 MR. BALSIGER: Okay. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Pat.

21 MR. POURCHOT: This may be a question for you,  
22 Larry. Some of these activities, they sound like  
23 they're illegal activities. Do you guys enforce stuff  
24 like that? Dumping oil and dumping and antifreeze in  
25 harbors?

1 MR. BALSIGER: You're not talking about funding  
2 this project being illegal, right?

3 MR. POURCHOT: No.

4 (Laughter)

5 MR. BALSIGER: Okay.

6 MS. HSIEH: Spill of any size, Larry, ring any  
7 bells?

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, yeah. It would be --  
9 if somebody puts hydrocarbons in the water, whatever  
10 amount, they should report it to the state, and we  
11 would decide what the -- if it needs a response, but  
12 what we're talking about here are just routine  
13 practices that -- whether it's bilge water or people  
14 washing off their decks, and -- you know, it's a whole  
15 host of different activities that cumulatively over  
16 time have an impact.

17 MR. PEGAU: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: You didn't talk about that,  
19 but.....

20 DR. PEGAU: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....over time, this just  
22 gets worse. And so the sooner you can get in there and  
23 have a -- sorry about that. Put that on the other side  
24 here.

25 MS. HSIEH: I think that's.....

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: That's the live one there?

2           REPORTER: That one goes to my machine.

3           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

4           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

5           (Off record discussion re knocking microphone  
6 on floor)

7           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But anyway, what we would do  
8 is try -- and these programs have been successful  
9 around the state, and so I think it's a good planned  
10 project, and maybe this -- Catherine and Elise just  
11 working with Eyak Native Group and others just to kind  
12 of fine-tune some of the figures and what's behind  
13 them. Yeah, I think it would be successful. And I  
14 think what you do is have a long-term cleanup. And I  
15 don't know how Scott feels about it, but I think, too,  
16 once you introduce these better practices, it won't be  
17 just the harbor. It will be, you know, out on the  
18 water. People will just be taking care of things  
19 better.

20          MR. PEGAU: Like you said, this -- what we're  
21 looking at would be the third year, so we've had two  
22 years, and we've already started to notice a  
23 difference, you know, the last two years we -- or this  
24 year -- no, the last two, we've had people go through  
25 the harbor on a weekly basis just doing regular

1 cleanup. And that means all the people who are on  
2 their boats are going, what are you doing? You know,  
3 and why are you doing it? Oh, can we help you. You  
4 know, and it's recognizing that, oh, this stuff, if I  
5 leave it here, it's a bad spot, because it's likely to  
6 end up in the harbor. So it's elevating I think a lot  
7 of people's consciousness. We've been very pleased  
8 with the response that we've got from the boating  
9 community. There's a few cranky people that, you know,  
10 don't think it's a great idea, but the majority have  
11 been very supportive, and, you know, it's just made  
12 them stop and think about little things like net  
13 clippings that, you know, we show them that that's the  
14 majority of what we pick up is people's net clippings  
15 where they've just over years have gotten use to just  
16 dropping them on the dock and not thinking about it, is  
17 we're bringing it to their conscious. We're bringing  
18 their conscious, you know, in the cleaning of your  
19 deck, you know. What happens when you do that? You  
20 know, how long it stays in the harbor. Things like  
21 that.

22 MR. POURCHOT: Mr. Chair.....

23 MS. PATTON: This is Ivy Patton. Can you hear  
24 me over there?

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes, we can. Go ahead, Ivy.

1 MS. PATTON: Okay. Hi. Thanks. And thanks,  
2 Scott, for giving that background. I'm here if there's  
3 any other specific questions that need to be addressed.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We have a few more  
5 questions I think among the trustees here. We'll get  
6 back if we have any questions. But, yeah, stay on for  
7 a little bit longer.

8 MS. PATTON: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Pat.

10 MR. POURCHOT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't  
11 want to jump too far ahead here, but I was trying --  
12 I'm trying to make sense out of the Science Panel  
13 comments, and then our staff comments that agree, and  
14 the -- overall the short recommendation has been  
15 approve with conditions or conditional approval. But  
16 when you read this year's, after the revisions, after  
17 the revisions came on, after you read them, the Science  
18 Panel's comments, and then our DOJ attorney's comments,  
19 it seems like there's still two main questions out  
20 there. One is, I think one said, the tenuous  
21 connection between restoration, or, you know, the  
22 direct impacts of EVOS species. And then the second  
23 thing though is this question of action versus outreach  
24 or planning for something for the future. And I'm -- I  
25 don't know how -- what the conditions are that address

1 those questions. I guess for anybody.

2           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, I don't know, the  
3 connection with the restoration, I mean, it's -- when  
4 we look at some of the habitat acquisition projects  
5 like the two parcels on the Kenai River, I don't know  
6 if we could draw any closer connection there than we  
7 can here in my book. I mean, it's like, well, it's  
8 more of a policy decision rather than a fine line test  
9 that we have here. And it's whether we think that this  
10 is in my mind consistent with our restoration policies  
11 and goals, and if it's consistent with it, but we can't  
12 draw a really hard connection, well, we probably have  
13 too many restoration projects. My book, but.....

14           MS. HSIEH: I think, you know, you mentioned  
15 habitat, and I think both habitat and aspects of both  
16 of these projects support habitat for an injured  
17 species, which in this case really is herring. You  
18 know, as for how substantial that is, the numbers, I  
19 don't really think we have that information.

20           Your second question about funding a planning  
21 activity versus a direction action, I'm not sure --  
22 that really is a policy question as well. I think the  
23 Trustee Council tries to provide seed money for  
24 activities which have a second stage or some other  
25 group to take things on and continue them. I think

1 it's good for the Council to be conscious of both its  
2 generosity in trying to get things going with seed  
3 money, and also sometimes that hasn't always worked  
4 out, and I think that is just sort of the gray area  
5 reality of funding projects. I'm not sure I can add  
6 more clarity to that aspect.

7 MR. POURCHOT: Well, if I -- I'm sorry, just to  
8 respond. As I understood both responses, which, you  
9 know, very understandable, is I don't necessarily  
10 relate either one of those policy questions with a  
11 condition I guess. So I don't know what the -- what  
12 conditional means in this case.

