EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT TRUSTEE COUNCIL

RESTORATION OFFICE 645 G Street Anchorage, Alaska September 14, 1992 10:00 a.m.

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS:

25

6	State of Alaska	MR. CHARLES COLE Attorney General
8	State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation	MR. JOHN SANDOR Commissioner
10	Alaska Department of Fish and Game	MR. CARL ROSIER Commissioner
11	USDA Forest Service	MR. MICHAEL BARTON Regional Forester
12 13	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	MR. STEVEN PENNOYER Regional Director Council Chairman
14 15	United States Department of the Interior	MR. CURTIS McVEE Special Assistant to the Secretary
16 17	* * * *	* * * *
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

R & R COURT REPORTERS

PROCEEDINGS

MR. PENNOYER: I think we'd like to go ahead and get started if we could. We have a rather ambitious agenda here and I think we need to go through the whole process.

This is a meeting of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, and I have here with me our -- my fellow trustees with Carl Rosier, Curt McVee, Mike Barton, John Sandor, myself, and Attorney General Charles Cole. I won't introduce all the members of the Restoration Team that are sitting at the table with me.

We're scheduled to meet tomorrow and possibly tomorrow 10depending on how the agenda works out. As I mentioned, we have a 11very long agenda process before, and obviously an adequate amount 12of paperwork to go through.

I think maybe -- does anybody wish to make any opening 14statements or shall we go to Mr. Gibbons and ask him to review 15the agenda and then comment on that? Mr. Gibbons, would you 16review the agenda and the state of preparation of these various 17items and in essence just sort of march through us (sic) and tell 18us -- through it and tell us what we have to do relative to the 19time schedule?

DR. GIBBONS: Sure. Item number one, the 1completion of Public Advisory Group nominations. This is a 2continuation from the August 31st meeting. The Trustee Council 3requested the Restoration Team to solicit more nominees in three 24categories. The first category was Recreational Users, the 25second category is Sport Fishing and Hunting, and the third

R & R COURT REPORTERS

category, Public at Large. This was done immediately following that August 31st meeting. We've received a good response from the public. In the packages out in front and in the Trustee Council packages are a summary sheet of the nominees for each of these three categories, plus a spread sheet of additional information, and the Trustee Council additionally have a copy of all the submissions from the public for their qualifications. And I've got one additional one here that just came in over the weekend from Gary Kompkoff. He's on the list but we had 10no information on him, and so I'll be passing that out. So the item here would be to complete the selection of 12the Public Advisory Group nominees. The second item on the 13 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons, excuse me? 14 DR. GIBBONS: Sure. 15 MR. PENNOYER: Could I ask a question what we 16 17have in front of us? DR. GIBBONS: Sure. 18 MR. PENNOYER: We have a spreadsheet I notice in 19 $\mathbf{1}_0$ the first package I got, and I'm not sure which of these books is 1-- contains what yet, but the first package was a spreadsheet 2 with a lot of blanks in it. Are those blanks basically filled in

R & R COURT REPORTERS

That's correct. Yeah.

The second

 \mathfrak{A}_3 then in the -- by the -- these are the resumes in the second

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

DR. GIBBONS:

4package we got this morning?

sheet on this package that I laid in front of you, the first sheet has the spread of the people by category. The second sheet has a status of the information for each Public Advisory Group nominee. If there's a conflict of interest or in -- in the biography.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. Anybody have any other questions on this one agenda item before we move on and get a review of what's in the other packages? Mr. Gibbons, would you proceed?

DR. GIBBONS: The second item on the agenda is a 10habitat protection process. The Trustee Council in -- directed 11the Restoration Team to go back and develop a grand plan for 12habitat protection. We've done this. It's in the package here, 13and today we'd like to talk about the over view of the -- of the 14process, and then the detailed proposals by Kim Sundburg and then 15I'll briefly talk about the status of the comments on the 16Restoration Framework Supplement, which was mailed late July and 17the public comments have been taken through the end of this 18month.

MR. PENNOYER: And what does the -- what's the analysis and all the analysis and analysis analysis and analysis analysis and analysis analysis analysis and analysis analysis analysis and analysis analysis

DR. GIBBONS: The action item is we -- we have 22some -- there's five proposals in the 1993 package including two 3on imminent threat analysis and three on the over-all process, 4and we'd like to get the direction from the Trustee Council on 5what actions they'd like us to take.

Thank you. Would you proceed? DR. GIBBONS: The third item is the 1993 draft work plan, would be a discussion of the process we've used to develop a draft 1993 work plan, including the submission of ideas, the screening of those, the development of three-page project outlines and the analysis of those to reach the package There's two binders in front of you. you have in front of you. One is the package, have the description of all 63 or 64 studies, three-page studies, outlines, and the additional package that we 10need to request what -- how you would like to handle this, is a 11 detailed budget for the 1993, including administrative director $_{12}$ and the staff and the projects. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons, what's the time frame 13 $_{\parallel}$ 40n that? It's to go out to public review after the decision, and ∥5when do you need it back by? What's our time frame on this? DR. GIBBONS: Well, we'd like to go to the public 16 $\sqrt{1}$ 7review as quickly as we can get the approval of the Trustee $\sqrt{8}$ Council to move forward with it. Basically I'd -- that we'd like 19to get the package out and get it to the public for comment. MR. SANDOR: What's -- Mr. Chairman? 20 MR. PENNOYER: Yes? 21 MR. SANDOR: Dr. Gibbons, what's the projected 22 3period of time for the review by the public of that package when $\frac{1}{2}$ 4it -- after it does go out? DR. GIBBONS: I believe it's 45 days. 25

MR. PENNOYER: Any other questions on that item?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: Uh-huh.

MR. PENNOYER: And, Mr. Gibbons, when do you have to have it back to conform to our getting on track with OMB and everybody else? What's our time schedule?

DR. GIBBONS: Well, OMB, both of them would like an estimate or the budget as quickly as possible. I think we're a little late even on that process, but they'd like to have those -- the numbers for the 1993 package as quickly as possible. Under the schedule we've got is we're petitioning the Court in December for the funds for the 1993 activities.

10 MR. PENNOYER: Any other questions? Okay. Would 11you review the -- continue then?

DR. GIBBONS: The next item on the agenda is the 13financial operating procedures. In the package in front of you 14is another draft of the financial operating procedures. I 15believe it's pretty close to being final. You've reviewed these 16in the past and this is another version having input from the 17Trustee Council.

MR. COLE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

18

19

MR. COLE: As I made one last review of the 1 financial operating procedures I found to my chagrin that it 2 contained some provisions which I could not agree with. I should 2 shave caught it when I reviewed it earlier. And I have proposed 2 4 along with Mr. McVee some amendments to the operating procedures, 2 5 which in general in my view contain some restrictions on overhead

R & R COURT REPORTERS

R & R COURT REPORTERS

4placed in front of us, and I know that several Trustee Council

√smembers have even some concerns about how we're to get through

this particularly today when some of us have not seen all of this package very far in advance of the meeting, but perhaps as we sat down some of it. I know Mr. McVee had written a letter to the other Trustee Council meetings (sic) in that regard, suggesting some concerns of his inability to at this session, or at least at this morning's meeting to accomplish the review of particularly the budget packet for public review, the '93 work plan, but the letter also encompassed concern about agenda items in general.

Mr. McVee, would you care to comment?

MR. McVEE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Pennoyer. I loadvised the other members of the Trustee Council that Interior, that we wouldn't -- would not have or did not have opportunity to thoroughly analyze all of the material that's -- that's in the spackage, and that -- and so that we felt like that I would be in tho position to bring to conclusion, to actually vote or to reach sconsensus on items that are in the agenda that are of major fimportance, and -- to the future operation. Certainly the '93 to budget.

I feel like that we could proceed with discussions and 19provide guidance and counsel to the R.T. We could proceed to set 20a schedule whereby we could reach closure at some future time in 21the near future on the major items after they have -- after we 22have had, you know, time to analy and review.

I feel like that if we possibly can, we should deal -24that we should deal with the Public Advisory Group and maybe we 25can find a way to do that, because we know - we knew that we

were going to commit ourselves to a very short turn-around, closing nominations on Friday and then meeting on Monday. So I would hope that we could, and I'm prepared to deal with that.

But the other items I guess I would not be prepared to deal with in a final way until, you know, I've had adequate to involve some staff and people that I work with on these issues, but I have no problems, you know, in proceeding with discussion and advice and counsel to the R.T.

The other problem, excuse me, is that I'm sure this package did not get out to the public so that they have -- they have in turn not have had any time to look at the agenda or the package or any pieces of it, so that they're somewhat pain adequately prepared maybe in terms of comment, too, for that parents. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I concur with 16Curt McVee's suggestion that we essentially make this a working 17session. I do want to acknowledge that the Restoration Team and 18the work -- the groups that have been working on this package 19have really been working overtime on this. I think perhaps our 20project- -- our need to develop and shift to a federal budget and 21also to develop not only the plan, the Restoration Plan, but the 22budget along with it was a mammoth task. And I wanted to commend 23the staff for the work that they've done.

 $_{24}$ However, we really have not had -- I have not had an $_{25}$ adequate amount of time to review this package, but I think it's

R & R COURT REPORTERS

going to be worthwhile to work through it, and if we commit ourselves as a working -- to this as a working session as opposed to a decision-making session and then as soon after as this meeting as possible, either by teleconference or another meeting, I think we can reach the decisions, so -- but I'd feel more comfortable regarding this as mostly a working session.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I join with the remarks of Mr. McVee and Mr. Sandor. I mean, it appears, I don't know 250, 300 detailed pages, maybe more. I'm not just sure, you know, how 10many more. I received this Saturday afternoon, and I haven't 11been able to devote time to studying these pages. They contain 12detailed proposals for I don't know how many, 100, 200 various 13projects, and I cannot make intelligent decisions on these 14projects without having studied this material, and even 15discussing it in instances which I think I would like more 16information.

I even question how productive a, quote, "working 18session" would be today, you know, before we've had an 19opportunity to just review the materials. It sort of harks back 20to the days in law school when the professor said, "You know, you 21have to read the cases before you come to class to discuss them." 22 And, you know, it took me a number of years to find out I should 23have listened to him then, but nevertheless, maybe I've learned 24something in the ensuing 40 years.

But, I mean, to discuss and to take people's time to go

R & R COURT REPORTERS

through these projects, the ones that we can even look at today, it seems not to be very productive to the people who are here and to ourselves and to the members of the Restoration Team who would discuss them. I think that we simply don't have the time to have people talk to us meaningfully about these projects which are recommended on the one hand and those which are proposed for rejection on the other. And the same goes, you know, with the budget and other matters.

I don't fault the Restoration Team, but I mean that's where we are today, and that's where I am.

MR. PENNOYER: Other comments?

I think I do echo some of the remarks, that we've set a 2very difficult task for people obviously, although we've known 3 about this meeting for a fair amount of time. Things have 4 4 changed and more demands have been made, and obviously from the 15 thickness of the package there's a lot of work to do.

I guess I'm a little a concerned with just sort of how we 17end up doing business. We -- this meeting was an agonizing thing 18to set up as I recall. We went over calendars back and forth and 19up and down and sideways and couldn't find time when all of us 20could get together and meet, and finally settled on today. With 21some real consternation about what we did about tomorrow if the 22meeting stretched into two days.

I guess I'm a little concerned as to how we get this 24thing back together, not that I have an alternative to suggest, 25because I have some of the same problems with the project review

R & R COURT REPORTERS

in terms of this particular agenda, but in general I don't know how we set this up, whether we decide to go for a rather set timetable each year that has four scheduled meetings that we set aside everything else for and they're on the calendar and we do them. Everybody knows, we can point to them. I mean, there's been a lot of concern about schedules with OMB and schedules with the State process and how we set that up, and I think that's starting to come to gel. We're starting to understand how that should work. At least I think the Restoration Team is.

And I'm very concerned as to how we get back together on 10this. I heard schedules for the next two weeks that look pretty 11terrible, and Mr. Gibbons needs to get this out fairly soon to 12get the public review and finalize the '93 work plan.

I have no problem with making this a work schedule. I'm 14a little concerned with Mr. Cole's walking away from here and not 15at least going through here and outlining pretty discretely by 16agenda item where some of these things are. I think we could 17have somebody lead us through the choices to be made at least and 18the criteria and maybe framework what -- better what we need to 19be thinking about as we get into some of these items.

For example, on the habitat protection process, I know that the have a review here, and perhaps with somebody going through it with us, we'd better be able to, when we come back, to added with it quickly than we could by simply going away and trying on our own individual intent to go through and understand the process that's proposed.

But I think we've got a real problem in setting this up. It's very difficult for us to get our schedules together. We all travel an inordinant amount of time, and an inordinant amount of meetings that we have to go to, and I know for the next two weeks it sounded kind of rough. So I think as part of this discussion of where we go from here, we should decide when we're going to come back and try and do this, because I know the next two weeks are nearly impossible for me now. Later this week might have been possible initially, but today was the only day a lot of people this week could get together.

So any further discussion and observation on where we go?

1 Do we -- do you think we can proceed down through the agenda and

1 2 look at it as a work session and maybe cut certain items off

1 3 early if in fact we don't seem to be able to deal with them, but

1 4 at least proceed down and take a look at those item by item? And

1 5 does anybody have any comments on our future meeting? No

I do remember -- Mr. Gibbons, would you care to elaborate 180n scheduling, because it seems to me when we set this meeting 19up, there were some that could meet any time during this week, 20and others could only meet on Monday. I know next week is a 21disaster for some people, so I'm not sure when we're -- when we 22would -- looking at our schedule, when could we get back together 23again and deal with this? Not that we'll probably have a choice, 24but?

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah. Well, part of the problem

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

with that, when I -- when I was polling the Trustee Council when they were available was several weeks ago, and so I know how the Trustee Council's agendas go and so something that may be available two weeks ago may not be available today, so I guess the only thing I'd request is maybe we can try to set up a meeting date here, a continuation of this and I'm not sure how soon, you know, your schedules will allow that, but

MR. PENNOYER: What's you drop-dead in dealing with the budget? I mean, where are we in coming back and if we go through this as a work plan, have a chance to go off and meet lowith our individual staffs and talk about the projects and review lithem, when could we -- when is your drop-dead date on getting the loudget out?

DR. GIBBONS: Well, the drop-dead date basically 14 is on the five-month -- the remaining five-month period on the 15 approved 1992 budget. We have a petition to the Court we're 16 preparing for that time, and that -- that's a real crunch to us 17 right now.

We also need to get back to OMB some kind of budgets to 19put in the Governor's budget -- or whatever the -- how the State 20wants to handle that, and the federal government. So I know they 1 requested the first of September, and we were hoping, you know, 2 we would give it to them on the 15th of September. It's just -- 23It's a negotiation process, but I think it's on their side, not 24on ours.

MR. PENNOYER: Would you elaborate on that '92

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

question again? Which decision do we have to make on the '92 Court Registry?

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah, the Trustee Council basically approved a budget from March 1st, '92 to February 28th, '93, but we were told to petition the Court for the seven month period from March 1st, '92, to September 30th, '92, then come in line with the federal fiscal year. So the budget spreads in front of you have a five-month period that runs from October 1st, '92 to February 28th, '93, and then an additional '93 portion of seven months from March 1st to the end of September to bring us in line 10with the federal fiscal year.

MR. PENNOYER: I guess my question was the second 12part is something we'd already signed off on? We originally 13signed off on 12 months worth of budget, so what decision has to 14be made on what you need to do to send to the Court Registry?

DR. GIBBONS: Well, I think there's a couple of 16things the Trustee Council needs to do is to come to closure on 17the Public Advisory Group, and also on financial operating 18procedures.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. That was my question. So 20the two items on the agenda were the Public Advisory Group and 1the financial operating procedures are required then to get done 22so you can submit -- and when do you have to have this submitted 23now for the second?

DR. GIBBONS: To the Court?

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah.

24

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

DR. GIBBONS: Well, a lot of the agencies run out of money come October 1st.

MR. PENNOYER: So there's a real urgent need to get those two pieces -- those are the two pieces you're missing in a package that has to go to the Court then?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct. There's a little additional money in the '92 period if the Trustee Council elects to -- well, there's some discussion on the chief scientist that the Trustee Council needs to come to closure with, and also on the habitat protection process. We need to get moving with a lodata collection system in as quickly as possible, and so that -- land the Trustee Council has not authorized that expenditure to lodate.

MR. PENNOYER: That would be part of this 14request?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct.

15

16

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I think the problem is really deeper 18than we're talking about. As I hark back to what Mr. McCutcheon 19said two or three meetings ago, that in some ways we've almost 20lost control of this project. I'm not saying we have, but -- I 1mean, we jus cannot, gentlemen, continue to not get our business 22done. I mean, we have to make decisions. You know, we're -- and 23we're not getting our work done timely, and now we're talking 24here today of putting this off I don't know how long, another 25two, three weeks, months, two months, three months? And we

simply have to do something about that. And as far as I'm concerned, I am prepared to drop everything that I do, I think, just about, in order to get this business done. I mean, if we have to meet this weekend or the first of next week, but we simply must get this done. We cannot continue to put this off for three weeks, a month or two months. And properly we're being criticized. So I feel very strongly about that.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, I fully agree with you and that's why I was bringing up the scheduling. It was not simply as an administrative procedure, but the fact that we're lohaving a hard time figuring out when we can get together and get lithese things done in concert with getting the information before 12us.

Mr. Sandor?

13

SANDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly MR. 14 $_{\parallel \sf F}$ agree with the comments about the need for time and -- but I 1_6 would suggest that insofar as items one on the agenda, the Public ₁7Advisory Group nominations, the financial operating procedures, $_{1}$ and item -- well, that's item four, and even item two, the $\P_{\mathtt{S}}$ habitat protection process. We've been dealing with that, those $\frac{1}{2}$ 0three habits for a substantial amount of time. I think I'd be 1 very disappointed if we didn't -- aren't able to deal with the 22 Public Advisory Group nominations; two, the financial operating 3procedures. We -- I've reviewed at least two drafts over the 4 last six weeks, and there's been some changes, and I think we're svery close to closure on that.

I think it's very essential that we go through this habitat protection process. A lot of information is displayed. I have a lot of questions with regard with the segments in that agenda item. But the strategy is laid out, the proposals are Some very specific suggestions with respect to potential there. contracts to do the kind of work we need, and the Restoration Team and the public needs to I think -- we need to share with the public, and I hope during our public comment period this -- late this afternoon, early this evening, that we can get some reaction on that, but I'm less concerned I guess about the 1993 Draft Work 100 Plan and the budget. By saying "less concerned," that doesn't $1 \mid 1$ mean I'm not concerned, but I think those are lower priority ₁₂items than those other three, and we've been dealing with these 13 other three items for two long. There's a proposal, for example, to allocate \$5 million 15 for habitat restoration -- or habitat protection for imminently 16threatened, and I think, you know, we can discuss that, even $\sqrt{1}$ 7though we may not reach a conclusion about it. So my suggestion, $\sqrt{8}$ Mr. Chairman, is to proceed with items one, two and four at least $\P_{\mathtt{S}}$ and then plunge into the draft work plan and the budget as time nallows. See how it goes.

MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, are we going 22to

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

23

MR. COLE: work tomorrow? Are we going to 25continue this meeting to tomorrow,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Well,

MR. COLE: and assuming we work today?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, I would assume that if we're just going to treat this as a work session, we might try and get done today if it looks like we can get through the agenda. If now, however, we're all prepared to be here tomorrow, so if it looks like to accomplish the items that Mr. Sandor has pointed out we need to, then I think it's available to us.

MR. COLE: I'm not sure I heard what you said?

MR. PENNOYER: I said I think we're prepared to 10do it. I don't know if we have to yet until we march through the 11agenda. If we're not going to go through the '93 work plan, I'm 12not sure how far we need to go and how long it's going to take us 13to get through the review of the rest of it, is what I said.

MR. COLE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Circularly.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

17 MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman?

18 MR. PENNOYER: Does anybody have any further

1 9comments?

14

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Can we I guess -- as I understand it 23in the '93 work plan, this discussion also contains the 24components that were of the five-month budget that were approved 25and understanding, you know, that there is urgency in getting the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

request to the Court for that five-month period, is there a way to deal with just that component, that request to the Court, the previously approved projects for that five-month period plus whatever additions that we need to consider in that budget?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes, we cold -- we could go through and point out the additions to the approved 1992 five-month period. And there's I believe that -- Mark, correct me if I'm wrong, I think there's only several -- a couple of these, a few additions, but

- 10 MR. PENNOYER: And you would do that under the 11 financial operations procedures on the agenda?
- $\mathbb{1}_2$ DR. GIBBONS: We could do it then, yes.
- MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Well, I don't think we're 14going to come to a resolution as to how far we can get on each 15item until we try it, so perhaps the best thing to do would be to 16start down the list and see where we get. In some cases some 17items might benefit from just a short recess or moving them on 18the agenda to a latter period of time when more information is in 19front of us, and yet still accomplish them either today or 20tomorrow.
- MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, I move we approve the 22financial operating procedures as amended.
- MR. SANDOR: I second that.
- MR. PENNOYER: Any discussion? Is there any 25objection? Item one down here.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: One thing we got done.

MR. PENNOYER: The amendment that was sent out by Mr. McVee and by Mr. Cole. Everyone knows which one we're talking about?

MR. McVEE: We do.

MR. BARTON: Would you share with us which one we just adopted?

MR. PENNOYER: For the reference of the record, would you -- for the record so that \dots

MR. McVEE: It's not the one that's in the book.

MR. PENNOYER: the Restoration Team knows 11which one we're talking about? Would you reference the items 12specifically where it is?

MR. McVEE: Let's see, I was trying to remember 14dates.

MR. PENNOYER: I know I've read it. I'm not sure 16which folder it's in. Give us a date on the memo?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, while you're looking for 18it, what it does is it -- it eliminates the provision that an 19agency may take as overhead expenses \$50,000.00 regardless of the 20size of the project. That's the substantive change in the 21financial operation procedures. So that

MR. McVEE: I

MR. BARTON: In that.

MR. COLE: Subsection one just limits it to 2515%, and it removes the second and third sentences as I recall

R & R COURT REPORTERS

22 which makes a provision that an agency, that if the total amount of the plans for its projects are less than \$250,000.00 it can take nevertheless \$50,000.00 overhead fee.

MR. PENNOYER: Was that the only change as I recall?

MR. COLE: Well, then it makes amendments into the following paragraph.

> MR. PENNOYER: I believe this is a

There are changes are three pages. MR. McVEE: think it was page two and I believe page -- it was either three 100r four, and page six, having to do with equipment.

- This is the one, yeah. MR. COLE: 11
- MS. BERGMANN: Okay. 1 2
- Yeah, that's it I think that you MR. McVEE: 13

14have.

- MR. PENNOYER: This is enclosed in a memorandum 15 1_6 from -- on September 8th from Curt McVee to Charles Cole?
- MR. McVEE: Yeah. 17
- MR. PENNOYER: And that's the one we're 18

1 9referencing?

- MR. McVEE: That's the one, yes. 20
- MR. PENNOYER: And do you have any other 21

2comments?

- I'd have no other comments. MR. McVEE: 23
- MR. PENNOYER: Well, as long as we're on it, and 24 √sthat seems to be the number one item to have a time crunch, maybe

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

of changing buildings, different methods of hiring staff, cetera, to see what we can do about getting the bill down, but we have not reached closure on that yet.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole? No questions? This is the administrative underpinnings for what

> MR. BRODERSON: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: you're accomplishing?

BRODERSON: This is our librarians, our administrative staff upstairs, the clerk typist, receptionist, et cetera, administrative assistants, clerical help. It's the 1 opeople that make this building work.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman?

11

12

13

14

DR. GIBBONS: And the building.

MR. BRODERSON: And the building.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since 15 16we have previously approved, you know, this budget item, I would 17 support seeing the amount in the request to the Court, but I feel $\eta_{\rm g}$ like that this additional five months also gives us some time, 1/9hopefully, although it will probably will not be the case, that d₀we'll have less time crunch and more time to look at alternatives 1 in terms of staffing, and also in terms of the building, because as we all know, that there are some problems with the space that need to be addressed, and I would hope in that -- with our 4approval of this, if that's what we'll go ahead and do, that will √give us -- that five months from now we won't be in the same

position, but we will have had time to take a look at alternatives and the future use of this building or alternatives -- or alternative space.

MR. BRODERSON: We are in the process now of doing a space analysis to determine what the actual square footage is supposed to be underneath the state and federal system for an operation like this. It's a rather lengthy process. It looks like it's going to take another month or two.

We're negotiating with the owners of the -- or actually that managers of the building over handicapped access 10 requirements. There's some sticky points on that one that we're 11 going to have to resolve.

I'm not sure we'll be as far along as Mr. McVee would 13 like us to be. I would like to be there also, but five months is 14 not a very long time. If we do decide to make a move, we need 90 15 to 120 days to make that move. Five months doesn't give you very 16 much time to actually do that in.

We're trying to get position descriptions updated for 18each of the staff positions to make a much more coherent whole 19out of our staffing needs for this place. Unfortunately the '93 20work plan got in the way and some staff we had working on our 21budget change- -- our staffing requirement changes were pulled 22off to work on the '93 plan to get that out to the public, and so 23we're trying to have people do dual roles there.

We just didn't have enough staff to get this done, but we ashopefully will have it done next time, but I'm not going to

promise. The same problem. We're still working on the '93 one and actually need to start on the '94 one pretty soon so we're not caught in the crunch that we were in '93. So we're utilizing people to the fullest at the present point.

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion on this item?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I think the time is not far away from that on which we should make decision about how long we want to continue maintaining the level of staffing, whatever, that we're now doing. I think we should review that, because maybe we don't want to continue with this level indefinitely. I don't know. Lambda some other Trustees have some thoughts on that. I think we should take a look at that.

MR. PENNOYER: Any other comments?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman?

14

16

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee? Mr. Rosier?

MR. McVEE: I would agree. I guess that 18basically is what I was getting at, suggesting, that there should 19be some review. As I recall last winter, or February sometime, 20we looked at staffing requirements, and I don't -- various job 21descriptions or various job titles, and I don't believe that 22those may be the actual types of people that we have on board at 23the present time, so I would like to -- I would think that we 24should go back and review that whole -- that whole area, the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

√sstaffing issue at some future time and, and I guess just what I

was trying to get at is this is something we can do within -- and have it done so we can make decisions in the next five months.

We should move ahead with this request to the Court, you know, to basically approve status quo for the time being, but work on trying to get some analysis of staffing and of space.

MR. BRODERSON: Mr. Chairman?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: I'm just saying I do have a rough draft a work force analysis in my desk that I'm working on lodiligently. Like Mr. Broderson said, that the '93 got in the laway. We just didn't have enough time to do it, but we are -- I laway working on that and we'll have actual duties that the people law in the building are doing and the amount of time they are layending doing that, so

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Broderson?

15

MR. BRODERSON: As a follow-up to Mr. McVee's 17statements there, it seems like the natural time to make a 18transition will come when the Restoration Plan is finished, and 19that we should be aiming toward a thorough review of what --20where we want to go and who we need to do it when we make the 1transition, which is not too long after this five-month period 22runs out, so that's what I was saying, that there's a -- they 23don't quite correspond, but they come pretty close, and it would 24seem like that's the point in time when we really need to present 25a package to the Trustee Council of who do we need -- well, you

need to give us guidance of where we want to go, and then we need to tell you who we need to get it done and you need to approve that. And so that's kind of the -- the schedule that I'd like to see laid out for figuring out the staffing requirements and what we do with it is when the Restoration Plan comes to closure.

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion on this item?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I think at least two of us are quietly expressing the sentiment that maybe we should consider reducing the level of operation some appropriate time in the future. I mean, I guess that's what I'm saying. I don't know if Mr. Barton joins in that, but I see he's very pensive about the subject.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman?

13

14

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: I think, you know, we need to 16re-examine our operations and be as efficient as we can. And I 17think Mr. Broderson has pointed out a very logical time to do 18that.

I would point out though that despite the fact that the 20staff has worked long and hard, we're sitting saying we can't 21take action on the '93 program of work because we didn't get it 22in time. So I agreement with an examination. We ought to 23examine the staffing, but at the same time we need to keep in 24mind what is it that we want the staff to do.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah, I'm not -- I'm not sure

R & R COURT REPORTERS

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Yes, those are approved. And we approved the procedures. extension of the contract on the chief scientist. We've approved the CACI, the expenditure of the funds we had already authorized for the last five months, and we left open the question of the two habitat proposals to fund The Nature Conservancy to expedite acquisition of data for the habitat process until we review the habitat process itself. I think that's all the items we took action on, so Where do we wish to go next? I mean, do we want to go to the Public Advisory Group, MR. BARTON: Right. 10 MR. PENNOYER: and at least get a review of 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ where we are and see if we need to have some further information η_3 presented to us before we can take action? Is that acceptable? MR. BARTON: That sounds good. 14 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Mr. Gibbons, do you want to 15 16 lead us through the Public Advisory Group process, where we are, ₁7what we've already approved, the items that were left outstanding η_{R} and what you've done in the interim period of time, and what we phave in front of us in terms of information? DR. GIBBONS: Yes, on August 31st the Trustee 20 1 Council approved ten of the 15 members for the Public Advisory and requested that the Restoration Team go out and solicit 3more nominees for three categories, which were the Recreational 4Users, the Sport Fishing and Hunting category and the Public at √5large. On September 2nd we released a request for nominees to

the newspapers, on the radio, for anybody that wanted to pick one up. The closure on that was September 11th, and as of about 5:00 p.m. on Friday I was still putting those together.

What you have in the big package is the status as of about 5:15 p.m. on Friday the 11th. What you have, -- you've got an additional package that's -- that have the nominees for the three groups in front of you. It has, like I said for the three groups, it has the status of information for the Public Advisory Group nominees. I have one addition to that that we got over the weekend again. I'll pass that out. It's in front of me here.

10And then the submissions that we've received from the public are lattached to the back of that. So what's required is or it's 2hoped that was needed would be the selection of the remaining 13five members to the Public Advisory Group.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I move we expand the public at large 17group by two members.

18 MR. PENNOYER: Sir?

19 MR. SANDOR: From what to what?

20 MR. COLE: To five.

MR. SANDOR: Oh, to five.

MR. COLE: Rather than three. And making quiet

 $\frac{1}{3}$ (ph) word in support of that, I

MR. PENNOYER: Do we have a second to that 25proposal for purposes of discussion?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: Well, I'll second it.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor has seconded.

Mr. Cole?

13

14

MR. COLE: I just want to say that I would like
-- I think we could use a little more public at large balance. I
know certainly at least one member of the public had expressed
the view that the Public Advisory Group may be over-loaded with
special interests and it occurred to me that a little more
balance in the public advisory group would be well. So that's
the reason for I make the motion.

MR. PENNOYER: Where would that leave us in total 11then?

MR. COLE: Seventeen.

MR. SANDOR: Seventeen.

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion on this item?

MR. SANDOR: I think the question, Mr. Chairman 16is -- I was trying to look for my charter of the Public Advisory 17Group, and

MR. McVEE: We'll have to amend the charter.

MR. SANDOR: what this would do is I 20 assume, Dr. Gibbons is it would modify the charter to include the 21 group of 17 as opposed to 15, is that what would happen?

DR. GIBBONS: That's correct. I think it's 23 section 6(a) of the charter specifically would have to be 24 modified. It's the one that was modified recently to include the 25 way the -- the nominees would be selected by principal interest

R & R COURT REPORTERS

group and public at large.

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion of the motion? The motion is to expand the public at large group from three to five members, and the total from 15 to 17.

Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: A question in regards to the budget process. Has there been a budget that's in fact been put together based on the existing number? I mean, are we talking about now changing the budget as well and?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman? There is a budget 10projected on 15 members, that's correct, there's support for 11travel, per diem and then support from the staff in this 12building.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, the question I have is 14haven't appointed one yet, and they haven't really gotten started 15yet. Would it not be -- you know, we went through our previous 16deliberations based on 15 people and had balance. Is it time to 17change it now and to change the operating -- or the operating 18procedures now, or should we go ahead and make our appointments? 19 We can modify it at any time. I mean, there's no -- depending 20on how we view the advice coming in or the mix that -- of people 21we'd want, or if we have some particular specific expertise we 22think we want there as we go along, we can modify it. Do we need 23to modify it now?

MR. COLE: Well, we don't want the specific $_{25}$ expertise, that's the very reason for the proposal, to make it

R & R COURT REPORTERS

five. I want to get somewhat away in my view from, quote, "specific expertise," and to get some balance in the public advisory group. And my view is, yes, this is the time to make that decision, not in my view, I'm tempted to say when we conclude that we've made a mistake and have too large a composite of public -- of special interest groups. As was pointed out. I mean, now do we really distinguish between the classification conservation and in environment? I mean, you know, it seems to me we get, you know, two for the price of one there.

And I just have the sense that, you know, just what I see loand read in the paper and observe in these many years that we 1should strive for balance in these public advisory groups. And I 2have in mind balance from Southeastern Alaska, balance from the 13Interior, balance from South Central area, that would include 14Kodiak. Just get balance. And I think that where we are right 15now in my view we don't have the balance that I would like to 16see. Now, you know, maybe I'm a singular voice, but I feel 17pretty good that -- strongly that that's what we should know, and 18furthermore the additional expense is diminimous for one person, 19transportation, you know, and these people get modest amounts of 20per diem and travel, and I think it would be well worth the 21price.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I 24certainly don't have any problem with balance as far as the 25public process is concerned here on this, but it seemed to me

that many of the individuals that we've already appointed were recommended, you know, to cover a number of the individual user groups that we've moved ahead on, that -- and made appointments to here at the present time, so we're -- we're really talking about people that have got multiple, multiple interests. I think we've said right from the very beginning that the people that we've appointed, that we were looking for the best, you know, the balance that was there. I don't have great -- don't take great exception to 17 members, but it seems that that's a pretty large, pretty cumbersome size quite frankly from my perspective.

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman?

11 MR. PENNOYER: Further comment on this?

12Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: I can support the proposal as put 14 forth by Mr. Cole, however I expect that balance is like beauty, 15 in the eye of the beholder, but I think there's more opportunity 16 to achieve that perhaps with more rather than less, although I 17 think that 17 is getting to be a pretty large group to be 18 effective,

MR. COLE: It is.

20 MR. BARTON: so

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton, I wasn't sure whether 2 you were supporting the motion or talking against it. Seventeen 3 is too large or do you kind of?

MR. BARTON: No, I supported the motion, would -- $_{25}$ I am concerned about the size of the group.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: With regard to the question of balance, I guess balance from the standpoint of special interest, also from the balance of distribution of the people who are on that group, I did a summary of at least, and maybe Dr. Gibbons, you could verify this, of those ten that we've picked so far, two are from Cordova, three are from Anchorage, one from Juneau, one from Chenega Bay, one from Valdez, one from Kodiak.

So I was quite frankly looking at the public at large, the sport hunting and fishing, recreation user, the individuals 10 that we're to pick, presumably five more, and I was looking at 11 this matter of balance. And the thought did come to mind, you ₁₂know, are we wanting to confine, concentrate this group to the ₁3Spill area, or are we going at the State at large? And I guess I 14concluded that, you know, it really ought to be the State at 15large, and, you know, maybe we ought to have some of them from 16Fairbanks. We don't have one now, and there are candidates from $\sqrt{1}$ 7these other communities, Ninilchik, Homer, and -- and so I $_{\parallel 8}$ suspect that what I'd like to see is that we do, when we pick $\P_{\mathfrak{I}}$ these remaining five or seven, that we give consideration to obalance with regard to the geographic distribution of these folks 21within the State and I guess -- am I off perhaps in the minority in suggesting that, for example, we really should have someone 3from Fairbanks and areas not impacted by the Spill?

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: I see my good friend, Commissioner Sandor is so dedicated and so structured, he's worked all this out. I just sort of think about it a little bit, but he expresses well and in detail my views, and that is the reason that I nominated Senator Eliason from

MR. SANDOR: Sitka.

MR. COLE: Sitka, Southeastern, fisherman.

I nominated Mr. Gavora from Fairbanks, I thought someone from
the Interior would be well to put on. I do think we need the
geographic balance of people, because I think that it is while
principally a subject of which the people in the Oil Spill area
lare most concerned, that there should be some statewide views,
perspective on it. So I join you, Commissioner Sandor.

MR. PENNOYER: Any further discussion on this 14item? Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, I would have no problem 16with increasing the public at large membership to five. I think 17when we do that, that we certainly should look at candidates and 18I'm sure we will, that have had, you know a broad breadth of 19experience and interests and can best represent the public at 20large, if there's such an individual that's available. But I 21think there's some advantage of considering, you know, people 22from -- or representation from Southeast or Fairbanks or 23elsewhere in the State in that, you know, those folks could have 24a different perspective concerning the program and that 25perspective may be very useful to the P.A.G. and therefore useful

to the Trustee Council. So I'd have no problem with increasing it to five.

MR. PENNOYER: Further comment on this item?

Well, I think I'd add some comment that, however, I had some feeling that I had the same concern Mr. Rosier, but I certainly do agree with the need for balanced representation, and I think it ought to be -- I, too, agree it ought to be statewide not just simply for any one particular area, so I have no problem with that suggestion either.

Are there any objections to the proposal? Do you we have 10to pass a new budget then? Other formal actions we'd have to do 11 if we did this?

- DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that 13 will be difficult to figure. It will be -- it will be a slight $_{\parallel 4}$ increase, but it, you know, we -- we can just take the 15 and 15divide it into the budget and just add enough for two more.
- So if we did do this then, the MR. PENNOYER: 16 procedures would be changed automatic, or at least you $\eta_{\rm g}$ would type that in and make that change? We're voting on ochanging operating procedures?
- DR. GIBBONS: (Nods affirmative) 20
- MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Are there any objections to 21 2the proposal?
- DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, are you referring to 23 1/4 the charter, changing the charter?
- The charter, yeah, I meant. MR. PENNOYER: 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Right. Okay. Then that's accomplished.

Do you want to continue on, Mr. Gibbons? What's the first category and who are the -- and how do I find the -- what's the first one we didn't do?

DR. GIBBONS: The first

MR. BARTON: Recreational users.

MR. PENNOYER: Recreational users?

DR. GIBBONS: Recreational users.