13 MS. HSIEH: The conditional fund came from the  
14 Science Panel, and Catherine's comments that there's  
15 certain things in the budgets I think that could be  
16 refined and tightened up, and that's what that has to  
17 do with.

18 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

19 MS. HSIEH: I think those larger policy  
20 questions we can't really add value to those. But, you  
21 know, some of the budget things, it looks like they  
22 could take another look see and see if they could  
23 tighten those up a little bit.

24 MS. SCHORR: So would those, for example,  
25 include estimating the costs of each of the three

1 disposal processes and outlining those in advance?

2 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

3 MS. SCHORR: Okay.

4 MS. BOERNER: And perhaps getting additional  
5 assistance from DEC to hopefully help them work that  
6 through, because that information should be able to be  
7 provided.

8 MS. HSIEH: And these were community-based  
9 proposals, and we're very pleased with all the efforts.  
10 And I think.....

11 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

12 MS. HSIEH: .....the Science Panel also  
13 acknowledged that, too, but suggested there's a few  
14 little budget things we can maybe assist with.

15 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

16 MS. PATTON: All right. And this is Ivy Patton  
17 here again. I would like to say that I would be more  
18 than happy to work with the EVOS staff and City of  
19 Cordova staff to make some adjustment to the budget.  
20 Regarding the antifreeze project, I feel like the most  
21 important part of it is the construction and design of  
22 the shed to actually dispose of the antifreeze so  
23 people don't keep putting it into the used oil  
24 receptacle.

25 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Jim.

2           MR. BALSIGER: I was going to comment to Pat,  
3 you know, we have herring, I think it's something in  
4 the order of 8 to 10 percent of what we think the  
5 population was there before. And we've made him say  
6 that the harbor area interchange with whole  
7 populations. But if animals are that low a level, I  
8 think we have to take some concern over any additional  
9 mortality. So to me, this is not a tenuous link to  
10 that population any more that we're trying to recover,  
11 and all this time it hasn't. OES or 2012 year class  
12 may change our story, but until then I think that this  
13 is an impact on the damaged resources. So I actually  
14 don't have a problem with that part.

15           On the planning stuff, I think that's a good  
16 question, but Elise perhaps has addressed that.

17           MS. HSIEH: Well, I think I've captured the  
18 rub, I'm not sure I can resolve it for you, but, you  
19 know, I think what Jim just said also echoes similar to  
20 what you reviewed in the pigeon project where you have  
21 species which, you know, hasn't recovered, is under  
22 assault whether by prey or habitat assault. And I  
23 think that is a common ground that the Trustee Council  
24 has met on before.

25           MR. POURCHOT: Just to be a little bit

1 argumentative on that.

2 MS. HSIEH: Sure.

3 MR. POURCHOT: But I understand in principle  
4 your analogy, but.....

5 MS. HSIEH: Right.

6 MR. POURCHOT: .....the numbers are hugely  
7 different. My guess is that the -- and maybe you know,  
8 what the percentage of herring utilizing Cordova harbor  
9 are compared to all the herring in Prince William  
10 Sound, as opposed to the numbers of breeding pigeon  
11 guillemot on Naked Island is compared to all the pigeon  
12 guillemot nesting in Prince William Sound. I don't  
13 think those are particularly comparable. But I  
14 understand your point.

15 MS. HSIEH: Did you have a comment, Scott?

16 MR. PEGAU: I was going to say, you know, in  
17 many years it's probably -- I've seen as high as two or  
18 three percent of what I find for juvenile herring I  
19 find within the harbor itself. The eastern side  
20 contains most of the juvenile herring, and so that puts  
21 a lot of the juvenile herring either in the harbor or  
22 near the front of it. And so I think the number is  
23 higher than you might expect. In a very big year, that  
24 goes down, because it is a limited amount of habitat.  
25 It's just it's one of those preferred habitats, so it's

1 -- I can find herring there on a very regular basis,  
2 whereas many other areas I can't do the same.

3 MR. POURCHOT: It's probably antifreeze luring  
4 them in.

5 (Laughter)

6 MR. PEGAU: Yeah, it probably is.

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. They're very  
8 legitimate questions that we struggle with on this one,  
9 but I don't know how we could put too much more work  
10 into it, but obviously staff could go back and help  
11 refine those budget questions.

12 Are we ready for a motion?

13 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman. I would move we  
14 approve \$193,722, which includes GA, for fiscal year 14  
15 funding of project 14120112-A, the harbor water quality  
16 improvement program, dated September 3, 2013. That's  
17 the NVE proposal. I guess that's Native Village of  
18 Eyak.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Jim.

20 MR. BROOKOVER: I'll second.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Second. Thank you. Any  
22 other discussion.

23 (No comments)

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposition to the motion.

25 (No comments)

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Seeing none, it  
2 passes. Thank you. I guess we'll just expect  
3 Catherine and Elise to follow up on budget concerns.

4           MS. BOERNER: Yeah, we'll continue to work with  
5 the project.

6           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It sounds like everybody's  
7 wanting to work through those.

8           MS. BOERNER: And we've worked with them very  
9 closely just in developing the revised proposal,  
10 so.....

11          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, and the more.....

12          MS. PATTON: Okay.

13          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....more that can be done on  
14 that nexus to restoration, protecting the herring  
15 better. Okay.

16          MS. PATTON: Well, thank you, and I look  
17 forward to hearing back. We're working on those  
18 changes. This is a great opportunity for Cordova and  
19 the Native Village of Eyak.

20          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Ivy. And thanks for  
21 all your help in refining the proposal and sticking  
22 with us on it.

23          MS. PATTON: You're welcome. I'm going to sign  
24 out now, so thanks again.

25          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Shall we go onto other

1 -- Cordova snow management analysis?

2 MS. BOERNER: Yep. That's project 14120112-B.  
3 And that's the snow management analysis plan from the  
4 Copper River Watershed Program. They're hoping to fund  
5 a study that would allow them to identify the toxins  
6 coming off of snowmelt and identify ways of mitigating  
7 that -- mitigating the oil and sediment that is part of  
8 the snow piles, mitigate that from getting into the  
9 habitat.

10 This was a fund conditional by the Science  
11 Panel and Elise. The conditions were about the concern  
12 about that there wasn't a quality monitoring plan in  
13 place as well as the fact that this is a plan and that  
14 at this point in time there's no implementation that  
15 would immediately follow. They have provided some  
16 information which is contained in your packets that  
17 responded to the comments.

18 I did not recommend the project for funding. I  
19 thought that the link to injured resources and service  
20 was very tenuous at best on this. I'm also concerned  
21 whether or not they have a firm commitment from the  
22 City of Cordova to actually implement the study once  
23 it's completed.

24 I did look at their comments. They did respond  
25 about the no water quality monitoring program, but that

1 is part of the study that they want to do, so it would  
2 make sense that they would not have that information at  
3 this time.

4           Unfortunately I don't have Jan. Again we made  
5 available resources from DEC to help them work on this  
6 proposal. They've tried to address all of the comments  
7 that were from the Science -- or from the Science  
8 Panel, Trustee Council, and legal counsel. And they  
9 have for the most part met most of those concerns.

10           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Elise, did you have anything  
11 to say on this one or.....

12           MS. HSIEH: You know, both sets of PIs worked  
13 so hard to try and hear the comments from the last  
14 meeting and worked really hard. They -- we had several  
15 telephonic meetings with their staff, which was  
16 fantastic, and talked with NOAA to try and address  
17 those concerns. And I think that everyone did  
18 everything that they could to address those concerns.  
19 I think some concerns, similar to the -- that this is a  
20 planning project versus a physical implementation. And  
21 certainly if you gave them more money, I'm sure they'd,  
22 you know, be plowing snow as appropriately. But I  
23 think that those are some things that can't be cured  
24 through the refining process that we worked with PIs  
25 on.

1 MS. CARPENTER: May -- so this is Kristin  
2 Carpenter from the Copper River Watershed Project. If  
3 I -- if there's a moment in which it's appropriate, I'd  
4 like to.....

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I was just going to  
6 turn to you, Kristin, so thanks. Yeah, could you --  
7 yeah, we'd be interested in anything you have to say on  
8 the project.

9 MS. CARPENTER: Sure. Thank you. Yeah, thanks  
10 for the chance to comment.

11 I think we mentioned in the proposal that sewer  
12 and water runoff pollution, which includes snowmelt,  
13 had been a focus of ours for a long time. We  
14 commissioned three successive reports since 2008 that  
15 examined the issue in Cordova, and each of them  
16 recommended a snow management analysis for city street  
17 clearing.

18 And I guess just to -- I had some other  
19 comments, but to go right to the issues that were  
20 mentioned, yes, we don't have a water quality  
21 monitoring plan all worked out, because I felt like we  
22 would have to do the snow management analysis and look  
23 at the different sites. You know, some of them are in  
24 areas that are kind of boggy and wetlands. Some of  
25 them are under steep slopes. Some of them are closer

1 to water -- storm water receiving water bodies than  
2 others. And so the frequency with which we sample and  
3 the types of things that we sample for and how we  
4 sample for stuff in a water state, because we can't  
5 sample in the snow state. We actually have to sample  
6 water and not snow. I think all of those things, we're  
7 just going to have to be working with engineers to look  
8 at those site-specific conditions to work that out, so  
9 I didn't -- I just didn't feel like I could make --  
10 that there were a lot of assumptions I couldn't make  
11 yet. Or make at all. I mean, you know, we need more  
12 data.

13           We do -- we did very -- well, and in -- there  
14 is a line item in the budget for fiscal year '14 where  
15 we allocated money specifically for assistance with  
16 working out the water quality monitoring plan. So we  
17 know that's a very definite need.

18           With regard to the concern about whether we  
19 were going to result in something tangible, we did  
20 specifically add a much more -- what I thought was a  
21 more detailed phase two where we said we would like to  
22 build three structures to help mitigate snowmelt  
23 runoff, and that's why I also set the pictures and --  
24 attached to my comment letter showing an example of a  
25 similar construction project that we just finished two

1 weeks ago. It's not related to snowmelt, I realize  
2 that, but it is a tangible construction project that  
3 specifically treats storm water that we designed and  
4 constructed to treat storm water. And so I sent that  
5 as an example of the kind of thing that we have the  
6 capacity to do. We've managed several much larger  
7 construction scale projects which again don't have to  
8 do -- these other ones don't have to do with storm  
9 water, but we have the capacity to do contracts, to do  
10 competitive solicitations, to manage contractors and  
11 oversee these kinds of things.

12           And I guess I also sent that to show that we  
13 have a very strong working relationship with the city.  
14 You know, they let us construct that biofoil (ph) on  
15 city property. We had to work out a memorandum of  
16 understanding with the city that discussed long-term  
17 maintenance needs so that we have a role, the city has  
18 a role in making maintaining that biofoil, and we would  
19 certainly do the same kinds of things, depending on  
20 the, you know, extent of maintenance that's needed for  
21 these other projects.

22           And so anyway I just wanted to speak to the  
23 relationship that we have with the city and to say  
24 that, yes, we did budget funding for something tangible  
25 for a project result, not just a study. We wanted to

1 be sure that -- and frankly we were thrilled to have  
2 the opportunity to be able to do something more than  
3 just a study, because I think these kinds of projects  
4 are tangible in the community. They explain -- they  
5 help explain to people why they're necessary, and I  
6 just thought that those pictures would help give an  
7 idea of how snow analysis can translate into another  
8 project. And the Odiak (ph) pond storm water  
9 assessment that we did, but again I realize was for a  
10 broader category of storm water pollution runoff beyond  
11 just snow, identified 10 possible storm water treatment  
12 locations within the Odiak pond sub watershed. So I  
13 don't have any doubt that there are at least three in  
14 other place -- parts of the city that we could work on  
15 that will help mitigate storm water that drains into  
16 Orca Inlet, which is I know where the -- Orca Inlet and  
17 the harbor, which is where the herring population is of  
18 concern to us and to the Trustee Council.