MR. PENNOYER: And do we have again that list in front of us that lists all the people that are --? And we're looking at the wrong

MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Well, as I recall, we had a 14 recreational user nominated and some comments at the last meeting 15 by Mr. Barton. But if someone could refresh my recollection, 16 that we had one nominee with four first place votes. Isn't that 17 the recreational user category?

18 MR. PENNOYER: I don't know. Oh, I should take 190ne?

MR. SANDOR: Take one.

MR. PENNOYER: Oh, I just take one. I thought 22that was the answer to the question.

MR. SANDOR: No.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, I believe that was the above that was the above the particular

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Was that Tileston?

MS. BERGMANN: Tileston, yeah.

MR. COLE: Tileston was two.

MR. PENNOYER: Who?

MR. COLE: Tileston. Mr. Tileston.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Tileston. Tileston, okay, was

number two.

10

Further comments? Commissioner Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, my recollection 12 and the listing I have, if it remains correct, is that for the 13 recreational user group we had -- we did have the nomination of 14 Mr. Diehl, one, two, three, four, five of the Trustees, and Mr. 15 Tileston was second. Actually my recollection is in our vote 16 itself, we came down to a three to three essentially tie on each 17 one of those two with the suggestion by those who had essentially 18 changed their vote on Mr. Diehl was that he could really be 19 considered for the public at large category since we were short 20 in that category, and that was part of, you know, the rationale 21 for that was reasonable, since he was also in that category as 22 well as in recreation user.

And so I guess to make a specific proposal, Mr. Chairman, which is a specific proposal, Mr. Chairman, and a specific proposal, Mr. Chai

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: That's only public at large?

DR. GIBBONS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, the second

MR. PENNOYER: So, Mr. McVee, how do you suggest 24we proceed on that? I agree with your concept. How do we -- how

 $\frac{1}{2}$ is not. The status of the information is not by category.

ashall we do it? I can't

20

21

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
MR. McVEE: I'd just like to take a minute to
 pull those resumes out and take a quick look at them, and .....
                 MR. PENNOYER:
                                Okay. You're referring to Paul
 Andrews, Jon Dunham, Jeff Pasco and Jill Wittenbrader?
                            There's five -- five new .....
                 MR. McVEE:
                 MR. COLE: And Scott Bothwell, too.
                 MR. McVEE: .... resumes we need to look.
                 MR. PENNOYER: Uh-huh.
                                          Shall we stand at ease
 for five minutes and take a look .....
                 MR. BARTON: How about a recess and ....?
                 DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman?
10
                 MR. PENNOYER:
                                We'll stand in recess for what,
11
\frac{1}{2}take a short break of ten minutes to look at the applications.
                 DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman? One point, would it
4help if the -- we went back and spread these by geographic
15 location, too, so you can understand where the new applications,
16what communities they're representing?
                 MR. COLE:
                             Oh, I think we -- Mr. Chairman, I
17
18think we can keep them in mind.
                                      There are not that many.
19There's only five of them.
                 MR. PENNOYER:
                                 We're going to do this in each
20
1 category, however.
                     Is there any staff work we could get between
now and after lunch that would help us to get through this?
3Gibbons, if we're going to do this for each of these categories,
4the public at large has like 15 new nominees.
                 DR. GIBBONS: I'm not quite sure, you know, I
25
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

12 the process and then come back. Anybody want to have some 3discussion of this before we leave?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that 24 √swe go ahead and deal with the rec users group and then break for

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

lunch.

10

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Any problems with that approach? Do you have a suggestion, Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: Yes, I move James Diehl the representative of the recreational users.

MR. McVEE: I'll second that motion.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Are there any objections? Mr. Diehl has been appointed to the recreational -- well, Mr. Diehl has been appointed to the Public Advisory Group.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

 $_{12}$ MR. COLE: Since that went so rapidly, would it $_{13}$ be worth while to address the sport fishing before lunch?

MR. PENNOYER: I'm willing to try anything once.

MR. COLE: I leave that to the other Trustee 16members. It's up to them. If anyone has feelings that we ought 17not, that's fine with me.

MR. PENNOYER: Any comments? Are there any 19nominees for the recreational -- or sport fishing and hunting or 20do you wish to adjourn to lunch and then come back and do it at 21one? Do I have a nomination?

MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton?

MR. BARTON: I'd nominate Rupe Andrews to 25represent sport fishing and hunting.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: It's been moved and seconded Mr. Andrews be appointed as sport fishing and hunting. Any comment or any discussion? Mr. Barton?

MR. COLE: Well, now I would like a moment to

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole wishes a moment to review the \dots

MR. ROSIER: He's right at the top of the page.

MR. PENNOYER: Would either the maker of the 10motion or the second care to elaborate on Mr. Andrews' 11qualifications for this position?

MR. COLE: Thank you. I've had an opportunity to 13look

MR. PENNOYER: Had enough opportunity?

MR. COLE: at the documents.

14

16 MR. PENNOYER: Fine. Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: I would just like to say that, you 18know as indicated in Mr. Andrews' application here that Rupe has 19been very actively involved in fishing and hunting issues 20statewide for a good many years, and he just -- he's been an 21active member of the NRA. He's been active in outdoor council. 22He was a field person with the Department of Fish and Game prior 23to statehood, dating back prior to statehood and up through the 24growth years of the Department and he's been a very active 25individual that would be I think an excellent appointee to this

R & R COURT REPORTERS

-- to this public advisory group.

MR. PENNOYER: Further discussion? Are there any objections to Mr. Andrews being appointed to this group? Thank you.

Are we agreed then we'll adjourn for lunch and come back at 1:00 o'clock to do the public at large? Okay. We're adjourned then.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. PENNOYER: I would like to go ahead and get 10started if we could? If everybody will take their seats, then we 11can get back on the track here.

- Before we adjourned for lunch we had made some decisions 13 on the public at large -- Public Advisory Group, and we're 14 dealing with the public at large category. We had had a series 15 of applications sent to us and we requested the time over lunch 16 hour to go and review those and come back then and try to deal 17 with that particular seat on the Trustee -- on the Public 18 Advisory Group.
- Over the lunch hour did anybody get any ideas of how we 20should approach this? Does anybody want to suggest an approach 21to dealing with this category? Mr. Sandor?
- MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, in our last meeting we 23had in preparation for that identified the -- each of us 24independently identified individuals, one or two, for each 25category, and then at that meeting -- or in preparation for it,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

then we each were given a summary and we had essentially the nominations or proposals by each Trustee. I would put on the table a proposal that each one of the Trustees identify not less than five and not more than seven or eight individuals for the five public at large positions, that the staff summarize them and then go on to some other agenda items, and then perhaps at 3:00 o'clock or later in the afternoon have the display of how -- what individuals had been nominated. Is that reasonable? There's g nothing magic about not less than five and not more than seven or eight, but in thinking through I've come up with seven that -- or 10eight perhaps. Thoughts among? MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton? 11 MR. BARTON: Yes, I think there's some merit to 1 2 1/3that consistent with the process that we used earlier. $_{\parallel 4}$ think though that we need to select the number at which we're 15going to nominate and use that number. MR. SANDOR: The same number? 16 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor? Anybody else have any 17 $\sqrt{8}$ comments on the process, either Mr. Sandor's proposal, or Mr. pBarton's modification? Mr. McVee? MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, I think that would be a 20 ⅓1 way to move it forward. I would suggest that we all come up with 2the same number. MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, I move we come up with 23 24seven.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Anybody second that?

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

25

MR. BARTON: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: It's been moved and seconded that we each come up with our nominees to the public at large seat on the advisory group and that we nominate seven each, have the staff, excuse me, compile these, and then at the appropriate point in the agenda come back and -- and deal with that. And I don't know I want to pick a time certain, perhaps whenever the staff's ready, we'll see how the agenda's going. Does anybody have any objection to that procedure? Well, do we then want to take two minutes, three minutes here and each of do that?

MR. SANDOR: Ten minutes.

MR. PENNOYER: Ten minutes? Ten minutes to do 12that. One and a half minutes per name, and then, Dave, can 13somebody go do that compilation while we're working on something 14else?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. So if we would each 17nominate seven people to the public at large seat for the 18advisory group, staff will compile it and we'll come back at 2:30 19or 3:00 o'clock and get the results of that and then discuss how 20we proceed on the nominations.

21 (Off record)

22 (On record)

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, Mr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: I do have one correction. Under 25Jules Tileston's new application, he would like to be recognized

R & R COURT REPORTERS

public larqe also, so you might under under at your considerations add Jules Tileston to the list.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Take ten minutes and write our lists.

(Off record)

(On record)

10

MR. SANDOR: May I suggest that the staff put the city of residence of each of the nominees?

MR. PENNOYER: A good suggestion, thank you. Mr. Gibbons, would you do that, please?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MR. PENNOYER: Have we concluded? Have you got 11 Okay. Mr. Gibbons, we'll come back to you possibly 12everybody? Nafter the next agenda item and see the results of 14nominations.

Can we continue on? The next item on the list, Okay. 15 16unless somebody wants to take something else up out of order is $\sqrt{1}$ 7the habitat protection process. I think this is going to be a $_{1}$ 8 fairly lengthy presentation. There are things that we may or may \P_{\circ} not wish to take a decision on here, but probably we should try oand work through that whole process.

My objective, if I could get concurrence, if we're not 22going to do the '93 work plan, it seems to me a full day of our 3 work is going to be taken at another time, and it would be my papreference to try and finish this afternoon and this evening if √swe can, other than to tie up an hour or two tomorrow morning and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

MR. SHERIDAN: Mr. Chairman, members of the 20Council, at your last meeting you directed the Restoration Team 1 to do a number of things with respect to the -- to habitat 22protection. First you asked that they develop a grand strategy 23for habitat protection, and they have done that and we're now 24prepared to make some recommendations to you on that.

You also asked that the process be accelerated. I think

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

that the term that was used was "get on with it," and the Restoration Team heard that and has incorporated that into their recommendations.

And finally the direction required that we look at the use of existing data so that we could get on with it without having to be involved in a long, drawn-out process of additional data acquisition.

And what we'd like to do this afternoon is give you an overview of what we're calling a comprehensive habitat protection strategy, and I'll provide that for you, and then Mr. Sundberg 10 with -- from the Department of Fish and Game will provide you $_{\parallel 1}$ some of the details of some of the items that we've already ₁₂started getting on with as well as some additional information, 13 and then finally Dave Gibbons will discuss the Restoration 14Framework supplement and some of the comments that were included 15in that relative to habitat protection.

In starting out to look at how to fulfill the direction 16 $\sqrt{1}$ 7that you were giving us, we first thought it would be good to develop some framework, some sideboards on what would be included Some of those sideboards were that the strategy 19in that process. oneeded to be consistent with the restoration planning process, 1 that we do not have two processes going off in separate 2directions.

And we also felt that the accelerated process needed to 23 4be limited to habitats facing what is called imminent threat. √sother words, habitat that if not protected could result

restoration objectives not being able to be fulfilled.

It also needed a clear linkage to resources or services that were damaged by the Spill.

And we were constrained by time if we wanted to accelerate this thing to the use of existing data, as we mentioned earlier, and we needed some mechanism to rapidly initiate collection of new data where we found that the existing data was inadequate.

So within those kind of -- that kind of a framework, we developed this comprehensive strategy. It basically consists of 10two parts: an imminent threat process and what we're calling the 11long-term habitat protection process.

The main element, the main key point in the imminent 13threat process is that we believe that by December 1st, 1992, we 14can provide you with recommendations for specific short-term 15protection measures for specific parcels.

MR. COLE: Excuse me, could you give me that date 17again by which?

18 MR. SHERIDAN: December 1st of this year.

MR. COLE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SHERIDAN: How will we go about doing that?

21Well, we would do it by a couple of items that we've already

2initiated. The first one is we developed a questionnaire which

3we sent out to all the principal investigators asking them to

4provide preliminary study conclusions on the habitat requirements

5and the state of recovery of the resources that were injured by

R & R COURT REPORTERS

the Spill. We wanted to know what the rate and degree of recovery was and their best information as to what the habitat requirements are. Mr. Sundberg will give you some additional information on that shortly.

Second, we conducted a preliminary look at areas that were affected by the Spill which may be facing an imminent threat of habitat loss or degradation. Again, Mr. Sundberg will address that shortly.

Now we come to the elements of this where we need your concurrence if we're to move forward. The first of those is we lobelieve that it would be very useful to be able to conduct a series of workshops or a workshop that -- a combination workshop where we would bring in the principal investigators as well as speer reviewers and others with expertise on resources and services that were injured by the Spill and try to further refine sand document what the habitat requirements are for those services.

We would like to do that through -- the mechanism to do 18that would be a cost-share agreement with The Nature Conservancy, 19and that was mentioned earlier when you were discussing the 20financial needs that were imminent. If we can get approval on 21that and move forward with it, we think we can accomplish that by 22November 1st of this year.

The next element of the cost-share agreement that we are allooking for with Nature Conservancy is assistance from them in a specific spathering up the existing information. At the last meeting there

was a considerable amount of discussion about the fact that there probably is a lot of existing data in each of the agencies involved in the restoration and otherwise, and certainly that's correct, there are -- there is a lot of information available, but in a lot of cases we're not sure where it is, what kind of form it's in, whether it's compatible with the existing systems that we're trying to develop in order to do analysis, and what we would be looking for with this element of the accelerated process would be for the Trustee -- for the Nature Conservancy to assist us in identifying where all that information is and developing losome catalogs and getting that moved into a system where we can luse it to analyze these particular areas of habitat.

Concurrently with all of this that would be going on, the 13Restoration Team and the Habitat Work Group would be analyzing 14these parcels that we've identified and developing these 15recommendations for you by December 1st.

And finally, the accelerated process would include 17monitoring additional parcels that could come under imminent 18threat and developing recommendations as needed to you folks 19prior to completion of the restoration planning process.

The second phase then is the long-term habitat protection plan. That would be based on the direction that would be provided in the final restoration plan, and it would, of course, make use of all of the -- all of the tools and information that would be generated in the imminent threat process as well.

The parcels that would be considered in that long-term

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

process would, of course, include first those that received short-term protection through the imminent threat process. That would be the obvious one to take a look at first.

The second group of parcels would be all of those that were proposed for protection through the '93 work program and I believe there were some 50 parcels, some very, very large ones proposed for acquisition and for different kinds of protection through that process. That would be looked at primarily through the long-term process upon completion of the Restoration Plan.

And, third, we'd look at those parcels that would be 1_0 nominated for protection subsequent to this '93 process, and it 1_1 may -- we may actually even look at calling for some kind of a 1_2 special nomination process.

Now we'll turn it over to Mr. Sundberg who will talk about some additional details of the habitat protection process and then we'll be glad to answer any questions that you might have, and we also have -- we'd like to go through the '93 projects that we'll be asking for you approval on.

DR. GIBBONS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. I have a phandout here from Kim that lays out his presentation, so I'll phass that out.

MR. SUNDBERG: Good afternoon. My name is Kim 22Sundberg. I'm a habitat biologist with the Department of Fish 23 and Game, and what I'd like to do this afternoon is to take you 24through four different elements of information that we're 25 gathering for the habitat protection process to give you a sense

I have four -- the presentation is in four parts, and so I'd ask you for the first part to refer to this table one that's in your packet. It's about a quarter of an inch thick. Everybody finding it?

MR. PENNOYER: In some of you packets, table two will be in front of table one.

10

11

25

12it.

MR. SUNDBERG: That's the accelerated process.

MR. PENNOYER: Get right to the conclusion.

MR. SUNDBERG: Okay. Hopefully everybody's found

During this year's solicitation of restoration project 14ideas, 54 project ideas were received from the public dealing 15with habitat protection. Thirty-four of those projects were 16classified as nonspecific by the Habitat Protection Working 17Group, meaning that they generally advocated buying land, but did 18not specify where or how much.

Seventeen of the projects specifically identified 20geographic areas or parcels for acquisition. Four of these 21project ideas were submitted by land owners: Seldovia Native 22Association, Afognak Native Corporation, Old Harbor Native 23Corporation and Koniag, Incorporated, and they're indicated as 24willing sellers on this table one by an asterisk.

Fourteen of the proponents provided a cost estimate for

R & R COURT REPORTERS

their project idea. And they range in cost from a high of \$113.5 million to acquire 125,000 acres of Afognak Joint Venture lands on Afognak Island, which works out to about \$900.00 an acre, to a low of \$70,000.00 for a proposed land exchange between the State of Alaska and the Kodiak Island Borough for key recreation sites.

The \$22 million cost of acquiring the Katchemak State Park in-holdings from Seldovia Native Association shown on this table was proposed prior to the Governor's veto of the acquisition component of Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 10483, so that cost was the cost that came in back in July.

The total cost derived from all these project ideas is 1_2 \$412 million, of which \$263 million could be attributed to 1_3 willing sellers, i.e., the landowners themselves who are offering 1_4 to sell land.

And a more detailed summary of each project idea is appended to this table. Each of the project -- 17 project ideas that an abstract written on what was the major components of each sof the -- of each of the proposals, and those are at the back of this table one packet.

So in summary table one summarizes all the proposals that lact and in for this year under 1993 project ideas, all the specific proposals, and summarizes who the proponents are. The proponent would be the person that would have submitted the idea and their estimated costs. These costs are not the estimated costs of the specific proposals, and summarizes who the proponents are. The proponent are submitted the idea and their proposals. These costs are not the estimated costs of the proposals.

proponent.

MR. COLE: Can we comment on those now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: I'm not sure what your intent is to -- further explanation you mean? Certainly. Well, you're not proposing that we consider these,

MR. SUNDBERG: No.

MR. PENNOYER: these are just for

background?

19

MR. SUNDBERG: Correct. We're just -- what the 1 opurpose of this is to give you a background on what the public 1 proposed during this round of the project proposals.

MR. PENNOYER: Yeah. Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Well, is item number one and two, the 14Katchemak Bay State Park in-holdings, one's proposed by Seldovia 15Native Association, the other by Katchemak Bay Citizens 16Coalition, am I to understand that those are the same? Is that 17the same

MR. SUNDBERG: They were the same

MR. COLE: land involved in each?

20 MR. SUNDBERG: Correct. They propose the same 21 identical lands, two different groups proposed that project.

MR. COLE: And, let's see, under the Kodiak 23 acquisitions alone, that's 200 million approximately for the 24 Kodiak. That would be numbers what, six through 13, would be 25200 million. Then the Afognak two acquisitions, one for

R & R COURT REPORTERS

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SUNDBERG: I have no idea. It would be

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

25

MR. COLE: Well, then let's

MR. SUNDBERG: hundreds of millions.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Didn't we -- we knew something about Cape Suckling, didn't we, on House Bill 411? As I recall that was about 30 million along, wasn't it, or 40? I mean, look, let's address number 14, Afognak One, Cape Suckling, Kachemak Bay, Kenai Fjords, Kodiak Refuge and Prince William Sound, all proposed by Alaska Center of the Environment, and there's no cost cestimate there provided. I think that's the principal one of three for which there's no cost estimate. But I would hazard to guess that it's in the neighborhood of 100 million. So that takes us up probably to 550 million expenditures for these 4 habitat acquisitions alone out of the 625 we have left.