19           So maybe I'll just stop there and see if there  
20 are any other questions I can answer.

21           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. This is Larry,  
22 Kristin. On the three possible projects there, how  
23 much in your second year budget, proposed budget,  
24 relates to actual projects? I mean, they're all  
25 projects, but brick and mortar projects.

1 MS. HSIEH: It's \$70,000. The letter was sent  
2 first I think.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I didn't have it in  
4 mine.

5 MS. HSIEH: Kristin, was it \$70,000?

6 MS. CARPENTER: That's for the construction,  
7 yes. I think.....

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: About half?

9 MS. CARPENTER: Yeah. I think the total was  
10 70,000. We also budgeted some money for a second year  
11 water quality monitoring as well and for staff time.  
12 But, yeah, I think 70 was the -- what we had put in  
13 there so far for survey costs, contractor services, and  
14 design costs on the engineers.

15 MS. HSIEH: On the back of the letter, number  
16 3.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other discussion?  
18 Questions? Everybody's looking at the material here.

19 MR. POURCHOT: Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes, Pat.

21 MR. POURCHOT: Just to clarify then. Now here  
22 in this letter which I don't recall seeing, we included  
23 70,000 in our FY15 budget request, so that's not part  
24 of this request, right?

25 MS. HSIEH: Right. It would be in year two.

1 It would be a multi-year project, that would be in year  
2 two.

3 MS. BOERNER: They're requesting funds for  
4 fiscal year 14/15.

5 MS. HSIEH: But you're only reviewing '14 right  
6 now. You'll see this again for '15. As with any  
7 multi-year project, we review it every year, but  
8 they're letting you know that the entire project does  
9 encompass a physical product.

10 MS. SCHORR: Okay. So you're reviewing the  
11 request for those funds next year?

12 MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh. Correct.

13 MS. SCHORR: Got it.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And it's 70,000 out of the  
15 137.5 thousand.

16 MS. CARPENTER: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. It's about half the  
18 second year. Let's see. Kristin, this is Larry again.  
19 While others are still looking at the material here,  
20 I'm curious on these three sites that you might be  
21 doing the work on next year for possible collection. I  
22 assume you don't have what the expense of building  
23 these structures would be, or do you have that in mind?  
24 And I just wonder how significant it would be, and if  
25 the city was supposed to come up with that for the

1 construction, whether it's something has a reasonable  
2 likelihood of happening?

3 MS. CARPENTER: Oh, no, that's part of the  
4 70,000. I budgeted -- it depends on what happens at  
5 each site. You know, some of them might -- are  
6 probably going to involve some heavy equipment, some  
7 earth moving, and so that's contractor time. I  
8 budgeted it, and it may be a little on the skinny side,  
9 but I did budget about \$8,000 per site, because, for  
10 example, at one site I thought it would mean  
11 constructing some kind of a berm that would act as a  
12 retainer for a snow pile. And then maybe -- and then I  
13 envisioned the watershed project coming in with some  
14 volunteers to help plant native plants on that berm so  
15 you get some vegetation established there, and you get  
16 a root network in place. And so the vegetative berm,  
17 maybe it's, I don't know, a couple feet high or three  
18 feet high, and that acts as a retaining wall. And then  
19 the snowmelt can percolate through that, so sediment  
20 and hydrocarbons would get -- run through that  
21 percolation system and get filtered and broken down by  
22 the vegetation and the soil.

23 It's going to be different in different places.  
24 I may have lowballed the construction costs, but I did  
25 put -- that is what that money is for.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I see now. Thank you.

2           MS. CARPENTER: Sure. And that's just one  
3 example. I mean, I know there's a host of best  
4 management practice information that the state has  
5 published, and that -- and it frankly becomes more and  
6 more current each year as more and more states realize  
7 the need for this kind of thing. I'm always trolling  
8 online to see what other -- you know, what is Minnesota  
9 doing? What's happening in Ohio? What about New  
10 Hampshire? And so there's a lot of information out  
11 there about snow management and structures to help  
12 retain snowmelt runoff and filter it.

13           MS. HSIEH: Has everyone had a chance to see  
14 the letter that I think helps answer a lot of our  
15 concerns as well. The fund conditional was three weeks  
16 ago, so I think -- Catherine, are you more comfortable  
17 -- with this additional information, are you more  
18 comfortable, or what issues remain for you?

19           MS. BOERNER: I actually think my original  
20 conditions still remain. I still think the link to  
21 injured resources is tenuous, and I'm still concerned  
22 about the actual full implementation of the project.

23           MS. SCHORR: Do you think that there are  
24 conditions that can address your concerns? Sorry,  
25 I'm.....

1 MS. BOERNER: That's a tricky one.

2 MS. SCHORR: .....putting you totally on the  
3 spot, sorry.

4 MS. BOERNER: No, that's okay. I can't think  
5 of anything specific.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Jim.

7 MR. BALSIGER: And so we just -- the previous  
8 project which was similar in nature, we tried to  
9 demonstrate or we thought that we had demonstrated an  
10 impact on injured resources. This, although it's snow  
11 instead of direct oil in the habitat, for me it's the  
12 same kind of deal. It puts pollutants, it puts toxins  
13 into the -- potentially into the harbor. So why  
14 wouldn't that be the same connection to injured  
15 resources that the previous project was?

16 MS. BOERNER: Only -- I think only one of the  
17 sites would actually feed directly into the harbor. I  
18 know most of them are up on lakes a little bit further  
19 up.

20 MS. CARPENTER: I wouldn't -- we don't know  
21 what sites. We haven't chosen them, because we haven't  
22 done the analysis yet. And the whole hillside, the  
23 front hillside of Cordova, all of the stormwater system  
24 drains to the harbor or to Orca Inlet.

25 MS. BOERNER: I'm also concerned, as we've been

1 in the past about funding studies. We've had kind of a  
2 mixed experience in the past with funding where some of  
3 them have gone on to be implemented, and then we've had  
4 others where they haven't. And I think my major  
5 concern still stands, is the city going to stand behind  
6 this so if we do fund this study, are they then going  
7 to come in and make funds available to actually have  
8 something done with that money instead of just a study  
9 that's going to sit on the shelf. And I know that's  
10 something that they can't -- you know, Kristin can't --  
11 I think she -- you know, she's done everything she  
12 could possibly do, but you really can't get the city  
13 to commit to something, of course until the study's  
14 done. But that's just my own personal opinion.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Understand. Thank you.

16 MS. CARPENTER: I guess if I could respond,  
17 that's why we budget funding in this budget request.  
18 We weren't planning on asking the city -- I mean, the  
19 city will be contributing to long-term maintenance.  
20 They'll be working with us reviewing site design plans  
21 and things like that, so they will definitely be  
22 involved, but the reason we came to the Trustee Council  
23 with at the request for this entire project is that  
24 this is the kind of thing that in a small community,  
25 it's just never going to rise to the top of the list,

1 because as Commission Hartig knows, it's not required  
2 for a city of our size. And yet we are contributing to  
3 long-term chronic toxicity every day. I means it's  
4 pouring outside right now, and every time we have a dry  
5 spell, you see rainbow sheen in all the street gutters  
6 and all the parking lots, and all of that gets washed  
7 straight into the ocean. And I think.....

8 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. And I don't doubt that.

9 MS. CARPENTER: .....that's what I -- when I  
10 look at the work that Charles Peterson did synthesizing  
11 the results from the Exxon Valdez where they measured  
12 the level of toxicity, the -- I'm trying to think of  
13 the -- it's almost like it's exponentially more toxic  
14 than they originally thought in terms of the -- what it  
15 takes to have an effect on pink salmon and herring eggs  
16 that are incubated. You know, the Clean Water Act  
17 standards were written for toxicity in terms of parts  
18 per million, and really it's toxic in parts per  
19 billion. So storm water pollution is a thousand times  
20 more toxic than we thought it was in the 1970s.

21 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman. So.....

22 MS. CARPENTER: And I think.....

23 MR. BALSIGER: So thank you for this  
24 discussion. So I think we do have potentially a  
25 similar -- we have a similar potential impact on

1 injured resources we had in the previous program. And  
2 I just want to clarify then that the whole project,  
3 which includes the 70-some thousand dollars in the  
4 second year is in fact going to further construction,  
5 to put into place the -- whatever the structures are,  
6 and that the cooperation we're looking from Cordova is  
7 really review of plans and permits, and perhaps  
8 maintenance three years from now, or four years from  
9 now, or three and four and five years from now. But if  
10 that's what we need -- if that's what we're saying is a  
11 problem with Cordova? I didn't say that well, but  
12 that's the -- the potential failure of this project  
13 because we're not sure what Cordova is going to be, is  
14 only asking them to review the projects and commit --  
15 hopefully they will do some maintenance down the road.  
16 That was kind of a question which is said awkwardly,  
17 but.....

18 MS. BOERNER: Well, they have to. Somebody has  
19 to maintain it, and she just said that on some projects  
20 like this tend to fall to the bottom of the pile. So  
21 I'm just concerned that even if we do build something,  
22 is it then just going to sit there and not fulfill what  
23 it needs to be doing.

24 MR. BALSIGER: Yeah. Thank you. I just wanted  
25 to confirm that that's what we're talking about.

1 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Did we get a letter of  
3 support from the city? Or some kind of acknowledgement  
4 in support?

5 MS. BOERNER: There was a letter in the  
6 package, just.....

7 MS. HSIEH: Back in February I believe.

8 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Just saying -- and in  
9 this one as well.

10 MS. PATTON: No, there was a new one.

11 MS. HSIEH: Is there a new one?

12 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, in this one as well,  
13 stating that, of course, you know, they supported the  
14 project, but there was nothing beyond, you know, that,  
15 of course, they -- you know, they supported the  
16 validity of the project.

17 MR. BROOKOVER: I guess one of my thoughts is I  
18 don't know what more we could expect from the city on a  
19 project like this. Larry, maybe you have some  
20 perspective where there have been other similar type of  
21 projects that have been.....

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think it's -- my own  
23 experience is, is that particularly in the smaller  
24 communities, it's a lot of just awareness, letting them  
25 recog -- people recognizing what an impact storm water

1 can have in terms of water quality. And that is  
2 something that one can control, and build settling  
3 areas and, you know, put berms up like that, and be  
4 able to put vegetative berms in and deal with the  
5 hydrocarbons before they get into the ocean, the  
6 harbor. I mean, it's all on the right track, but it's  
7 true, I mean, these are kind of orphan child's when it  
8 comes to small community budgets.

9 MR. BROOKOVER: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And I wouldn't disagree with  
11 any of that. I think that it does create more of an  
12 issue on the nexus to recovery of injured, impacted  
13 resources, but I -- to draw a tight line, I don't know  
14 that anybody can. It's kind of like the last project.  
15 It's how tenuous do you think that line is and how  
16 worth doing you think the project is. I don't -- as  
17 everybody keeps saying, I don't know how you could make  
18 it any better. It's just whether it's a fit. And will  
19 it have a beneficial impact? Yes. Will it be  
20 significant enough to rise to a level as a policy we  
21 should take these kind of projects? I don't know that  
22 we know at this point in time. We don't have data.  
23 But certainly I don't see any way you can make it  
24 better right now.

25 Terri.

1 MS. MARCERON: Mr. Chairman. My comment after  
2 reading this and listening to the comments is that  
3 again the first piece is a fit of that design and that  
4 study, but the second piece that I thought Kristin did  
5 a good job on was by including the 70,000, that second,  
6 that potentially whether it's the three or the one,  
7 maybe they could strengthen it by showing the  
8 relationship as Kristin indicated. Having been to  
9 Cordova many times, that relationship that maybe a  
10 couple of those locations would be in that front that  
11 would have a direct relationship into the water, and  
12 that we don't know yet, as Kristin indicated, whether  
13 that's going to be the outcome, where these sites are  
14 best going to be located, but if there's maybe a way  
15 that we tie the approval to recognizing that that  
16 second stage does relate to some of those sites  
17 directly into the water, and she comes back and can  
18 show how many of those are, whether it's one, two, or  
19 three, maybe then that would tailor either that funding  
20 amount or provide a direct correlation. I mean,  
21 that's the one thought. So I'm thinking about how she  
22 worded it on that forefront of it. I mean, it just  
23 seems like there's a lot -- there is a lot of water  
24 that runs down in some of those area.  
25 So that's one way maybe to shrinking this a

1 little bit, to tweak it. At least that would make me  
2 comfortable at going forward.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: You're talking more about  
4 just kind of a quantity of sites versus actual water  
5 quality impact of the storm water?