Now, you know, I just want to say, so as the Governor 16 would say, people have a sense of where I'm coming from, if you 17 want us to look at these and not exercise a lot of care and 18 discretion, there's 550 million here, out of 625, we better -- if 19 we were to say, yes, we could put an end to this Trustee Council 20 and ou work for the next ten years and say it's done, good-bye. 21 really doubt if that's what the public would like us to do. So 22 when you look at those signs out there and think about what we're 23 supposed to do in response to them, I would like you to keep in 24 mind where that would lead us, the very end of this function off 25 the Trustee Council, 'cause that will take it all.

```
66
                  MR.
                       PENNOYER:
                                    Hopefully, Mr. Sundberg and
 Mr. Sheridan are proposing a process whereby we can pick and
 choose the appropriate ones to take out of their list, so .....
                  MR. SUNDBERG: We'll be trying to get to that.
                  MR. PENNOYER: Are there further comments at this
 point or -- further .....
                  MR. SUNDBERG:
                                  That's why we're all here.
                                  ..... comments at this point, or
                  MR. PENNOYER:
 shall they proceed with their ....?
                  MR. McVEE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I quess on the
10^{-1} item four, let's see, I'm not sure what page we're on here.
11 It was part of Walt Sheridan's presentation.
                                                    The cost-share
<sub>12</sub>agreement with Nature Conservancy to assist the Restoration Team
13in collecting and organizing existing data. I guess I was -- I
<sub>1</sub>4and the understanding that the Restoration Planning Work Group
<sub>1</sub>| 5 would also be collecting and organizing data and I hope we don't
16have duplicate efforts here, that the -- if we approve this,
<sub>1</sub>7Nature Conservancy could take off from where the Restoration
\parallel_{8}Planning Group is now in terms of data that's on file.
                                  Were you going to get into more
19
                  MR. PENNOYER:
20detail .....
                  MR. SUNDBERG:
                                  Mr. ....
21
                  MR.
                      PENNOYER:
                                   ..... on those two proposals
22
3later, because .....
                  MR. SUNDBERG: Mr. Chair, if I .....
24
                                  ..... I have some questions as
                  MR. PENNOYER:
25
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

67

well?

25

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ SUNDBERG: could respond to that, I would just say

MR. PENNOYER: Concerns.

MR. SUNDBERG: that we were going to deal with those projects later on in our presentation

MR. McVEE: Okay. Okay.

MR. SUNDBERG: and we'll have an opportunity to talk about in more detail.

MR. PENNOYER: I'm interested when you get to it 10what you mean by "cost sharing," too, so -- okay. Thank you. 11Could you proceed then, please?

MR. SUNDBERG: Certainly. Also attached to table 13 one in the packet is a land value overview. It looks like this. 14 And this was prepared by John Harmony of the Forest Service and 15 Dee Butler of the Fish and Wild Life Service. This analysis is 16 intended to provide you with a general guide to the range of land 17 and timber values found in the Spill area.

Fee simple land sales occurring during the 1985 to '91 ptime period and current timber values were analyzed for four 20geographic regions in the Spill area. As shown, fee simple land 1values will vary widely throughout the area, which could be 22expected. Small parcel values range from \$825.00 an acre up to 23\$53,890.00 per acre. And large parcel sales range from \$625.00 per acre up to \$1,125.00 per acre.

Timber values also varied widely depending upon volume,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

The main point of this exercise I think was to just look 13 at past sales in the area and get good idea of what land values 14 are. It wasn't an attempt to appraise land or do anything to 15 come up with any hard numbers, but to give the Trustee Council an 16 idea of what we're talking about in terms of costs.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

17

18

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: That timber value from say 10,000 an 20 acre to \$40,000.00 an acre is pretty wide spread. Do you have a 21 better sense of what we'd be looking at or?

MR. SUNDBERG: My impression is that probably the $_{23}$ average price we're looking out there is somewhere around 15 to $_{24}$ \$20,000.00 an acre for timber. The difference between timber $_{25}$ values say on Afognak Island, which some of that would be at the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

high end of the scale versus timber values on areas around the lower Kenai Peninsula, which would probably be at the lower end of the scale.

MR. PENNOYER: Proceed.

MR. SUNDBERG: Okay. I'd like to move on to the next table, and Dave has a replacement table to hand out. The estimated acreages on this replacement table are more accurate and were based on some recent analysis that we did over late last week, being after the packets were mailed out or were completed.

DR. GIBBONS: Some of the -- copies of the new 10table two are out in the lobby, so the corrected table two.

MR. SUNDBERG: The proposed habitat protection 12strategy places a high priority on identifying and evaluating so-13called imminent threat lands. In the near terms these lands 14would be evaluated to determine, one, if key habitats thought to 15be important for restoration of injured resources or services 16occur there; two, if a land use activity would potentially 17threaten an essential habitat component or foreclose future 18restoration options; and, three, if short-term protection of a 19habitat component is warranted pending a more detailed evaluation 20and/or implementation of the Restoration Plan.

Of all the anticipated land use activities in the Spill 2area, timber harvest perhaps has the highest potential to affect 3habitat components for some of the injured fish and wildlife 4resources and services. An identification of potential imminent 25threat lands and a strategy to protect key habitats will need to

Table two and the maps displayed on the wall over here to your left provide a preliminary summary of recent and projected timber harvest activities in the Spill area. The information used in this analysis was obtained from reviewing Forest Practices notifications, incorporating data from timber harvest unit maps provided by the State Division of Forestry, and by consulting with foresters and habitat biologists with specific knowledge of the history and projected timber harvest activities of these areas.

Only harvest activities on private lands are depicted on l2these maps. Recent harvest activities on state and federal lands l3are relatively insignificant to the effort that has been on l4private lands, and potential impacts to recovery on state and l5federal lands can be addressed through normal agency management l6actions.

On table two areas which are designated -- are designated 18harvest if they were known to have been previously harvested or 19in the -- be in the process of being harvested this year. So up 20to and including 1992. The total area harvested is estimated at 2139,500 acres.

Projected harvest areas on table two are areas where 23timber harvest is expected to begin in 1993. This does not mean 24to imply that all the projected area would necessarily be 25harvested in 1993. It more -- it more correctly shows just areas

where timber harvest is expected to begin to occur. Projected harvest areas are estimated at 33,000 acres. These lands would be reviewed with others through the imminent threat process in the habitat protection strategy.

Turning your attention to these maps over here, and I have some slides later which maybe will show that a little better, for those of you like me who are near-sighted, but the areas in red on those maps are essentially the projected harvest areas and the areas in that rust brown color are the areas that have already been harvested. And these maps were prepared 10through the able services of Diane Lyles and her staff over at 11the Department of Natural Resources, and this information is now 12in our geographic information system and can be used to analyze 13properties as to what their timber harvest history is.

I'd also like to caution that they're preliminary maps 15 and we're continuing to do some verification on some of the 16 acreages and configurations of some of the harvest areas, but at 17 this point they reflect, you know, pretty much most of the 18 information that's out there right now.

MR. PENNOYER: Any questions before we proceed?

MR. SANDOR: One question.

19

20

21

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Is it fair to use that 15 to 23\$20,000.00 value against say that 33,000 estimated acres of --24being -- that's projected for harvest, just to get an indication 250f how much money we're talking about?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SUNDBERG: Yes, I think so.

MR. SANDOR: So 33,000 acres times 15 to \$20,000.00 per acre would be a fair value for that then? Or is a reasonable one to just project?

MR. SUNDBERG: As for just a back of a napkin type approach, yeah.

MR. COLE: Somebody help me with the zeros, please?

MR. PENNOYER: Five to \$600,000.00 I suppose.

MR. COLE: What?

MR. PENNOYER: I mean, million dollars, sorry.

MR. SANDOR: I got four, somewhere between 450

 $_{12}$ and 500 million. Is that in the ballpark?

11

UNIDENTIFIED: 495 million.

MR. SANDOR: 495 million.

MR. PENNOYER: At 15,000.

16 UNIDENTIFIED: At 15.

MR. COLE: Wouldn't it be 660 million at 20?

18 MR. SUNDBERG: Right.

MR. SANDOR: On the upper end.

MR. COLE: That's what I figured it at. This 21 little table here of estimated acres projected for harvest, 33 22 million (sic), 20,000, and I'll be 660 million while at 10,000 an 23 acre it would simply be 330 million.

 $_{24}$ MR. SANDOR: That -- and, Mr. Chairman, that was $_{25}$ the first part of the question, and I was trying to match that

R & R COURT REPORTERS

with the other table which was I think 412 and then that was a total, this is the imminently threatened group category, is that right?

MR. SUNDBERG: Correct, although some of these values that are on the timber harvest table may be incorporated into these projected costs

MR. SANDOR: I see.

MR. SUNDBERG: on the acquisition, but also they are -- there are parcels on the timber harvest table that do not -- are not included in these acquisition proposals.

MR. SANDOR: And if I'm reading the paper, the 1process is set up to in fact evaluate these parcels and there is 12a method of prioritizing and determining the linkage between 13resources or services damaged and proposed acquisition?

MR. SHERIDAN: Yes, that's correct. What we're 15talking about here is a screening process.

MR. SANDOR: Yeah.

16

24

25

MR. SHERIDAN: These areas are the ones where 18timber harvest is likely to take place, but that's only the first 19step in the process. You have the -- the big piece that's 20missing is identifying the critical habitats that are linked to 21recovery of resources damaged by the Spill, but this is where we 22would go looking first, around those areas where harvest is 23anticipated, and that's the accelerated piece of it only.

MR. SANDOR: Just an observation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: That is -- I had assumed that perhaps the imminently threatened would be perhaps half of what the total was, and that doesn't turn out that way. It turns out actually that five to 600 million is imminently threatened, so it's a big, big job to do the analysis on these imminently threatened lands. That's the message I get out of that. Is that a valid conclusion?

MR. SHERIDAN: Yes.

continue?

MR. PENNOYER: Further questions? Why don't you

10 MR. SUNDBERG: Okay. Table Three looks like 11this.

Another way of gauging the imminent threat of a proposed 13 land use activity, and thus helping to identify potential areas 14 needing habitat protection, is to examine the various land and 15 water use permit authorizations issued by state and federal 16 agencies. For example, a proposed timber harvest activity may 17 require permits from several agencies including the Army Corps of 18 Engineers, Department of Environmental Conservation, Department 19 of Natural Resources, and Department of Fish and Game.

Presumably landowners who have received all the required proposed presumably landowners who have received all the required proposed propos

to protection of injured resources and services.

Table three summarizes all the state-reviewed land and water authorizations for private owners in the Spill area during the period from July 1, 1989, through June 12th, 1992. Federal permits that are subject to the State's coordinated coastal consistency review process, which basically encompasses all of the significant activities, are included.

A total of 419 permitting records were found for the Spill area during the previous four-year period. These records document authorizations for seven timber operations in Prince 10William Sound, five operations on the Lower Kenai Peninsula, and 11four operations on Afognak Island. In contrast, there are no 12authorizations for timber harvest in Katchemak Bay at this time.

This table also helps to identify other land and water 14use activities in addition to timber harvests that may affect the 15recovery of injured resources and services.

And I apologize, this is a rather lengthy table, but we 17thought it might be useful for you just to see the various 18different types of activities that are going on out there, and 19also to give you an idea of sort of what their geographic scope 20 is and the kinds of permits that are issued. And in addition to 21timber harvest, there's a lot of other types of activities out 22there: placer mining, mariculture, water use permits, wetland 23fills, docks. Just a number of different things in addition to 24timber harvest.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

MR. SANDOR: Well, this is a remarkable table. really commend the group for actually tracking down these There's at least six or seven placer mine permits, at least one hard-rock mining permit, and if they're at the

MR. SUNDBERG: Yes, these are the actual permits that have already been issued, so these people would have the authorizations to go ahead.

permitting stage, they must be near imminent operation.

permits.

I quess the question, and maybe MR. SANDOR: you're going to get into this, to what degree or how are you $_{10}$ going to look at these other -- these kinds of activities, the 11placer mining, hard-rock mining, for instance? Is there a $_{12}$ mechanism to also examine that and, this is the question, is a projection of perhaps acquiring the rights of that? 140bviously that is not included in the listing of the timber 15acquisitions, so we're talking some additional monies 16potential acquisition of these potentially imminently threatened 170r imminently threatened activities in these areas, is that 1gright?

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah. We're getting a little bit 19 anead of ourselves, but I think that the approach that we would 1 be proposing would be to determine what it is out there that we need to look at for protection first as just sort of one of the 23first steps. We have to be aware of these imminent processes 4that are going on, and as key habitat area pop up out of this √sevaluation process, we would need to look to see whether there

was some land use activity that might foreclose a restoration option or potentially threaten that habitat component, but there's a lot of land out there and while not all habitat is created equal, and I think our proposal is to look specifically into what habitats are needed for restoration and approach it from that angle, while being cognizant of the other activities that may cause an impact in the interim.

MR. SANDOR: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Other questions. Please proceed.

MR. SUNDBERG: Okay. The last table to go 10through is table four. The Habitat Protection Working Group has 11begun the process of defining the essential habitats for injured 12species so that they can be identified on lands within the Spill 13area. This is a critical first step towards establishing a 14linkage between key habitats and their role in the recovery of 15injured resources and services.

In July a two-page questionnaire was sent out to all 17principal investigators working on damage assessment and 18restoration studies. The questionnaire was designed to obtain 19preliminary information on, one, the degree and rate of recovery 20of injured species; two, factors which may be limiting recovery; 21and, three, key habitat characteristics which are needed to 22 sustain each species and foster its recovery.

The questionnaire has yielded some interesting results. $_{24}$ First, for the ten injured species which elicited responses, $_{25}$ recovery was rated either inadequate, declining, or unknown.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

3investigator investigating harlequin ducks did not list nesting

4habitat as a limiting factor at this time, although I don't think

5that there's really -- the analysis, nest -- you know, that has

been completed in order to determine whether that is a limiting factor or not.

MR. SANDOR: Uh-huh.

MR. SUNDBERG: I think the primary concern on harlequins at this time is that there is still contaminated food, i.e., mussels out there that seem to be doing more of a limiting job on harlequins at this point.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Yeah. When you say, you know, guplands" and so forth, and, you know, how far, for example, on loeach side of a stream would you want to say is part of the local habitat for pink salmon and sockeye salmon for example?

12 I'm just trying to get an idea of what we're dealing with here logically some presentation.

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah, I don't think that we've 15defined how far on either side of a stream is needed at this 16point for pink and sockeye salmon within the specific parcels out 17here. You know, the Forest Practices Act gives a 66-foot no -- 18or a buffer on either side of the stream of which you can cut 25% 19of the trees within 25 to 66 feet. The fishery biologists were 20asking for 100 feet on either side of the stream. Some people 21were asking for more, some people were asking for less. You 22know, the sense of it is, is that for fish somewhere in the 33neighborhood probably of 100 feet, maybe 200 feet is

MR. COLE: But certainly less than for a half a mile on each side, a quarter of a mile? No more than a quarter

80 of a mile on each side would you say? MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah, I don't want to get pinned down, you know, specifically but, yeah, I mean MR. COLE: Yeah, I'm not trying to pin you down, MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah. MR. COLE: I'm just, you know, giving you between 66 feet and, you know, a quarter of a -- 440, I mean, MR. SUNDBERG: I'd say a quarter MR. COLE: that's a pretty good spread. 10 MR. SUNDBERG: mile is on the very large 11 $_{12}$ end of that spectrum, and probably it's closer to 100 to 200 1/3 feet. It's my opinion. Did that answer you question? MR. COLE: Sure. 14 SUNDBERG: Okay. Were there any other MR. 15 16questions on this? Should I MR. PENNOYER: Why don't you go ahead? 17 MR. SUNDBERG: just go ahead? Okay. 18 Excuse me, just let -- I'm trying to 19 MR. COLE: dostill get a sense. We talked about salmon, but how about the narbled murrelet, pigeon and the common murre? Did -- do you 2have any sense of what's needed there? MR. SUNDBERG: Well, murrelets are an interesting 23 4critter, because apparently there's been some seven or eight

R & R COURT REPORTERS

√nests located recently in the State, and I think all of those

were located in trees. There's some question as to whether some of these murrelets may be nesting on the ground or in rock crevices also, but at least the ones that have been found lately all appear to be in trees, and they seem to have fairly -- they -- they nest up high up in the watersheds a lot of times. And they seem to have some component that they like northwest or west, you know, facing slopes, fairly steep slopes. starting to get a sense I think more and more about where these murrelets might be nesting, but they could be anywhere within a watershed, and it appears that they like trees.

MR. PENNOYER: Some more? 10

11

12

13

14

MR. COLE: No, that's all for now.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

Thank you. Go ahead. MR. PENNOYER:

MR. SUNDBERG: Okay. Okay. Finally the 15 16confidence of the principal investigators varies widely when _{¶7}asked to identify recovery rates, limiting factors and key Aphabitat characteristics for injured species. This is ∥osurprising keeping in mind that very little habitat information owas available on many of these species prior to the Spill, and 1 that most of the Spill studies conducted previously were designed 12 to determine injuries or damages rather than focusing on 3identifying key habitat needs.

And the point of that is is that some people say that, √swell, there's a lot of information out there, and we've done all

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

these studies, and there is quite a bit of information, and I think we're making a start at trying to synthesize it down, but it's also the kind of questions that have been asked during the Oil Spill have been mostly related to looking at damages and population level changes versus what these critters actually need in terms of habitat. So that -- later on we'll talk about some of the additional data needs that we think are warranted for the habitat protection process.

The additional column on this table that's labelled "data layers" identifies the types of information needed in a logeographic information system data base in order to identify the location of key habitat areas in the Spill area. The need to logiture refine the identification of key habitat characteristics and to construct a geographic information system for use in laidentifying strategic lands for habitat protection will be logiture covered during the discussion of the proposed habitat feprotection projects in the '93 work plan, and we hope to be able logitude the opportunity to discuss those at the end of this appresentation.

- And what I propose to do next is to show a few slides and 20then we could open it up to any questions. But I could take any 21questions that you have right now, too.
- MR. SHERIDAN: One comment before we go to that 23might be the way the numbers on table one and the numbers on 24table two, to make sure you have a clear understanding of that. 25The numbers on table one are numbers that the proponent of those

parcels being purchased or flagged, those are numbers that they provided. Those are not -- they have not been verified in any form and we -- they were just transposing them from the proposals onto this chart.

When you start talking about the acreages and the average values from the table two that Attorney General Cole was inquiring about, there's no correlation between the numbers on table two and the numbers on table one, and we've made no effort at all to try to reconcile any differences between the two at this point. We're merely providing those to you for some loinformation at this time.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

11

12

MR. SUNDBERG: Somebody get the lights?

This is just an over-view map showing the Spill-affected 14area, and within that light grey line that's around there is 15approximately 8.5 million acres of uplands, and approximately 1.6 16million acres of that area is privately owned, which figures out 17to about 20% of the uplands in the area.

This is a satellite image taken of southern Prince 19William Sound that was just classified and processed in ground 20truth (ph) this summer by Dr. Richard Padolski who is under 1contract to the Restoration Team. And it depicts various upland 2habitat types found in Prince William Sound, including snow 3fields which are shown in blue, rocks, alpine areas which are in 24dark orange, muskegs which are light green, shrub lands which are 25light orange, and forests which are dark green. And, incidently,

most of these islands in this group here are -- the majority of them are in private ownership.

This image is in a digital format so that it can be incorporated into our proposed habitat protection, geographic information system, and other systems that are in place in agencies. And the information contained in this kind of remote sensing inform- -- images can be very useful in concert with other information for accurately defining, mapping, analyzing and comparing habitat characteristics across large areas.

The point of showing this slide is that this is the kind 100f information that we would be proposing to use to classify and 11locate key habitat areas throughout the spill area in concert 12with other information which I'll talk about.

I apologize, this slide is a little dark, but the land land land surface in the Spill area contains a mosaic of different habitat late types with varying degrees of relative importance to the recovery late injured species and services. For example, in this picture late open bog meadow which is depicted in the center of this lapicture may be important as a flight corridor for these marbled land species, but it may have little value as actual nesting area.

The accurate identification and mapping of anadromous 1 fish streams and associated riparian lands is critical to 2 determining the habitat protection needs of salmon and other 3 injured species, including harlequin ducks. The small spawning 2 4 and rearing streams connected to this large stream cannot always 2 5 be detected on remote sensing images and aerial photos, and it is

important that field stream surveys be continued so that fish habitat characteristics can be accurately classified and mapped.

This is an example of an old growth forest. Forest types and their respective habitat values vary widely within the Spill area and include forest exhibiting old growth characteristics, and forests like this which were previously logged about 40 or 50 years ago which show successional growth characteristics.

It is critical to define where the key forest habitat characteristics occur, assuming, for example, that marbled murrelets require old growth characteristics for nesting habitat.

Again I apologize for the dark slide. Transition areas 1_1 and high relief forest lands may also be important for some 1_2 species such as murrelets and harlequin ducks. These are the 1_3 kind of high elevation areas that have been found to be nesting 1_4 areas for both murrelets and harlequins.

And not to forget that an estimated five to 10% of all 16the uplands in the Spill area are essentially rock and ice and 17have little potential habitat value for injured species.

Timber harvests and subsequent siltacultural (ph) 19practices that produce even-aged tree farms as depicted by this 20operation in Two Moon Bay, will change the habitat 21characteristics over portions of forested lands in the Spill 22area.

Forests are estimated to cover some 20 to 30% of the $_{24}$ uplands throughout the Spill area, but forests cover a higher $_{25}$ percentage on private lands.

In studies on Naked Island, Afognak Island and elsewhere indicate that marbled murrelets are using old-growth spruce trees such as this as nesting habitat.

This is -- this map is essentially the same as are on the wall. They're a little different colors because of the way they had to be projected. But this shows eastern Prince William Sound and shows the private lands in yellow and the public lands which are in blue and the previously harvested areas are shown in green on this map and the projected harvest areas are shown in red. And within eastern Prince William Sound, the areas harvested are lapproximately 8,900 acres and the areas projected for harvest are lapproximately 8,600 acres. And again that's using the same laterminology as I explained before, that projected harvest areas lare areas where timber harvest is likely to begin in 1993.

MR. SANDOR: A question before

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole (ph)?

MR. SANDOR: you move -- Mr. Chairman, if I

17may?

18 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

19 MR. SANDOR: That red is the imminently

dothreatened land or?

MR. SUNDBERG: Correct. It's the projected

2harvest areas.

MR. SANDOR: Yet

MR. SUNDBERG: We don't know whether there's a simminent threats in there yet, but there is

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SANDOR: Potentially so?

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah, potentially.

MR. SANDOR: Yet the adjacent yellow is also privately owned and presumably would have potential for harvest?

MR. SUNDBERG: That's correct. In fact this doesn't show, you know, down the line where timber harvests may occur in the future on some of those other yellow lands, because

MR. SANDOR: Just

MR. SUNDBERG: we just don't know at this

MR. SANDOR: Precisely the question that comes to 12mind, if in fact we protected the imminently threatened areas in 13red what would preclude that same land owner to move onto yellow 14areas and -- which may also have habitat that would be 15potentially adversely impacting to these same species?