6 MS. MARCERON: Just strengthening, that's.....

7 MS. CARPENTER: And its relation to Orca Inlet,  
8 is that.....

9 MS. MARCERON: Uh-huh.

10 MS. BOERNER: But this is about snowmelt; is  
11 that correct? Because I hear about rain and the water  
12 coming off, so it's just -- that to me -- is that still  
13 part and parcel?

14 MS. MARCERON: I'm sorry. Maybe it was -- it  
15 was probably.....

16 MS. BOERNER: No, no, I'm sorry.

17 MS. MARCERON: .....my part. It was just  
18 looking at these three -- looking at the sites for the  
19 70,000 and.....

20 MS. BOERNER: Right.

21 MS. MARCERON: .....just trying to correlate  
22 their locations, because I think earlier you.....

23 MS. BOERNER: Oh, absolutely.

24 MS. MARCERON: .....indicated that maybe some  
25 of those were way back and that that's.....

1 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. And it sounds like they're  
2 not even sure yet. And that would be part of the  
3 study, of course, is to.....

4 MS. CARPENTER: Well.....

5 MS. BOERNER: .....identify those.

6 MS. CARPENTER: This is Kristin. And what I  
7 can say is that there are several snow storage sites on  
8 the -- what would it be? I guess the western-facing  
9 side of town, which is the side -- I mean, I try to  
10 think of Cordova -- well, in this case I think of it in  
11 terms of planes, so I grossly over-simplify in my  
12 visual picture, but there's one whole hillside that  
13 drains to Orca Inlet, and there are several snow  
14 storage sites on this west-facing side of town where  
15 you get mountains of snow with all the sand and all the  
16 truck leaking vehicle fluids that get washed up in that  
17 sand, and the -- or absorbed to those sand particles,  
18 and that is what drains straight to Orca Inlet. So  
19 with what Commissioner Marceron was saying was that,  
20 you know, would we try to target the sites where we do  
21 construct either a sediment trap, or a berm, or a  
22 combination of those things to filter snowmelt  
23 pollution, can we do that for the locations that drain  
24 to Orca Inlet and the harbor? Yes, we can certainly  
25 make that a priority.

1 MS. HSIEH: Would that information -- Kristin,  
2 would that information be available for the year two  
3 proposal that would come in next September 1st?

4 MS. CARPENTER: Oh, yeah. Yeah. I mean, I  
5 think that's.....

6 MS. HSIEH: Is that.....

7 MS. CARPENTER: .....whole goal is that we do  
8 -- we'd like to be doing the analysis this coming  
9 winter that so we've got those recommendations for  
10 stuff -- that those are developed say, I think that's  
11 what I put in the plan, in March, April, May of 2014,  
12 and so that we're ready to implement those things for  
13 the winter of 2014/2015.

14 MR. BALSIGER: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me try  
15 this.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

17 MR. BALSIGER: I move we approve funding  
18 \$103,818, which includes GA, for fiscal year '14  
19 funding of project 14120112-B, EVOS Legacy, reducing  
20 Cordova snowmelt pollution to marine habitat, September  
21 3rd, 2013. And as an aside, Mr. Chairman, I'd -- if  
22 it's necessary in the motion, I would say the second --  
23 the 70,000 construction part is dependent on them  
24 coming back with a design next year. They'd have to  
25 come back anyway to get the second year of funding, so

1 would you like that to be part of the motion?

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I'd like to maybe, Jim,  
3 suggest that you say in your motion that they should --  
4 in their work that they do in fiscal year '14 to try to  
5 identify the sources of the snowmelt water that would  
6 impact -- which harbor is it?

7 MS. MARCERON: Orca Inlet.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Orca Inlet, excuse me. Orca  
9 Inlet, and -- because what we're trying to do in the --  
10 is get projects that would target impacts to that  
11 critical area. I don't know, those are -- you put it  
12 in better words, but that's I think what we're both  
13 after.

14 MR. BALSIGER: I'm sure I won't put it in  
15 better words, but I would addend to my motion that we  
16 expect that the work done in fiscal '14 would identify  
17 those area -- or those snowmelt collection areas that  
18 would drain into Orca Inlet so that we would have that  
19 information at our next time to meet.

20 MS. HSIEH: I'm sorry, expect that the work  
21 done in what, '14?

22 MR. BALSIGER: Right.

23 MS. HSIEH: Oh, didn't he say '15?

24 MR. BALSIGER: I meant to say '14.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

1 MS. MARCERON: I second.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: A second. Any more  
3 discussion.

4 (No comments)

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No discussion. Any  
6 opposition.

7 (No comments)

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Hearing none, it  
9 passes.

10 MS. BOERNER: So that leads us to the final  
11 project for me today, and.....

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. I think before we  
13 finish, thanks, Kristin, for all your work on this.  
14 And I think as you heard, that there's concern about  
15 the nexus between this project and restoration of  
16 injured resources. And so, you know, maybe talking  
17 with Elise you can talk about how the work in this  
18 first year of the project can set you better up for  
19 funding next year. But I think it will get a critical  
20 look next year, you know, as is this headed in a  
21 direction where we can make that connection and so  
22 comfortable funding.

23 MS. HSIEH: Okay. I think for Ivy and Laurel  
24 as well to consider that next years proposals can  
25 include the piece that Scott so helpfully illustrated

1 today, if that could be in those proposals as that  
2 piece, you know, I think people will be expecting to  
3 see that again reiterated for the second.....

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

5 MS. HSIEH: .....year for the projects.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Good.

7 MS. HSIEH: As well as more information with  
8 regard to the drainage areas for the snow work draining  
9 into Orca.

10 MS. CARPENTER: Absolutely. Well, that's  
11 great. Well, thank you so much for your  
12 consideration. I appreciate everybody (indiscernible)  
13 through this with us. I know it's a big policy  
14 subject.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Well, great. We'll  
16 look forward to hearing about your successes next year.