MR. SUNDBERG: Nothing. That's why what we're proposing is to identify where these habitats are sort of across sthe scale and so we make sure that we look at the important ones.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

10point.

25

20 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Let me see if I -- I'm not sure I got 22that. How many acres in red?

MR. SUNDBERG: In red there's approximately 8,600 24acres.

MR. COLE: And how many acres in yellow?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

88 MR. SUNDBERG: Oh, boy. MR. COLE: Well, you know, just about. MR. SUNDBERG: Walt, do you know? MR. COLE: It looks like it ought to be more than ten times greater, doesn't it? MR. SHERIDAN: I believe that it's safe to say it's more than ten times greater, yes. MR. SUNDBERG: If I had a computer here, I could give you MR. SHERIDAN: Yeah. MR. SUNDBERG: an instant answer, but I'd 10 $1 \mid 1$ say it's probably 800,000 acres, close to a million acres? 12it's not that much. MS. RUTHERFORD: 80. 13 MR. SUNDBERG: Ten times than the red at 8,900. 14 MR. SHERIDAN: I think it's more like 100,000 or 115 16so. MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah, about 100. 17 Or 150. MR. SHERIDAN: 18 MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah. Walt says 150,000, quess. 19 MR. COLE: 150,000? 20 MR. SHERIDAN: Yeah. 21 MR. COLE: And we were dealing with that other 22 3imminently threatened on table two of 33,000? MR. SUNDBERG: Correct. 24 MR. COLE: And we calculated that at 20,000 an 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 272-7515 272-3022 277-0572

acre to be 660 million.

10

MR. SUNDBERG: Correct.

MR. COLE: So this would be five times 660 million if the basic numbers remained the same. I mean, tell me if I'm off base, but I'm trying to get a sense of where we are. Five times this would be three billion.

MR. SUNDBERG: Within -- yeah, within this area I would sort of venture that the values are probably somewhere around 20,000 an acre.

MR. COLE: How much?

MR. SUNDBERG: 20,000 for timber value.

UNIDENTIFIED: Could I object just for a second?

1 That is an absolutely absurd number. The native corporation

1 themselves have talked about prices lower than \$1,000.00 per

1 the acre. And Katchemak Bay along is around \$1,000.00 an acre, fee

1 title plus the subsurface rights. So this \$20,000.00 an

1 the acre is an (indiscernible) number to be calculating the fact that

1 the acre is an object just for a second?

MR. COLE: Well, we haven't gotten to that, but 19that's what this contract, or this study I think will address, 20but

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah. I think the important thing 2is, too, is that we're -- we're zeroing in on timbered lands here 3versus all lands including muskegs and rock and everything else, 4and, you know, John Harmony looked at what timber prices were 25going for within this area to come up with his spread for the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

R & R COURT REPORTERS

earlier for acreage in general on -- that is being sold in that area range from less than \$1,000.00 an acre to way above, to sev-- quite a few thousand dollars per acre, so you have to be careful whether you're talking about apples or oranges in this process.

MR. COLE: Well, let's do it another way. If you took a tenth of that, you know, take -- start with the three billion, however we got there, you take a tenth of that, you know, that's 330,000. I mean, what I'm saying is that you're dealing a pretty big number just in this little area here in the loeastern Sound. I guess

MR. SHERIDAN: Well, Mr. Chairman,

11

12

MR. COLE: that's what I'm saying.

MR. SHERIDAN: Well, I think that one of the 14 numbers that was quoted again by Kim earlier was that in the 15 whole Spill-affected area you're looking at something like 1.2 16 million acres of private land. I think that was the number that 17 was quoted. But that includes land of all kinds and 18 descriptions.

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah, one other thing to keep in 19 $\mathbf{1}_{0}$ mind, it's difficult to project on where exactly the cutting 1 units are going to occur until somebody goes out there and lays area 22out the timbered and submits а Forest Practices 3Notification, and even in that respect it's sometimes difficult, 4because some of these Forest Practices Notifications, they just √sdraw a line around a section and say, "We're going to cut timber

in this area."

The green areas on there actually reflect pretty accurately where the cutting units have occurred. The red areas are the best sort of guesstimate as to where the cutting units would be occurring, but they probably over -- the actual cutting within those red units is going to be somewhat -- is going to be somewhat less like Walt said.

This map here depicts southern Montague Island, which is the focus of a current road construction project by Koncor and Chugach Alaska Corporation to begin logging out there, and shows loabout 1,000 acres which would be projected to be cut or start to libe cut next year. Eventually they plan on logging all the logger and shows are start to logging the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logging all the logger and shows are start to logger and

- MR. COLE: Could you go back to the other slide 1_4 so I -- we can get a sense of where this is compared to the 1_5 other?
- MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah, it's off the scale to the 17lower left.
- 18 MR. COLE: Oh, it's off the -- that's -- okay.

 19It's not on that slide.
- MR. SUNDBERG: Correct. We had to put it on a 21different map, because it's in the other end of the Sound.
- MR. SANDOR: Again, Mr. Chairman, the
- MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?
- MR. SANDOR: you're saying although that 25 area that's in red is what's currently planned for harvest, but

R & R COURT REPORTERS

R & R COURT REPORTERS

4it seemed like some opportunity, and I'd really like Walt or Kim

Is

√sto address it, but that we have previously harvested areas.

there any way of establishing the impacts that that harvest has had upon Oil Spill-damaged resources, or maybe another way is the effectiveness of the various permits and the Forest Practices Act to say protect the anadromous streams? It seems like that might be useful, too, since that's a factor or an element of the total formula that we have to work with.

MR. SUNDBERG: There is a low-level of agency monitoring that occurs after timber cutting on these areas. There's fairly active monitoring that goes on while the timber harvests are in operation to enforce the buffer provisions. There are no targeted studies at this point that I know of to, lyou know, specifically go into some of these cutting units and levaluate what the impacts have been on wildlife habitat.

The Forest Practices Act doesn't really do anything 14specifically for wildlife. It does provide some level of 15protection for fish and the buffer areas that are left along the 16streams provide some benefit to wildlife afterwards, but there 17really are no targeted studies at this point to evaluate that.

Okay. Last, this is a map of Afognak Island, which is 19 once you get much past this going down the coast there really 20 aren't any more trees, except for the northern part of Kodiak.

1 And this is an area where the most timber harvest activity has 2 taken place. There's approximately 20,800 acres that have been 2 3 harvested up until and including 1992, and there's a projected 24 harvest area of 15,500 acres.

MR. COLE: Do we know the price of the -- that

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

that timber was sold for? That should give us a pretty good number.

I think we could probably get a MR. SUNDBERG: pretty good idea. I don't have those figures in front of me, but we do have some data on what the volume classes are on Afognak Island, and there is some access through economic data on what timber prices go for on the West Coast and out of Alaska that John Harmony's pulled together, so I think we could probably come up with, you know, some fairly good estimates as to what it's worth.

I put this slide in here to show sort of some of the gee-10 $1 \parallel 1$ whiz stuff that's possible. And what I think we would be proposing to do would be to use the geographic information system 13to model watersheds, using elevation data, anadromous stream $_{\parallel}$ 4data, models on where say murrelets are nesting, harlequin's are ₁5nesting, the various different injured species, and come up with 16 some, you know, configurations of habitat and how it relates to $\sqrt{1}$ 7the watershed as a whole in terms of identifying where these key 1 gareas are.

And concurrently, although we'll be focusing on these g_0 imminent threat lands, we would also intend to begin evaluating 10ther lands in the Spill-effected area to determine their prespective roles in facilitating recovery of injured resources 3and services. This example here of Chenega Island, which isn't 24-- there aren't any plans for a timber harvest or other eg_{5} activities on here at this point, but I think we'd want to be

looking at sort of the whole spectrum of available habitat out in the Spill area in terms of the big picture and grand strategy that we've been talking about.

This basically concludes the first part of this presentation, and if there is any questions, Walt and I would be happy to try to answer them.

MR. SHERIDAN: I guess I'd like to make just one comment before we open it up for questions, and that is that one point that I'd like to make sure that everyone understands in this thing is that there's an awful lot of private lands out there. There's a lot of activities that are going to be taking place out there, and the point that I think that we would like to make sure that you get is that what we're looking for and approposing is a way to narrow that down, a way to focus in on the those areas that truly provide some critical habitats and truly provide areas that truly provide some critical habitats and truly swill make a difference in restoring the resources that were dealing the statement of the statement of the problem that we're dealing the statement of the problem that we're dealing the precommendations.

- 20 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Any -- what is you 21 second part of your presentation, before we ask questions on the 22 first?
- MR. SHERIDAN: Okay. The second part of the 24presentation is to go through the projects that consti- -- that 25we need to get you approval on in order to move forward with

implementing the strategy. And there are five projects that constitute that. And in fact it might be that they -- presenting some overview of those specific projects might provide an appropriate vehicle to generate the kind of questions that you might have.

MR. PENNOYER: Let me ask you one question then. From the context of the questions you've been getting here from everybody, it's obvious we're concerned about the total land out there, proceeding onto the area in yellow on those charts.

MR. SHERIDAN: Yeah.

MR. PENNOYER: And you imminent threat analysis 1 includes an evaluation of if you do this, what's still left that 2 you'd have to do? I mean, you're going to put it -- the imminent 3 threat has to be put in some specific. There's just a lot out 4 there that could still be impacted, and as Attorney General 5 Cole's pointing out, you spend all your marbles on something that 6 looks like imminent threats and you've got ten times as much 17 threat out there potentially, you have to know that. So you're 18 -- the process will lead us not just an assessment of these 19 short-term projects, but that in context of what may come on 20 later?

MR. SHERIDAN: Okay. The imminent threat process 22 right now is designed to respond to the direction of you folks to 23 get on with it. And what we're trying to do is to have something 24 that will get us to the point where you complete your restoration 25 planning, and in that restoration planning process set the over-

all goals and objectives for the longer term kind of process.

I think another point that might be useful is that we're not here talking about acquisition per se. We're looking at a whole toolbox of possible measures that could be applied to protect these areas in the short term pending completion of that restoration plan. That can include different kinds of easements, it can include -- even include some no-cost kind of cooperative agreements, and in some cases it might include the recommendation for acquisition, but I don't think particularly in the imminent threat process, in the short term prior to the completion of the loplan that we're looking at wholesale kinds of acquisition approposal in any sense.

12 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Mr. Chairman, isn't it also true that the process by which you evaluate these imminently threatened lands really will be applicable to the long-term plans as well, so that is the criteria and the process that you're -- Tywhile it seems like part of our concern is about the other lands, swe can also make some projections, but I'm jumping ahead to the pospecific projects, so I will wait.

MR. PENNOYER: Any more questions on the first part of the presentation before they go on with their specific proposals? Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: What -- now that you've completed you 24first presentation, could you go back and help me again with the 25dates by which you could have some of this information available?

I think I would understand it a little more now if you could tell us?

MR. SHERIDAN: If we receive approval for the suite of projects that we're suggesting to you today, we can have to you a set of recommendations by December 1st as to some specific parcels and some specific protection measures that should be applied to that. That would be clearly linked to restoration objectives and we could lay that out for you by December 1st.

MR. PENNOYER: And that would also put in 10perspective those versus others that might still be coming down 11the road?

MR. SHERIDAN: I would hope so, yes.

13 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you.

12

MR. SUNDBERG: And then in terms of having this 15sort of system up to look at all the different lands out there, I 16think we're talking about next April to have that, all the 17elements together and have that functioning as an analytical 18tool, although parts of that as you can see we already -- we have 19-- we're networking with other systems out there, and I think 20that we can be providing analytical tools along the line, but the 21timeline shows about next April to have, you know, the habitat 22protection system up and running. And then we envision, you 23know, batching these through on say an annual basis of coming up 24with recommendations and bringing them before the Trustee 25Council.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Further questions at this point? Would you proceed then with part two? Should we take a recess and MR. COLE: MR. PENNOYER: Do you want to take a recess? MR. COLE: Would there be any sentiment to taking a recess and winding the public at large selection? MR. PENNOYER: We could do that, if you wish. MR. COLE: (Indiscernible) had that in mind. MR. PENNOYER: We had it in mind, but we didn't have it scheduled for a particular time. What's the pleasure of 10the group? Five, ten minute recess? Okay. (Off record) 11 (On record) 1 2 MR. PENNOYER: Could we start up again, please? 13 14 It's been suggested that we -- that we take a break from the land √sacquisition discussion and go back to the Public Advisory Group 16and discuss the public at large category. And MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chair? 17 MR. PENNOYER: Yes? 18 MS. RUTHERFORD: Dave's not back yet, but we just 19 owere handed some additional information from Tom Gallagher. <code>刘1you want me to hand to hand it out?</code> MR. PENNOYER: Certainly I guess. 22 MR. BARTON: Sure. 23 MR. PENNOYER: I'm not 24 MR. SANDOR: Yeah, we can see if that changes our 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

votes.

MR. PENNOYER: We'll take half a second to look at this before we proceed just with the discussion, so that we've had all of these items in front of us.

(Pause, looking at document)

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Do we -- are we ready to consider the public at large category and does anybody want to make any nominations? Staff has prepared some work and have -- we've been presented a summary of the process that we undertook after lunch, and each Trustee Council member nominating seven 10people to this group. Staff has compiled those and clearly as 11you can see they're -- the nominations are -- are ranked by 12number, and does anybody want to make any nominations? Or 13comments based on this?

- 14 MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman?
- MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier?
- MR. ROSIER: Are you looking to -- for a motion 17 for all five at one fell swoop, or individuals?
- MR. PENNOYER: Well, we might do that. We could 19accept amendments to it.
- MR. ROSIER: Mr. Chairman, I would move then that $_21$ the five top individuals in the list provided by the staff be $_22$ appointed to the public at large seats.
- MR. PENNOYER: Would you read their names, 24please?
- MR. ROSIER: James McCloud -- or James Cloud,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Richard Eliason, Llewellyn Williams, Paul Gavora, and Vern McCorkle.

MR. PENNOYER: Do I hear a second?

MR. BARTON: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: It's been moved and seconded the five names read by Mr. Rosier be appointed to the Public Advisory Group, public at large category. Are there any amendments or discussion? Any objection to those five? Hearing none, the five final names for the Public Advisory Group have been selected and we have a Public Advisory Group.

Staff, you can -- you have some work to do in 11modification of the charter I understand, and you've got a group 12to work with now, and I presume you'll quickly move to start the 13public advisory process, Public Advisory Group process. Can you 14give us any idea generally of how soon a meeting would be 15convened or when it might happen, Mr. Gibbons?

DR. GIBBONS: No idea right now, Mr. Chairman, 7but we'll move as quickly as we can on it.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Further comment by the 19Trustee Council on the Public Advisory Group? Okay. Thank you 20very much. I'm glad we completed that and I think it's one of 21the main items with a couple left to go back to the Court for the 22substantive part of the '92 budget.

We were dealing with the public -- with the land $_{24}$ acquisition question, and I believe we were ready for part two of $_{25}$ the presentation, and I think Kim probably went to get a cup of

coffee, because I think he thinks it was going to take us longer.

Walt, do you -- are you guys ready to go or do you

MR. SHERIDAN: Yes, sir.

MR. PENNOYER: need a minute? Oh, there he is, yeah.

MR. SHERIDAN: Mr. Chairman, I think what we have left for the second part of this is to give you a brief rundown on the projects that we're proposing and asking for your approval so that we can move forward with the recommended strategy.

The first project is numbered 92059 and it's titled 10 imminent threat habitat identification. And what this would do 11 would be to as quickly as possible convene some workshops the 12 purpose of which would be to identify and refine what we know 13 about the critical habitat for the injured resources and 14 services. That would include the peer reviewers, the principal 15 investigators and others who would have some knowledge that they 16 could bring to bear on this.

The idea here is to get as good of information as we algorithm as the secretary can on what these critical habitats are as quickly as a spossible so that we could use that as primary screening for a colooking at these areas that we've identified as having some a spoof at the secretary contains the secretary contains and secretary contains a spoof of information as we spoof a spoof and spoof as a spoof of information as we spoof a spoof and spoof and spoof are spoof as a spoof of information as we spoof a spoof of information as we spoof a spoof and spoof are spoof as a spoof of information as we spoof a spoof of information as we spoof a spoof and spoof are spoof as a spoof of information as we spoof spoof of information as well as well as well as well as well as well as well

We propose to do that through a cost share agreement with 23the Nature Conservancy. What the Nature Conservancy would bring 24to this process is they have a tremendous amount of expertise 25across the country in doing just exactly this kind of thing,

identifying critical habitats on lands and carrying out these kinds of workshops.

The question was raised earlier by Mr. Pennoyer about exactly what a cost-share agreement is. Well, a cost-share agreement is a situation where you have a cooperator, in this case the Nature Conservancy, who has some mutual interests with the agency who is signing the cost-share agreement, in this case the Trustee Council. And so what they bring -- they bring to the table more than what we're paying for is what it amounts to. In this case the cost for this particular item is \$42,300.00 that the Council will be putting into the process. In addition to that, the Nature Conservancy would be contributing about 13 to 1215% over and above what that cost would be. And the objective the agreement is a straight the series of the process are a where 1550me activities are going to take place.

The next project, which also involves the use of this 17cost-share agreement with the Nature Conservancy, Kim will give 18us a briefing on.

MR. SUNDBERG: Okay. This is project number 2093060. It's called accelerated data acquisition. And this 1 project would involve the Nature Conservancy to help the Habitat 2 Protection Working Group assemble all this information that's out 3 there that needs to go into our geographic information system. I 24 think the comments have been made previously that, well, there's 25 a lot of information, this stuff is all -- it's all been done, or

it's all available. It's true that there is a lot of information available and we're not going to be recreating any information that's already out there, but what we found is that a lot of this information is in various forms, formats. When you're getting into the computer world, you have to deal with whether it's in a compatible format for the hardware that you're using.

What we would like Nature Conservancy to do in this project is to assemble a catalog of this information, and we have defined in this project description the kind of data layers that we think we're going to need in this GIS, geographic information osystem to analyze these lands. The Nature Conservancy is also offering to give us some suggestions on other information that they think is pertinent, because they have previous experience with acquiring lands and analyzing lands for habitat protection and other forms of acquisition.

So I think the total cost on this is \$43,900.00. The loidea is that this project would spin up very soon. They would be loging right to work on this and starting to bring this lainformation back to us and to bear on this project.

The other reason for doing this this way is that we 20didn't want to have to hire on staff within the agencies in order 1 to do this, and any time that you're going out and gathering 2 information, you really have to have somebody that's dedicated to 3 doing that and that can sort of go around to different agencies 4 and know what kind of information to get and get it in a form, 25 and we thought that the most efficient way of doing that would be

to contract with an organization who has experience doing that kind of thing and also that would provide the best product in the shortest amount of time, and probably for the best price, too.

MR. SHERIDAN: The next element of the strategy is called -- is project 93064, which is the imminent threat habitat protection. And what this project does is set aside five -- up to \$5 million for short-term protection measures which will be allocated by the Trustee Council for specific parcels.

And the way this would work is that on December 1st after we have provided you with recommended protection measures for 10specific parcels, then you would be able then to make a decision 11on whether to utilize this money. Each one of those decisions 12would then be looked upon as an amendment to this project. It 13would modify the project and make it more specific, but would 14provide the funds in a timely fashion for the agency which 15assigned the responsibility for implementing the specific 16protection measure to go forward and actually obtain the easement 17or obtain the fee title if that happened to be what you decision 18was on that particular parcel.

- MR. PENNOYER: Well, clearly though that's in the 20'93 projects, that's what we're going to decide on later, not 21something you're asking for now?
- MR. SHERIDAN: No, that's correct on that one.

 23The ones that we need some action from you folks on now are the

 24ones involving the accelerated process. In other words, the two

 25cost-share agreements with the Nature Conservancy. These others

are part of the over-all

MR. PENNOYER: Shall we stop at those two, or do you want to put them in the context of what you're going to present later on?

Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I would argue that for planning purposes that it -- and this is with the, I guess, the qualification that it is up to \$5 million for shortsterm protection measures to be allocated by the Trustee Council for specific parcels of land. It seems to me it would be very nohelpful to the group that's doing the planning that we are not willing in fact to commit up to \$5 million for this protection, particularly since we're going to have the option of an approximately to pass on each parcel individually, you know, I think this brings in fact each project before us, but I would be story much in favor of committing the Trustee Council even at this nestage for planning purposes, that we are willing to commit up to 17\$5 million for the protection of these imminently threatened shands, and so I'd ask that those -- that the three items at least spee placed on the table.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

 $_{22}$ MR. COLE: Mr. McVee had his hand up first.

MR. PENNOYER: You were talking. Okay.

4Mr. McVee?

25

MR. McVEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

problem that I have with the five million, -- I think we should move ahead with the 059 and 060, and, you know, I realize the concept that Mr. Sandor has talked about here, but the problem I have with that is that I feel like it could go forward in the normal '93 budget process and we could get public review, you know, we could take action of that here in the next few days as part of the '93 budget proposal, and then it could go forward for public review and we could have that, you know, that number validated you might say before the general public. And we aren't -- we won't be delaying the process in any way if we do that, and 10 fulfill a requirement also of the decree I believe that we have 1 public input into these projects, particularly where they're a 1 2 substantial amount of money.

MR. SANDOR: A question.

14

25

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: When might that be if it's not done 16 now? Is it going to be done this month, or when is it going to 17 be done? I -- we've gotten a lot of public comments already that 18 we ought to be getting on with it.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor, I think we're -- the 20intent was provisionally to have been today or tomorrow to have 1dealt with the '93 process, including this particular number 22you're discussing. My assumption is before we get out of here, 23we've got to sit down and say when we're going to reconvene to do 24that

MR. SANDOR: I see.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
MR. PENNOYER: ..... and we have to do it in the
 very near future, because we need to get that into the public
 process so we can get it into the system, and to the Court before
 we run out of money next March. So we have to do that.
          I guess my problem with deciding it today is I still
 don't have any idea what's a reasonable number. I mean, when you
 say "up to," you're limiting my options before either discuss it
 or get public reviews, or if we put it into the court process now
 for '92, I'm not sure what we really should be doing with it.
                  MR.
                       SANDOR:
                                  So
                                       it's
                                             your understanding,
10^{10}Mr. Chairman, that we will deal with this as part of the .....
                  MR. PENNOYER: It is in the .....
11
                  MR. SANDOR: ..... as part of the '93 .....?
12
                  MR. PENNOYER: ..... '93 budget package now.
13
                  MR. SANDOR: Uh-huh.
14
                  MR. PENNOYER: The '93 budget package we didn't
15
1_{6}act on today has that as a project .....
                  MR. SANDOR: Okay.
17
                  MR. PENNOYER: ..... listed and it was certainly
18
gone of the things we're going to discuss.
         Mr. Cole?
20
                  MR. COLE:
                             I have a problem dealing with it (a)
21
12 today and (b) as part of the '93 projects. Let me say why.
33First I think we have no rational basis for arriving at the
24$5 million figure.
                      I mean, it could be 10, it could be two, it
25could be 20.
                  If the information presented to us warrants
```

109

arriving at any specific number. Now, as you said, I think we're limiting our judgement, and also I think that this information that we're going to get from 059 and 060 is the information that we need to figure out or determine whether the figure is five or two or 20, you see. I don't see how we can say later this week that, well, one of the projects is 5 million. I think we need the data from 059 and 060 to make this decision, so therefore I would not favor, you know, putting this on the project agenda until we have that information. Maybe I'm missing the point but

MR. PENNOYER: Wasn't there a need to have a place holder in terms of informing OMB about the general size of the budget and we couldn't wait until December to do that, so we're faced with a Catch 22. Either we have something in there that indicates we're intending to spend some money on this scategory, if we want the public to know that, and for OMB to have some general concept of magnitude, or -- without actually knowing rahead of time what the projects are going to look like.

Mr. Sheridan?

18

MR. SHERIDAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak to 20that for a second. There was some rationale to the development 21of that number, and that being that \$5 million is a substantial 22sum of money, and we were looking for having a substantial sum 23that could be used by the Council in a very timely manner to 24respond to the recommendations that will be coming forward on 25December 1st.

The second thing was that it allows the Council to show that it's very serious about the imminent threat process, the protection of critical habitat.

Now, whether or not that's the right number or not, a lot of people could argue with, but we also just approved, or you just approved today the financial operating procedures which include in that a mechanism where by if we run into changes where we need to double, triple, quadruple that number, that's possible to do through actually the Council, but that kind of action will require public input again and will slow the process down. If we need to take some action on a specific parcel in a very timely manner, and don't have some funds set up for that, we may lose that opportunity.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: You see, what I'm concerned about is, 15 16and I think properly so, those who urge us to make habitat √acquisition, et cetera, et cetera, will say, "Well, goodness, $_{\parallel}$ 8they only set aside 5 million for all this problem," and I ∥gquarantee you we will be savaqely attacked for such -- setting and a small number. I just know that. And why not duck, And say positively, affirmatively we're prepared to 21 you know? 22spend whatever money is necessary to fulfill our 3responsibilities, you see, and really mean it, instead of just $\frac{1}{2}$ 4 having 5 million out there. Now that's the way I would do it. ₅So there you are, gentlemen.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think there's a procedural problem here, but I agree with Mr. Cole. I can't pick 5 million as the -- first of all, I can't do it today. I'd rather see it in the context of all the projects. Second of all, when we get to it, I'm not going to know anyway to chose that number. You say there was a basis for it, I yet still don't know what that basis would be. So maybe when we discuss the project in more detail I'll have a better idea, but right now I don't know why five or ten or 15. It says up to. It doesn't say I'm going to do it. But why I should limit myself to that particular level, 10and I'd prefer to do what you're suggesting, but I don't know $1 \mid 1$ procedurally exactly how we can accommodate that, and I need some 12help from the R.T. when we get into it, but I would not be prepared to do it today.

MR. SANDOR: Well, Mr. Chairman,

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

14

MR. SANDOR: it's clear I'm being 17 outnumbered, but this is partly a commitment of actually placing 18 money for planning purposes for the acquisition or other 19 mechanisms to protect this imminently threatened habitat. As I 20 understand the words "imminently threatened," this means that, 21 you know, that these lands are on the verge of in fact being 22 planned for, permitted for action, and we may want to use one of 23 a number of mechanisms to protect those.

I don't believe we need to act on this today, but it a sould really disappointing for the '93 budget package we would

R & R COURT REPORTERS

send that out for comment with zero identified for acquisition or other protection purposes.

So, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the actions here today, I move adoption of 93059 and 93060, the agreements with Nature Conservancy, and defer action on 93064.

MR. PENNOYER: Do I have a second?

MR. BARTON: Second.

MR. PENNOYER: It's moved and seconded. Any

discussion?

10

11

1 2

25

MR. COLE: Could I comment

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: just briefly on 064?

MR. PENNOYER: Certainly.

MR. COLE: Commissioner, it's not that you're 14just outnumbered, but I don't think it's a matter of simply 15putting a zero, in this proposed budget. I think we could put 16what you might, the accounting CPAs could say contingent, you 17know, obligations, and put something in there that, you know, 18describes where we're going with this, and furthermore, maybe we 19should give some thought to what imminently threatened means. I 20mean, I'm not under the impression that that means in the next 30 21days. It would be -- be my view that, you know, we -- but we do 22have to have something before the next logging season and we 23should have, no pun intended, our ducks pretty well in order by 24then.

MR. PENNOYER: So if the Restoration Team could

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
-- Dave, if you could think of how we might do something like
 that, I think when we get to that project, we're going to have a
 very difficult time in picking a number. And I don't know how to
 deal with that. I think there are folks who aren't going to want
 to limit our opportunities if those opportunities are presented
 to us, so I don't know how to do that.
         At any rate, is there further discussion on the two
 projects that were -- it was moved and seconded that we approve
 as part of the '92 -- balance of the '92 year Court submission?
                  MR. COLE: Yes, I have a comment, Mr. Chairman.
1_{0}Are we going to have a written contract for that, or is it just
1 sort of .....
                                They'll be written contract.
                  DR. GIBBONS:
12
                  MR. COLE:
                             Maybe we could appoint somebody to
13
14 look at the contract in the interim here, Mr. Barton?
                  MR. BARTON:
                               Be delighted.
15
                  MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Barton's going to take a look
16
√at the contract. Okay. Further discussion? Any objection to --
1gMr. Barton?
                               No discussion on that.
19
                  MR. BARTON:
                  MR. PENNOYER: Any objection to the motion?
20
1 motion's passed.
         Mr. Barton?
22
                  MR. BARTON: I'm a little confused. I thought we
23
4attempted to do what Charlie wanted to do in -- with the up to
√5$5 million in terms of setting aside a number for including in
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

16 $\sqrt{1}$ 7'93 budget, whenever that's going to be, and before we get out of nghere, we're going to have to decide that, we'll need as good an panswer to that question as we can get.

> MR. COLE: Yeah. Well, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

21

MR. COLE: You know, this is not an instance 22 3 where the money's expended would go to a federal agency or a 4state agency directly, so the Office of -- Federal Office of √5Management and budget I should think should not be quite so

R & R COURT REPORTERS

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SHERIDAN: up this suite -- package suite of projects, and Kim would like to go through those just briefly for you and then you would probably want to consider those as part of you regular work planning process.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah. Project number 93051, and that's a -- that's basically the field side of this project, the habitat protection strategy, and we have a need to continue to acquire some targeted field data on some of these parcels, and the two types of information that we anticipate that we're going to need for next year will be a continuation of locating and locating and mapping anadromous fish streams.

And sort of a corollary to that or in conjunction with 13that would be stream channel typing. That's a methodology for 14describing the kinds of stream channels, and it's a method of 15evaluating sort of its relative value for fish production. Those 16two projects work together.

And the third project would be looking more outside of 18the Naked Island study area as to where marbled murrelet nesting 19habitat exists. The PIs have done a pretty good job on Naked 20Island of defining where marbled murrelets nest on that island, 21but there's some lack of confidence as to whether we can 22extrapolate that information to other areas, and Naked Island is 23not an island -- it's all in public ownership, so it's not -- it 24would not be acquired or be part of this -- necessarily part of 25any habitat acquisition process. So the marbled murrelet

118 component of this would be to gather some additional information on outside of Prince William Sound on where marbled murrelets are nesting, and develop some additional information that we can use to target on where these key nesting areas are. Total cost MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SUNDBERG: Go ahead.

MR. PENNOYER: Comment?

MR. SANDOR: Yeah, a question. Can you, not here, but as this is sort of fleshed out, illustrate or show under 93051 the cost for component A and component B? That is $_{10}$ the

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah, it should be in there, and I 11 $_{1}$ 2believe that the stream habitat assessment part of that which is 13the anadromous stream surveys is 124.

MR. SANDOR: Oh, I see. 14

MR. SUNDBERG: And the channel typing I believe 15 16is 234.

MR. SHERIDAN: There are subprojects for each of 17 18those and we give you the specific numbers.

When will the -- Mr. Chairman? 19 MR. COLE:

MR. PENNOYER: Go ahead, Mr. Cole? 20

MR. COLE: When will this be -- the study be 21 2completed?

MR. SUNDBERG: The project would be completed a 23 4year from December I believe. The information wouldn't be √savailable until essentially the end of the next field season.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

I would like to point out that we are doing anadromous fish surveys during this current fiscal year and we are getting information in from that this fall, and so the stream, the anadromous fish component of this is essentially a continuation of that same effort that was begun last year.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I'm a little concerned about this study being completed not until a year from now. I mean, if we're looking forward to the acquisition of pink salmon and losockeye salmon habitat, then we're going to be long delayed, you lasee. That will not take us up until maybe the year from spring.

12 Is there not some way -- I mean, -- and furthermore, why is it lathat we so -- why are we so -- don't have this information by lanow? It's just troubling.

MR. SUNDBERG: Because essentially it involves 16having to go out there and walk every bloody stream on the land 17and sample it, and this -- what we've found is that we can't get 18a lot of this information from aerial photos or remote sensing or 19aerial overflights.

But to put the whole thing into context, we do have an landromous stream catalog that does show where a lot of streams landromous stream catalog that does show where a lot of streams landromous stream catalog that does show where a lot of streams landromous landromous stream catalog that does show where a lot of streams landromous landromo

We have good information on the Tatitlek Corporation lands. We have fairly good information on Eyak, but there's still some gaps and we have pretty good information on Afognak loand the Lower Kenai Peninsula, so where this project would look look targeted for next year would be on Eyak lands.

- And to speak to you first point, you have to do these 13 surveys essentially during the summer field season when the fish 14 are there and you can sample them. So we're pretty much locked 15 into the seasonal cycle in terms of getting that information.
- MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman? Well, one of my 17concerns is whether we're being too fine, you know, in looking at 18even the small streams. I'd like to have Commissioner Rosier's 19thoughts on that. He's the expert.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Rosier?

20

25

MR. ROSIER: Well, I think that from the 22standpoint of selecting critical habitat associated with salmon, 23that I think that the project as it's being put forth here is in 24fact probably a necessary project.

And I think in respect to your question, Charlie, it's

R & R COURT REPORTERS

fact justify what we're in fact doing I think is important.

MR. SUNDBERG: One other point I guess I would make is that if we're talking of land acquisition prices in the 10 range of as low as \$1,000.00 an acre, 124,000 buys 124 acres, and 11 guess I'd want to know whether there was any fish in there 12 before I bought it. And what we find out when we do these 13 surveys is that some areas that we think there were fish, there 14 aren't any fish, and in areas that we didn't think there were 15 fish, we find a lot of fish. So I guess the analogy is if you 16 bought a -- if you buy a house and you can buy it sight unseen on 17 the outside because it looks nice, but most people want to know 18 how many bedrooms it might have within the house, and sometimes 19 you've got to go inside and find them.

MR. COLE: Well, let me just respond to that.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: You know, it seems to me if you've got 23some stream going up there, it's not a big jump to say that the 24fish are going to go just a little farther upstream, you know. I 25mean, that's my sense, to where they can't go much farther, but I

R & R COURT REPORTERS

20

21

18 $\sqrt{9}$ going to pass on this today, and it's difficult, looking at it, $\mathbf{1}_{0}$ to decide whether the amount of money and the current information 1 base is sufficient relative to what you're going to go out and 22do. I can't -- we can't decide that looking at it anyway, so 3hopefully when we get into that project, you'll be prepared to $\frac{1}{2}$ 4tell us a little bit more about it.

There was quite an extensive stream catalog in Prince

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

William Sound, of course, and a lot of us walk an awful lot of streams in Prince William Sound from very far down to very far up, but we didn't as you say push on usually beyond the heaviest spawning areas of pink and chums, so -- but there is a lot of data there.

And unfortunately the salmon runs change, sometimes you find fish in a stream in a certain area and five years later you don't. And whether that's a change in the stream or a change in the run patterns is

without getting off into a lot of 100 obviously there will be interest in your background on that, so 1 you might be prepared to discuss it.