17 MS. CARPENTER: Great. And I look forward to  
18 working with the Trustee Council and the staff. Thank  
19 you so much.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you.

21 MS. HSIEH: Thank you.

22 MS. CARPENTER: All right.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Catherine.

24 MS. BOERNER: All right. This will be project  
25 14120112, and this is for project management costs for

1 the NOAA Restoration Office to actually assist these  
2 two projects with -- in their implementation. So  
3 there's -- they're asking for \$6,540 in fiscal year '14  
4 to -- for some travel and some project management  
5 costs. And again it will just help them help the  
6 communities work with these projects and hopefully try  
7 to leverage some of their costs.

8 MS. SCHORR: I just had a question about -- I  
9 wasn't clear from the letter what specific types of  
10 project monitoring activities were involved. There  
11 were, you know, multiple trips, but there wasn't any  
12 description of how that would be helpful to the  
13 projects, so if there could be just a brief description  
14 of that, that would be great.

15 MS. BOERNER: Erica, are you on line?

16 MS. AMMON: Yeah, you betcha.

17 MS. BOERNER: This is Erica Ammon (ph).

18 MS. AMMON: Yes, this is Erica Ammon from NOAA.

19 MS. HSIEH: Hi, Erica.

20 MS. AMMON: And this is just kind of one of the  
21 ways that the Restoration Center follows projects and  
22 adds support to projects. And obviously we've been  
23 working with both the Eyak Tribe and Copper River  
24 Watershed Partnership from before there was an idea for  
25 these projects. And so part of our project management

1 is on-site oversight of the projects and just  
2 continuing to work with the applicants to make sure  
3 that their projects are going along and also aid in any  
4 permitting or other kind of work that needs to be done  
5 to make sure that their projects are facilitated.

6 MR. BALSIGER: Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Jim.

8 MR. BALSIGER: So, Erica, I hesitate to ask  
9 this, but why is this letter not on some kind of NOAA  
10 letterhead?

11 MS. AMMON: I'm not sure. We could do that for  
12 you.

13 MR. BALSIGER: Well, I just want to make sure  
14 that it's not Laura Jennings in opposition to her boss,  
15 that had to type this at home and send it in.

16 (Laughter)

17 MS. AMMON: I'm sorry, I didn't -- I couldn't  
18 quite hear that last.

19 MR. BALSIGER: Well, the letter's from Laura  
20 Jennings at 7600 Sandpoint Way Northeast, and I know  
21 where that is, but it just seems weird to me that it  
22 wouldn't have been on NOAA letterhead.

23 MS. AMMON: Oh, yeah. Well, we could get that  
24 right to you on the proper good quality NOAA  
25 letterhead.

1 MS. HSIEH: No, no more paper.

2 MS. BOERNER: No more paper, please.

3 MS. HSIEH: We're good.

4 MR. BALSIGER: Send me a copy. I'd like to  
5 have that.

6 (Laughter)

7 MS. AMMON: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Pat.

9 MR. POURCHOT: This is really nit-picky. I  
10 couldn't rectify the two numbers, the one in the  
11 motion, and then both places of the NOAA management  
12 talks about \$6,000 even. What.....

13 MS. BOERNER: Plus the nine percent GA which  
14 needs to be added.

15 MS. HSIEH: So the motions add the nine  
16 percent.

17 MS. BOERNER: The numbers you have, yeah, adds  
18 the nine percent. Their proposal did not.

19 MS. SCHORR: Okay. So that's the \$540.

20 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

21 MS. SCHORR: Got it.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Ready for a motion?

23 MR. BALSIGER: Well, Mr. Chair, I'll move we  
24 approve funding \$6,540, which includes GA, for FY14  
25 funding for project 14120122, Prince William Sound

1 harbor cleanup program, dated September 3rd, 2013.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It's 0112.

3 MR. BALSIGER: Correct.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks.

5 MR. POURCHOT: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Second. Okay. Any other  
7 discussion.

8 (No comments)

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposition.

10 (No comments)

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: None. The motion passes.

12 MS. BOERNER: Before I scuttle off, I wanted to  
13 thank Larry and Michelle Hale and her staff who  
14 provided us assistance with the NOAA proposals. They  
15 were invaluable and really present and they gave us a  
16 lot of really great ideas to help refine those  
17 proposals. So thank you for that.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. I already passed that  
19 on to them, but I appreciate it, and any time we can  
20 help.

21 Okay. I guess we're ready for the Koniag  
22 master agreement and easement update from Joe. Thanks  
23 for waiting so long, Joe.

24 (Laughter)

25 MR. DARNELL: Well, it's been fascinating.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I'm sure.

2           MS. HSIEH: Tell us who's serving in Palatas  
3 (ph) (indiscernible).

4           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, we've got an executive  
5 session scheduled after this. I guess Joe will join us  
6 at that, too.

7           MR. DARNELL: Oh, okay.

8           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So you'll know the -- if you  
9 want to clear everything in executive session, you'll  
10 have that opportunity, also.

11          MR. DARNELL: All right. Okay. Well, I think  
12 this was put in here as a placeholder and personal  
13 expectation that we might have a visit from the folks  
14 from Koniag. They communicated with the Council, and  
15 Elise has a copy of a letter -- has a letter from them  
16 indicating that they've chosen not to come and make a  
17 presentation on the Koniag easement. They did indicate  
18 in the letter that they understand that from this date  
19 forward they have 30 days to make a decision.

20          As the Council may recall, under what you did  
21 last spring, they were given an opportunity for another  
22 opt out of the conservation easement. We're now in the  
23 year one of the next 10 years. So it's got another  
24 nine years to run. If they take no action, then it  
25 would -- then the easement is in place, or continue on

1 for nine more years. The do have the option of  
2 electing to withdraw from it within this 30 days, so  
3 the clock starts today. So that's where we're sitting.