- MR. SUNDBERG: Certainly. 12
- MR. PENNOYER: Further? 13
- MR. SHERIDAN: One other. 14
- MR. SUNDBERG: One other project I was going to 15 16speak to is This project is called new data this 93061. 17acquisition. Thank you.
- MR. PENNOYER: He didn't like you presentation. 18
- MR. SUNDBERG: 19 Yeah.
- MR. PENNOYER: Go ahead. 20
- MR. SUNDBERG: We know that we're going to 12through these workshops you're going to hold this fall and this 3data catalog that's going to be put together and assembling this 14 information base, we know that there's going to be some data gaps √sthat are going to crop up, and they may actually be fairly

critical data gaps. We can't until we go through those processes identify where all those are, but 93061 allocates \$500,000.00 to allow for new data acquisition between October of this year and the following fiscal year where those are identified. And the proposal would be to bring these back before the Trustee Council as individual projects for approval when these data gaps are identified. And so if we have to launch a project this winter to get some critical piece of information, we would propose to come back before the T.C. and ask to approve a certain amount of money below the \$500,000.00 cap to get that critical piece of 10information.

Also, if there's some field projects that need to be 12started next spring or next summer or possibly even in the 13wintertime, this would allow some monies to be available there to 14do these projects with the Trustee Council approval.

So I can't elaborate at this point any more about what the set of these particular projects are going to be, although I think some them will relate to -- to say refining some of this computer sinformation, maybe doing some digitizing of maps, and some of it spmay have to do with some very specific targeted field studies that would have to get launched into the field before the end of this fiscal year.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions on the project? Further 23comments? Further presentation?

MR. SHERIDAN: That's it.

MR. SUNDBERG: Yeah.

24

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. You certainly put together a lot of information in a short period of time. We're looking forward to your (indiscernible).

MR. SHERIDAN: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Phase two. Thank you.

Trustee Council, we've got a public hearing advertised from 5:00 o'clock tonight. We have a couple of things left on the agenda. We need to decide what to do with 1993 draft work plan in terms of any discussion here and where we're going to go with that. When we're going to meet on it and when we're going 10 to be ready to discuss it.

- We have one other item I think that we hadn't made a 12decision on whether to complete or not in this agenda, and that's 13the review of the Draft Restoration Plan and request for Trustee 14Council guidance, and I don't know what the guidance is, but that 15may be something that we could do here.
- Mr. Gibbons, is that something we complete here?
- DR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there's about a 18 five to ten-minute presentation just on the status of where we 19 are in the development of a draft restoration plan. It
- MR. PENNOYER: Could it
- DR. GIBBONS: lays out the issues and also 22 an annotated outline.
- MR. PENNOYER: Would the Trustee Council be $_{24}$ interested in moving to that item as something we might complete $_{25}$ today and getting the presentation and then deciding what to do

with it? Any problems with that? Mr. Gibbons, do you want to go ahead and start that then?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes. I'm going to request that Bob Loeffler come up and -- who is a member of the Restoration Planning Work Group and give a status of where they are with it.

MR. PENNOYER: Good afternoon.

MR. LOEFFLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Bob
Loeffler, I'm a restoration specialist and regional planner with
DEC. I'm standing in for John Strand who is the chairman of the
restoration working group, planning working group, and on
lovacation at the moment.

What I would like to do is spend four to five minutes and 12 just present to you some information which I believe is in you 13 packet and just tell you where we are with respect to the Draft 14 Restoration Plan. And I'd like to do three things: Present to 15 you the issues, which I believe are in you packet; an annotated 16 outline so to give you sort of a vision of what the draft plan 17 will look like when you see a working copy later this fall; and 18 third, just tell you where we are in developing that outline.

So first off, I believe in your packet you'll find 11 20 issues. Those 11 issues were first presented in slightly 1 different form in the Restoration Framework. They were modified 2 by the working group in response to public comments on the 2 3 Restoration Framework, and on comments from the Restoration Team.

Now, I wasn't going to go through those issues 25 individually today. I think they're there for your information,

to tell you where we're going, and they're here presented as a guide to the Restoration Plan.

I would make one note, that there will also be issues developed for the Environmental Impact Statement. Those issues will certainly be similar, but may not be identical to those here, and I believe they'll forwarded separately.

That's the limit of what I have to say on -- on the issues. I think you can read it at your leisure. I will be willing to answer questions now or at your leisure.

The second piece of information that's in your packet is 10the annotated outline. This, too, was developed by the 1Restoration Planning Working Group with comments from the 12Restoration Team. If you read it, again at you leisure, it 13should give you a sort of a vision of what the draft plan would 14look like.

But I -- one thing that you may not get from it, which 16I'd like to emphasize is that what we're trying to develop is a 17stand-alone document that is quite easily accessible to the 18public that the curious, interested observer without dramatic 19scientific training or a desire to read through reams of 20bureaucratic information, can pick out what we're -- what we're 21trying to do and let us know whether we're on the right track, or 22whether following an alternative would be good.

We're also assuming that this stand-alone, easily accessible document will be accompanied by the Environmental assumed to the statement when it's circulated for public review.

I believe the outline itself is relatively straight forward and while reading it, you can sort of see how the process will be packaged. You'll, of course, get many chances to review it before it becomes a final package.

Sort of one note to the long, long term is that I think we expect that the final restoration plan, which is where we're thinking, will be similar, only the draft presents a variety of alternatives for public review and the final is, of course, only one.

Again, we're available for questions now or at your loleisure.

1₁ The

12 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: With respect to the outline on 14spending guidelines, the civil settlement and the criminal 15settlement, -- well, I guess two questions. When will this -- 16when would we expect this to be completed, this total planning 17group (ph)?

MR. LOEFFLER: We were hoping that we would have 19a working draft of the important parts of this outline to you by 20the 15th of November. That's our target date.

The guidelines for civil settlement and criminal 22settlement, it will be very similar to what's in the Restoration 23Framework.

MR. SANDOR: Uh-huh. Well, this ought to be very ashelpful.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Yes.

MR. LOEFFLER: Well, my only other point was that I gave to Mr. Sandor, and that we're hoping for a working draft of the important parts to you by November 15th, and you will probably be seeing as we come to sort of critical points in the process, seeing some further status report and request for guidance.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes. I guess I'm interested in the 10detail that will be in the plan and, of course, for an outline $_{1}$ 1 it's difficult to see that, but maybe you could address that a 12little bit in terms of particularly the preferred alternative. $_{1}$ 3Do you -- and a specific question I quess or focus a little bit 14better is will that address injuries and proposed action by -- by ₁5damaged resources or services? Will it get that specific? MR. LOEFFLER: We'd certainly go by resource and 16 ₁7service. The -- we probably won't get down to the project level, $_{1}$ 8so that we probably can't say we'll do a fish pass on this stream phere, but we'd certainly say the kinds of things that we would do ofor pink salmon or for sockeye salmon. So the level of 1 specificity also probably varies by resource. So, for example, 22 some -- some options that we have are quite specific. They're 3really a project. Some options encompass a couple of projects, 4and we would -- we would push it probably as far as we can, and √shopefully with the help of your employees who are on the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: It seems like -- Mr. Chairman, it seems like when we need to take it as far as we can, and if we can get to the point, or it's important to try to get to the point where it's clear what is planned to be done, you know, to restore or enhance and so on each of these resources and services, but it seems like to get that information to the public as part of the draft plan will help focus, certainly focus occuments on restoration and provide, you know, better guidance to the restoration program as it proceeds in the future.

MR. LOEFFLER: I think that one thing it's approbably important that we take as a guiding sort of principle is that there needs to be a certain amount of detail or it -- for the public to understand it and comment. That is, while the appublic may not necessarily need to know where, on what stream or rexactly what we're going to do in what murre colony, if it's too ageneral, the public is ill-informed and can't really give us ageomments, so we're trying to make it specific enough so that appeople can see kind of -- can visualize quite easily what we're agoing to do, and that's our objective, where we're going.

MR. McVEE: Maybe just one other

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: question. There's been a lot $_{25}$ of discussion I guess on endowments. Will that be -- and that

whole aspect, will that be addressed as part of an alternative or in the alternatives?

MR. LOEFFLER: Yes, but let me back up a second.

We were imagining say three to five alternatives, enough to give
a clear choice to the public, but not so many as to confuse
everybody. However, it's useful to know that separable decisions
that could easily be applied to any alternative, like an
endowment, might be a separate category, so that we could
certainly ask questions on an endowment without having to
shoehorn it into an alternative if it could apply to either. So
the answer is, yes, we wold ask questions on the endowment, but
the shoehor it increases in the sound apply to either. So
the answer is, yes, we wold ask questions on the endowment, but
the shoehor it increases in the shoehor it wouldn't necessarily be you have to choose an endowment
calternative or a protection alternative. You could -- those
squestions could be answered separately.

MR. PENNOYER: Further questions? What -- the 15 agenda item says "Trustee Council guidance," that was -- that's 16 phase two of this presentation, later on,

MR. LOEFFLER: No, no, I think that

MR. PENNOYER: farther down in?

19 MR. LOEFFLER: is -- this is really a

20status report. If there is something in here

21 MR. PENNOYER: Okay.

17

MR. LOEFFLER: that you think requires your 23guidance, we'd be happy to know it however.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. You didn't have a specific $_{25}$ item then on this. Okay.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

132

Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I, you know, have had brought to mind when we talk about Trustee quidance, my thought that maybe the Trustee Council has been too isolated from the Restoration Team, that we meet here only once a month or so and we give some, I might say, just scattered advices, thoughts to the Restoration Team, but we've never really sat down with them around the table for a couple hours or half a day and said, "Look, this is what we really want to see or what we have in This is what we would like you to do." I think we've mind. η_0 fallen a little short in giving that type of advice to the 1 Restoration Team, and I would like to see that Council give some 12thought to that thought. MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, I certainly thought that 4when we discussed the '93 work plan we were going to sit around a 1 stable with the Restoration Team and ask considerable questions 16 and maybe give considerable on that aspect, but that's MR. COLE: Well, we sit 17 MR. PENNOYER: just one item. 18 MR. COLE: We sit here in this environment, which 19 a_0 is a little MR. PENNOYER: (Indiscernible, simultaneous 21 2speech) MR. COLE: bit formal from my standpoint. 23 4And I'd just like to see us get in a little closer contact with

R & R COURT REPORTERS

√sthem and have some interaction between the Restoration Team and

the Trustee Council and in fact tell them -- have them tell us where they think we're off base so to speak. I mean, I just don't think we're getting the interaction with the Restoration Team that it might be well to have.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons' eyes lit up at the last suggestion. Are you ready to do it right now, Mr. Gibbons, or do you want -- would you like to wait and order your thoughts, or are you prepared to go right now?

DR. GIBBONS: It's not necessary.

UNIDENTIFIED: Give us the first hour, the 10staff

MR. PENNOYER: How long do you want?

1₂ MR. BRODERSON: We scheduled another day

13tomorrow.

MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think the suggestion is a 15good one. We probably don't interact very well on just sort of 16how we're doing business, and we deal with the specific pieces 17 and the questions, but how we're doing business, and such as 18 meeting you problems with you scheduling with our scheduling and 19 how we fit those together, things we don't often get into except 20 when we come to a crunch point where we've got a date and a mass 21 of information and people had to work a lot of overtime to get it 22 done and yet we're still sitting here wondering how we're going 3 to do it, so it's a reasonable discussion. I'm not sure how we 24 get out of it except perhaps as we get into this '93 work plan, 25 we ought to do just that.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, it would obviously have to be a public meeting, you know,

MR. PENNOYER: I would assume that's true.

MR. COLE: not be a back room meeting, but nevertheless, I just think we need slightly more interaction at this public meeting with the Restoration Team.

MR. PENNOYER: I was going to suggest the last item on the agenda having to do with how they got to where they got to in the '93 work plan, and -- interactively, so when we get to it.

Other -- further comments on the Restoration Plan at this 1_1 time?

MR. McVEE: I guess, Mr.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee?

13

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman, yeah, I guess in 15terms of guidance, what I was focusing on on my question there, 16on the preferred alternative was since that's where a lot of 17attention will be directed, it seemed to me like it might be 18somewhat useful to expand the outline under that paragraph as to 19what really will be addressed. And that's a suggestion. I think 20that would be useful, because basically most people will look at 21the preferred alternative as a starting point, and I think that's 22-- that would be

MR. LOEFFLER: Well, one thing that might be -
24the way we think about it is while we're developing alternatives,

25we don' know what the preferred alternative is until you pick it,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

and so from our point of view, we are developing fully implementable parallel alternatives, and once you choose one, it is the preferred alternative. But until then, from our perspective they're all -- even though some people may want one or may want others, until you've picked it, it's -- they're all fully implementable, and I -- so that's the way we're going about it.

In terms of trying to present more detail, I think it might be more useful rather than giving you a further outline, is to sort of get into and for use to get further down the process loand work with the R.T. and the Department of Interior folks in lijust trying to push the detail.

12 MR. McVEE: Okay.

13 MR. LOEFFLER: Is that okay?

MR. PENNOYER: Very good. Thank you very much.

Question, where do we go from here? We have a 5:00 160'clock public meeting, scheduled public comment period 17scheduled. I thought there might be two things left on the 18agenda that we need to deal with and then I would suggest that 19after the public meeting period we probably adjourn to whenever 20we decide to take up the '93 work plan, which I presume might be 21a continuation of the same meeting.

And that's the topic I am wondering about. How much do 23we want to hear from the Restoration Team at this point as to how 24they made their project selections and some background on this 25package so as we go off and review projects and talk about it, we

have the benefit of that background before we get into that, and that's not discussing individual merits of the individual projects or arguing about them necessarily, but just seeing how the process got us to the stage we're at now.

And then the second thing is when are we going to get back and talk about '93 work plan? Leave it up to Mr. Gibbons to schedule our further meeting, or do we have some thoughts on that now? And I think people are concerned about timing and we need to -- probably need to get back at it, but is the Trustee Council amenable to that suggestion, that we have the Restoration Team 10give us some background on the package so we understand how they 11made their decisions and how they got to the point they got, and 12-- without getting into a lot of discussion of the individual 13projects, and then discuss where we go from here on making the 14approval process with the '93 work plan.

- MR. BARTON: I think we ought to take the second 16subject first, however, so we don't run out of time.
- MR. PENNOYER: All right. That's probably a good gidea.
- MR. COLE: You mean you think it's going to take 20us an hour to figure out when our meeting is?
- MR. PENNOYER: I think you have the other thing pain mind.
- MR. COLE: That's about the pace at we proceed I 24suppose is rational.
- MR. PENNOYER: I think Mr. Barton was suggesting