4           There were a number of conversations and  
5 meetings between ADF&G, Mark I think was part of it,  
6 Mitch Ellis who was here earlier, and he saw the letter  
7 and decided to leave. He's the chief of Refuges for  
8 the Fish and Wildlife Service. We had a number of  
9 meetings and Jen actually participated in those as well  
10 with the folks from Koniag. It was a good discussion,  
11 but it's clear as the letter indicates from Koniag that  
12 there are some basic disagreements in terms of where  
13 the folks at Koniag think the easement ought to be or  
14 where it should be going, and the way Fish and Wildlife  
15 Service is comfortable going with this, so I guess  
16 we'll just have to wait and see whether they in fact  
17 choose to pull the plug here in the next 30 days.

18           MS. HSIEH: I show -- I believe the annual  
19 payments for the remaining nine years, if they were not  
20 to terminate, I was doing this off the top of my head,  
21 I have \$744,000. I believe the figure is stable now at  
22 744.....

23           MS. SCHORR: I believe that it stabilizes next  
24 year \$744,000 and then remains there, yes.

25           MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

1           MR. DARNELL: Yeah. So they will be entitled  
2 to a payment here shortly, because the payments come at  
3 the end of the con -- of the year.

4           MS. HSIEH: I believe payment.....

5           MS. SCHORR: That payment has either  
6 occurred.....

7           MR. DARNELL: Or has it -- has it already  
8 occurred?

9           MS. SCHORR: .....or will be occurring.

10          MS. HSIEH: .....occurred last week.

11          MR. DARNELL: Okay. I had a note down. I  
12 wasn't sure whether -- where that was, but -- so.....

13          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I know that through this  
14 whole thing, and I appreciate all the work that you've  
15 put into it, and, Jen, I mean, you guys worked really  
16 hard on this. And I know that your counterparts at  
17 Koniag have, too. And I think the trustees just wanted  
18 to provide that opportunity so that if there was  
19 options to explore, if people felt uncomfortable, they  
20 had the time to do it, and caucus with their principals  
21 and -- I mean, I don't see anything else we as trustees  
22 can do. I think that we have to just kind of wait and  
23 see how it turns out at this point, unless you have  
24 anything else to recommend.

25          MR. DARNELL: No, I really don't. I think.....

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I mean, there's no bad blood  
2 here. There's nobody upset at anybody. It's just  
3 people have.....

4           MR. DARNELL: No.

5           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....different future --  
6 plans about the future.

7           MR. DARNELL: Yeah. I think that's a good way  
8 to put it. They do, and I think they're -- Koniag's  
9 working through how it wants to proceed.

10          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

11          MR. DARNELL: And I know from talking with  
12 Mitch Ellis that certainly the Fish and Wildlife  
13 Service, even if this things were to -- if Koniag were  
14 to choose to withdraw from it, that they're certainly  
15 interested in -- they will continue working with  
16 Koniag, because they share the island.

17          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right. And I'm sure the same  
18 with Fish and Game.

19          MR. DARNELL: Yeah, Fish and Game as well.  
20 But.....

21          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No animosity here.

22          MR. DARNELL: No. And.....

23          CHAIRMAN HARTIG: People upset anybody.

24          MR. DARNELL: .....entertain, you know, any  
25 future proposals or something, that's always an option.

1           CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Any questions for Joe  
2 right now? Pat.

3           MR. POURCHOT: I was good right up to the last  
4 sentence. What do you mean will entertain other  
5 proposals in the future? You mean when in the future  
6 are you talking about?

7           MR. DARNELL: Like if Koniag were to want to  
8 come in and say, well, we'd be interested in talking to  
9 you about something else, or something similar.  
10 Certainly Mitch's -- Mr. Ellis' view is that, well,  
11 depending on -- assuming there was money or something  
12 available, that they would certainly be willing to talk  
13 with them about something. But -- so as Commissioner  
14 Hartig points out, there's no bad blood here I don't  
15 think. It's just where the -- just under this current  
16 framework, it's -- they seem to think it's not quite  
17 working right for them, although, again, we've got 30  
18 more days, you know.

19          MR. POURCHOT: Well, I know -- I guess what I'm  
20 getting, we're not going to do anything in that -- we,  
21 the Council, aren't going to do anything in the next 30  
22 days, right?

23          MR. DARNELL: No, I don't -- no, it's up.....

24          MR. POURCHOT: Yeah.

25          MR. DARNELL: .....to the Council, but I don't

1 think so.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think we just wait and see.  
3 I think as I say I don't think there's anything else we  
4 can do or.....

5 MR. DARNELL: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....need to do right now. I  
7 just want to make it clear that, you know, we're not  
8 walking away. Nobody's walking away from each other.  
9 It's just this may or may not come again. Maybe  
10 they'll extend. Maybe nothing will happen. It will  
11 just keep going.

12 MR. DARNELL: Correct.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Which is fine, too.

14 MR. DARNELL: Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So I think that brings  
16 us to executive session unless there's anything else  
17 you know that we need to take up here or.....

18 MS. HSIEH: No, I think that's everything.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Anything else that any  
20 trustees want to bring during the public meeting.

21 (No comments)

22 MS. HSIEH: Thank you very much for your  
23 endurance, everyone.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So I guess we need a motion  
25 to go into executive session though, don't we?

1 MS. HSIEH: You do. And are we going to use  
2 this room, Cherri?

3 MS. WOMAC: We can.

4 MS. HSIEH: Okay.

5 MS. SCHORR: I move that we -- the Trustee  
6 Council goes into executive discussion -- session to  
7 discuss a personnel issue.

8 MR. BALSIGER: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Second. Okay. Any  
10 objections.

11 (No comments)

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. No objections. Okay.  
13 We're going to go into executive session and discuss a  
14 personnel issue. And then the plan would be to come  
15 back and close the meeting out. The intent is not to  
16 take up anything new once we come back.

17 (Off record)

18 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 229 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council's Meeting recorded electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 28th day of October 2013, commencing at the hour of 9:30 a.m. and thereafter transcribed under my direction and reduced to print:

THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the request of:

EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL  
Anchorage, Alaska

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 8th day of November 2013.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY:

\_\_\_\_\_

Salena A. Hile  
Notary Public, State of Alaska  
My Commission Expires:09/16/14