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
the other, that if we started to discuss the project -- or the
 plan itself, we might end up running out of time. Well, are
 there suggestions as to when we want to get back together on the
  '92 work plan? Mr. Gibbons, you have looked at the previous
             You've said they might have changed, but are we
 calendars.
 looking at later this week, looking at next week?
                                                       When are we
 going to try to do it?
                  DR. GIBBONS:
                                  Yeah, at this point in time,
 Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite sure how the calendars of the Trustee
 Council are filled. Like I did emphasize last time, I'd like to
_{\parallel 0} see if we could get this done as quickly as possible. It can be
1 \mid 1 done perhaps Friday of this week, or early next week, or -- we're
1/2available.
                  MR. PENNOYER: We have alternates, you know.
13
                  MR. BARTON: I think we need to get on with it.
14
_{\parallel}5We need to get a budget figure back to OMB as well as just deal
16 with the subject and get on with it. .....
                  MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?
17
                       BARTON:
                                ..... I would suggest we do it
                  MR.
18
<sub>¶9</sub>Monday and Tuesday.
                  MR. PENNOYER: Next week?
20
                  MR. BARTON: Yes, next week.
21
                  MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?
22
                  MR. PENNOYER: Yes, Mr. Cole?
23
                  MR. COLE:
                              I agree with that.
                                                    It's about the
24
√sonly time I really have enough time to read this material is on
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
138
 the weekend, and therefore I would support next Monday
 Tuesday.
                 MR. PENNOYER: Anybody else have some feelings on
     For some of us it will have to be an alternate if it's going
 it?
 to be next Monday and Tuesday, if that's okay. That's -- if
 that's the way it has to be, that's what we'll have to do.
                 MR. COLE: Well, do you have some other time next
 week? I mean, I .....
                 MR. PENNOYER: No, I've got .....
                 MR. COLE: .... find that the alternates, you
10know, we don't have sort of an even pattern with alternates.
                                                             I'm
1 not .....
                 MR. PENNOYER: I've got .....
12
                 MR. COLE: ..... talking about, you know, your
13
14alternate.
                 MR. PENNOYER: I assumed you weren't.
15
                 MR. COLE: Making you a little nervous, right.
16
                 MR. PENNOYER: I assumed you weren't. I've got
117
Reight straight days of North Pacific Council meetings starting
∥onext Monday. You know, I'm done. I could do it this Thursday or
oFriday, but, you know, I couldn't do two days.
                 MR. COLE:
                             I will be available any time, you
21
2know. What about you, Commissioners Sandor and Rosier? How does
3your schedule look?
                 MR. SANDOR: Well, Thursday and Friday I have a
24
5meeting with EPA, and Monday and Tuesday of next week is a
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
cabinet and budget review with the OMB and the Governor's Office.
   I'd weigh the opportunities and my alternate has chaired this
 meeting and has represented the Department very well. I would
 feel comfortable in Mead Treadwell representing the Department,
 so any time for these plans.
                  MR. COLE: Well, let me say this:
                                                      I mean, here
 we are with the '93 plan. It's probably among the most critical
 decisions that, you know, we have to make this, you know, whole
 year, and it seems to me that we should have the first team
 available to make those decisions.
                  MR. PENNOYER: Well, I don't disagree with you.
10
1 \mid 1 \mid 1 Unfortunately some of us sit on commissions and councils and
\sqrt{2} can't get out of it. So it's not an easy choice to make, but
13certainly .....
                  MR. COLE:
                            How about Saturday?
14
                  MR. SANDOR:
                               Saturday's fine.
115
                            I mean, you know, .....
                  MR. COLE:
16
                  MR. SANDOR:
                               Sunday. But maybe what we ought to
117
18do is give Dave our schedules and .....
19
                  MR. COLE:
                             No.
                                  We've got to do it now.
                  MR.
                       SANDOR:
                                  Okay.
                                           Well,
                                                  as
                                                      Ι
                                                        say,
                                                               I'm
20
```

23Monday? Can we do it in one day? If that's a possibility, I

I am, too. Could we do it on

24might be able to do Monday. Can we do it in one day?

MR. BARTON: I hope so.

1 comfortable with my deputy representing me.

22

25

MR. PENNOYER:

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
MR. PENNOYER: Well, let's -- why don't we trade
  (ph) ....
                 UNIDENTIFIED: Let's do it in one day.
                 MR. PENNOYER: ..... with -- if we can do it
 Monday, let's try that.
                 MR. BARTON:
                             Let's just plan on doing it in one
 day and figuring how -- how to do it that way.
                 MR. PENNOYER:
                               That's .....
                            We could go till midnight or two in
                 MR. COLE:
 the morning, until we get it done, you know.
                 MR. PENNOYER: Let's try for Monday.
10
                 MR. SANDOR: Monday.
11
                                Is that acceptable, to have it
                 MR. PENNOYER:
1 2
13Monday?
                 MR. SANDOR: Sounds great.
14
                 MR. McVEE:
                            Monday.
115
                 DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman? Can we start that
16
\sqrt{100}
#something -- such a time like that?
                                I think we'd probably better if
19
                 MR. PENNOYER:
\not \parallel_0we're going to get it done on Monday. And we go quick on the
\frac{1}{2} tape (ph), but then again -- Monday of next week.
                 MR. COLE: 8:30 right here Monday.
22
                 MR. PENNOYER: Sounds good. Okay.
                                                   That -- Now,
23
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

14Mr. Barton left having done the one part he's worried about

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

5running out of time on.

MR. COLE: May I -- can I make a statement?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: For those who are going to be addressing the Council with you complaints at 5:00 o'clock today, I for one would, you know, appreciate it if, you know, some of you can focus you thoughts on helping us develop a plan for the acquisition of critical habitat. You see the magnitude I would hope of the problem out there before us. It's not -- it's the selection of habitat lands, how much money, who will have the responsibility for maintaining it in the future and things of othat, you know. It would be nice to have some constructive help after those who have consistently criticized our decisions and the parate at which we are proceeding. So I look forward to that.

MR. PENNOYER: Can we -- we've got 50 minutes 14left before we're going to start the public. I'd sure like to 15take about a ten or 15-minute break before that starts, an 16opportunity to make a phone call or what have you, but perhaps 17right now we could just ask Mr. Gibbons if he would with the 18Restoration Team present us with the '93 plan not in all it's 19detail, but at least in what we've got in front of us so we know 20what we're looking at, and as we go off to study it, we've got 21that background to base our considerations on. It might help us 22get a leg up on next Monday. And so without evaluating the 23projects, Mr. Gibbons, will you describe to us the process and 24describe to us what we have here that we're looking at and the 25various pieces we have to work with?

DR. GIBBONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to -
I think there's two people that probably should help present
that. One is Jerome Montague, who is the chair of the 1993 work
group, and the second person is Bob Spies, the chief scientist,
and we've been trying to work together as a team to come up with
the recommendations, so maybe Jerome can run through the process
and if Bob has some comments on it, that he can give those at
this time and then again maybe perhaps detail next week.

DR. MONTAGUE: Thank you, Dave and Mr. Chairman.

9 First of all, I'd really like to thank the people on the '93

10 work plan work group and -- for all the long days and Labor Day

11 weekend and other weekends they've put in on this and especially

12 to our budget guru, Mark Broderson, who's probably out done

13 everyone for -- in terms of time put in on this activity.

In front of you you've got three notebooks. You may 15already be somewhat familiar with them, but I'll just go through 16them all anyway. One is the detailed budget which covers both 17the administrative director, the working groups, the Restoration 18Team and all the projects. Another smaller notebook, the 19thinnest notebook, is just copies of all of our final decision 20documents or recommendation documents on each project showing how 21we voted and our pros and cons and so forth for the projects.

And then the thickest notebook has quite a number of 23things in it, other than the things we've already covered. What 24it has relative to '93, it starts out with four tables that first 25list the projects in numerical order and shows their total cost

and what the vote was on those projects.

MR. COLE: Could you show us which one is that in, please?

DR. MONTAGUE: Okay. It's in

MS. BERGMANN: It's this, the blue one.

MR. COLE: The blue one?

MS. BERGMANN: Right here. Here.

DR. MONTAGUE: This is what the first page to it looks like, the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill, 1993 proposed projects.

And again the first table just lists the projects by their numerical order from 93001 through 64. The second table numerical order prioritizes the projects and listing those with numerical six votes as one section, those with three and four numerical six votes as one section, those with three and four numerical six votes as one section, and those with zero to two votes as number section.

MR. COLE: How many votes did you have to have leapproaching that to get the green light?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, relative to that we -- as 18you can see, all the projects are in front of you no matter what 19vote they had. The normal Restoration Team operating procedure 20is that a recommendation only goes to the Council when there's 21 five or six yes votes.

The projects in those first tables are categorized in a 23couple of different ways further to help you sort of get a vision 24of the program. One divides the projects up by category, and by 25that we mean whether it's an enhancement or manipulation action,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

a management action. And then the last of those four tables covers what we've termed type of project, whether it's shellfish, fish, marine mammals, mammals and so on and so forth. So that's what's in the first four tables.

And then after that is the text descriptions to all the projects, and then at the end of the book is six more tables and these, we felt that what happened to this huge number of ideas that came in was real important, and with 400 and some ideas, it's pretty complex, and all those tables from the number of the in-coming idea or the person's name, so and so forth, you can actually find where that idea came from and what happened to it.

If it was rejected, why it was rejected. If it was combined with another project.

We have probably two minutes, I'd like for Dr. Sullivan 14to come up and describe a little bit on how to use those six 15tables at the end in the event that someone from the public comes 16to you and wants to know what happened to one of their projects, 17and we'll keep it very short.

DR. SULLIVAN: Well, if you go to the -- if you 19go to the last table, that's where you would start with if 20someone wanted to know what happened to their project, and you 1 would look up their last name first, okay? Every time someone 22sent in a letter or proposal or any piece of correspondence, it 23received a document number. Within those documents, the '93 work 24group then tried to pull out all the different things that they 25could see as significant suggestions or ideas. We did have an

idea form that we asked people to submit. But whatever they sent in, if it appeared to be a suggestion to take any sort of action at all, then that was given an extension number.

So if you look at the left-hand column under any of these items in the last table, you'll see that there is an identification number. For example, most of them start 92, which is the year, and then there's a code for the date and then a particular number. And then following that long number is a digit that identifies each one of those ideas within a document.

So you take that number then and you move to the fourth 1_1 table, which is the list of project ideas or of ideas submitted 1_2 listed by project identification number. That's what the project 1_3 identification number is. Those are in numerical order, and that 1_4 then will tell you what has

MR. COLE: Excuse me, could you tell us which one 16we're looking at?

DR. SULLIVAN: I forget what color it is, but 18 it's the fourth in your -- it looks like it would be the yellow 19 set that you're looking at. Okay?

20 MR. COLE: Okay. That's not in numerical order, 21that's what throwing me.

DR. SULLIVAN: Well, let's me see which one.

 $_{23}$ MR. COLE: I don't think it is.

22

MS. BERGMANN: Yeah, it is. It is, 25 (indiscernible).

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
146
                 MR. COLE: No, it's not. It -- there's 12, 16,
 see?
                                That's goldenrod.
                 DR. SULLIVAN:
                 MR. BARTON: Well, here's yellow.
                 MR. McVEE: Well, that's our problem.
                 DR. SULLIVAN:
                                Right.
                                        There's two yellows.
 is -- one's a dark yellow that I'm calling goldenrod and a
 lighter yellow that actually has the project identification.
                            Which one were you just referring to?
                 MR. COLE:
                 DR. SULLIVAN: The one I'm referring to is the
10 light yellow, the lighter yellow.
                 MR.
                      COLE:
                               See,
                                    I didn't follow because I
11
_{12}couldn't find those in numerical order. That's what -- it skips,
alike twenty- .....
                 DR. SULLIVAN: That's right. What you see there,
14
1 5 the document number, not including the extension should be in
16 numerical order. They are not entirely sequential, because the
\sqrt{1}7first five -- or the first six left-hand digits denote the date,
         And so your date -- in other words, it's not entirely
∥9sequential, but a lower number is -- always precedes a higher
onumber.
         Also, within a document not all significant items were
considered ideas. Some were considered comments.
                                                     Those don't
3appear in here. We did consider all the comments.
                                                        In other
4words, like "you're doing a good job," or "you're not doing a
5good job, " something like that would be considered a comment, but
```

it's not a request for action, and that's what this table's about.

MR. COLE: What would be the explanation for not -- there not being a number 32, for example?

DR. SULLIVAN: Thirty-two may have been simply a letter that says, "You're doing a good job," and so it's just not there.

In any event, once you go to that table then, you'll see in the first column you have the document I.D. number, then there's the category, which we've described a little bit here, then project type, and the title of that particular project. Well, most of these projects, a lot of people had a number of very similar ideas. Some people even submitted duplicate ideas sof someone else's projects. They might take exactly the same thing and put their name on it, just basically to add support to

So when you go over to the status column, you have a 17 number of different choices there. If you have a "P" then you 18 have also associated with it project's number. That project 19 number then you would look up in the very first table, which is 20 the project table.

If there is a "C" in the status column, that means it was 2 combined with some other project. And whenever we combined 3 projects, we gave one document the lead number. And when you 4 look at the very right hand column, it will way "combined with," 5 then you would go to that "combined with" column, find that

number and proceed with that number to find what actually happened to the project.

The combined with numbers will always be a passed -- a "P," and "R," or an "E". A "P" is passed, of course, and that goes into the passed or project table. An "R" is rejected and you can look up that project in the rejected table and find out why it was rejected. An "E" is an endowment, and those have yet to be considered and they're all lumped together in a single page endowment table.

So once you find out, for example, let's say take a look 10at the "P's", you go to the very first table, and on that table, 11on the left-hand side, you'll see the project number is at the 12top, and then underneath that, the first -- you'll see a list of 13documents and extensions. The first document is called -- is the 14lead document and it may -- the rest may follow in numerical 15order or not, but we simply chose one document into which we 16would combine everything else, okay? So, for example, for 17project number 93-1, there are three documents that were 18considered when the agencies put together a three-page brief 19project proposal. So if you want to work backwards from this 20point then, you can look up the document I.D. numbers on those 21three things and find out where the things came from, who 22submitted them, what they originally had in mind and so on.

DR. MONTAGUE: And in short, you know, you're $_{24}$ probably going to have to spend some time with them to really $_{25}$ know how to use them, but it is simpler than 18 inches of

projects to look through. And I think with that, Joe, we sure appreciate -- and Joe kind of masterminded putting these tables together and a lot of other people worked on them, and thank you.

I'd like to take about ten minutes now to just explain how we got to where we are here with a short history.

In May for the first time since the Oil Spill we went public with the work plan process and solicited ideas, and we received some 460, of which about two-thirds were from agencies and about a third was from the public.

In conjunction with this effort of going public, we are loattempting to enter onto the federal fiscal year, which would login October 1st, and as such had to truncate the preparation process from about six month to three and a half months.

Of the 460 so original incoming ideas, when we eliminated the duplicates and eliminated those that weren't truly ideas, but smore or less a comment, it left us with about 360.

And also this year there's I think a necessary and 17complete paper trail on all the ideas, and there's decision 18sheets. Just the more it goes through the process, the more 19decision sheets that are added to it, but there is a good track 20record of what happened.

Of those 360, the working group and the Restoration Team 22first looked at them on three what we called critical factors.

3Did it meet the terms of the civil settlement. Was it legal and 24was it feasible, and if they were not deemed to pass any one of 25those, then the idea was rejected. And those that were rejected

on legal grounds were sent to legal counsel for confirmation, and in a few cases the decisions were changed.

The R.T. and the chief scientist then reviewed the remaining projects in terms of, one, whether they were damage assessment, and, two, whether they were restoration projects, and there were criteria that we used, applying a best professional judgment to the various categories of projects. For instance, management actions would have a different set of criteria applied to them than say an enhancement action.

But under damage assessment, if the project was supposed 10to have been closed out in FY 92 then it wasn't considered for 11funding this year. And new damage assessment projects or 12continuing damage assessment projects were considered only if 13there was reason to believe that there was damage and it wasn't 14sufficiently evaluated at this time for restoration actions.

Under the projects that were deemed to be restoration 16projects, we looked for four things: One, did they have a 17restoration end point? Were they time critical to be done this 18year? Was there a lost opportunity if they weren't done this 19year? And whether there was a long-term commitment or not. And 20normally long-term commitments were, you know, if it had a long-21term commitment, it was rejected unless it was time critical or a 21ost opportunity, and then it was still considered.

After we went through this, there was about 150 ideas $_{24}$ left. The R.T. and the chief scientist reviewed this list to see $_{25}$ if, you know, these 150 had any major omissions that, you know,

that we thought should be in the restoration -- or in this year's work plan, and also to make an attempt at logical clumping. You know, of these 150, which one of them were essentially the same project, or would logically -- logically go together?

And after we had done that, there was about 55 or 60 left that we sent out to have what we term brief project descriptions prepared for, and these are so-called three-pagers, as well as the detailed budget information. Then we received peer review, that was orchestrated by the chief scientist, and there was a number of specific changes to the projects, and we received some loadvice on priorities.

The R.T. then voted on the projects relative to their laindividual merit. The result of this voting was shared with lalegal counsel, and they made a number of recommendations, and was lalegal shared with the chief scientist and the finance committee land they also made recommendations of which we have made efforts late try and incorporate.

We then re-voted on the projects, not in terms of their 18 individual merit, but in terms of their priority, looking at the 19 total package, the whole picture of restoration needs. We re-20 voted on them in terms of that priority. And it's that vote that 21 is represented in these first four tables that lead into the 22 brief project descriptions.

The Restoration Team also debated somewhat on the -24 whether the Restoration Team or the lead agencies should make the 25decision whether a project should be done in-house or contracted

152

out. That wasn't fully resolved. And if the Trustee Council has any specific guidance on that, we're certainly open to it.

We realized that the documents in front of you in these three big notebooks are complex. They were done hurriedly. We know there are some errors. There's going to be tables and numbers that don't match up exactly, and we had contemplated delaying putting this on the agenda, but with the guidance that we had to begin the federal fiscal year this October 1st, we felt that we had to push ahead and go with the best package that we had, and admittedly it's going to be better with a couple of oweeks of editing and such which is certainly what we intend to do before it goes out as draft rest- -- or a draft work plan.

After the projects are approved for the draft work plan, 13two things will be done. Well, more than two things. Several 14things will be done. First, based upon that, that's what we will 15use to prepare our budgets for the State and Federal Offices of 16Management and Budget, and also at that time the projects are 17either going to be developed by the agency into a detailed 18project plan, which is, you know, maybe 20 or 30 pages as opposed 19to the three that we have here, or if it's deemed to go out for a 20competitive bet, a request for proposals will be prepared. So 21between the draft and the final work plan, there's going to be 22considerable work, you know, either writing RFPs or developing 23detailed project plans. And both the RFPs and the detailed 24project plans will be reviewed by the chief scientist and 25appropriate peer reviewers, and in the case of RFPs peer

reviewers and multi-agency personnel will be represented on the project selection committees.

And we'd also originally planned for a 45-day public review to go on during this time period, and a number of -- I don't know how many, I think about three specialized workshops to deal with some specific problems.

We had originally hoped to have the draft work plan, or the final work plan in early December, make the request to the Court then. We're about three weeks late right now, and we'll probably be about two more weeks further before we're more or loless onto our old schedule, so it's going to be problematic to that the final work plan done in December, and to get the Court request prior to the January 1st start-up of some of the projects, so one thing that you might consider was whether a 30-14day public review would be adequate as opposed to 45.

Just trying to summarize a huge amount of information, there's -- over lunch, again hurriedly, we put together this table here which I laid in your chairs or gave to you in person, and it more or less lists the summary of the projects on one page by voting order and by their category and by their type, so you can at a glance see whether fish are being covered or whether the habitat's being covered.

I'd like to point out one error. The totals column for $_{23}$ the votes by category, in the six or five column should be 42 and $_{24}$ not 32.

In terms of public versus private amounts of money that's

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

√5I think that to meet future renditions of this, we're pretty much

To avoid these, you know, kind of last minute deliveries,

going to have to devote three weeks after the Trustee Council and after the Restoration Team makes any changes to it, that will give the work group two weeks to put together a nice document and a week to get it to you all in advance, so I think we're going to have to consider that time period in here on our decisions, so if we meet next Monday and finalize it then, I think we'd be looking at two to three weeks before we could have a draft done, which would be about I guess the second week -- second week of October. So with a 45-day review with the second week of October, I don't think we could make the final with a 45-day review, and be ready 10before January 1st.

That's all I had if there's any questions.

11

MR. PENNOYER: Dave, do you have something to 13add?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add one 15 other thing, in -- on the '94 package we intend to do it a little 16 bit differently. We intend to structure a package that we 17 perhaps -- the framework for a package that we would like to 18 receive proposals under rather than what we did this year was to 19 open it up for any idea. We'd like to say this is our thoughts 20 on what a '94 package should look like using the Draft 21 Restoration Plan, and therefore get ideas perhaps structured a 21 little bit more.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, further on that, we add to have more like nine months to prepare it in rather than a 5three and a half, so

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Questions? Mr. McVee.

MR. McVEE: It's not a question, but last week in kind of preparation for this meeting, and knowing that we were going to have a package of projects to look at, I went back through some of the records and developed for my own use a set of the -- of a criteria for considering '93 and I thought I might share those and just -- I don't think we need to discuss it, but if it's helpful in

MR. PENNOYER: You're not looking for us to sign not on those, Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: No. They might be helpful is my only 12thought with people looking at projects.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you. I had a 14question, Mr. Montague. You mentioned that one of the criteria 15that you looked at was a legal review. Do we have any -- can I 16-- do we have anything in writing or can you elaborate on what 17that legal review consisted of? Who did it? What?

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman, yes. I mean, 19there's been several memoranda written. Probably the most useful 20right now would be the one that was written on the 64 projects 1 that were here now.

Dave, do you know if we have that? I mean, it's not in 23here, but we have it.

DR. GIBBONS: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, we have -- I $_{25}$ have that, but it's stamped right up on the top "attorney/ client

R & R COURT REPORTERS

product. Not released to public."

MR. PENNOYER: But we have copies of it though, the Trustee Council?

DR. GIBBONS: You don't in your package, no. I can get you copies of that.

MR. PENNOYER: I would appreciate that, thank you.

Any further questions of the Restoration Team on this package to help guide us through our review of it and then our discussions on it next Monday? Who? Dave?

DR. GIBBONS: Mr. Chairman. Bob, do you have lanything that you might like to add or shed some light on?

DR. SPIES: No, I think Jerome did a really a sexcellent job of describing the process that we went through, and think that in the end we're a lot closer than we were last year this time as to the scope of projects proposed and what the fepeer reviewers and I thought were justified based on the criteria for injury and so forth that were developed.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chair?

18

25

DR. SPIES: I don't think we're completely omatching on our views yet, but -- and I would like to get from the Trustee Council if they have a view as to what kind of input they would like from me on (indiscernible) I could participate in the to do they are they have a view as to what kind of input they are they would like from me on (indiscernible) I could participate in the to do they are the are they are the are the are t

MR. PENNOYER: Is there some indication in this

R & R COURT REPORTERS

package as to which recommendations were made by the chief scientist on these projects?

MR. COLE: Yeah, that was my question.

MR. PENNOYER: That might be handy to have.

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Well, how many projects that were given a yes vote so to speak, however it's labeled, did the peer reviewers oppose? You know, approximately?

DR. SPIES: Well, it -- those votes were taken -10what you see, those votes that you see now in the packet were
11taken after the peer reviewers had had it for three days, and
12that review was not ideal, because they were essentially handed
13things as they walked in the door Tuesday, I think it was August
14-- or the first week in August, and we had three days. We had
15good input mainly on the technical feasibility of the projects,
16and, you know, the comments were more like whether this is
17justified more than this is.

MR. COLE: Well, here's what I'm getting at. You 19know, we have a Restoration Team that makes the final decisions, 20essentially composed of agency personnel. That's given I think. 21 Now, you see, they would have -- be able to out-vote the 22recommendations of the peer reviewers and the chief scientist, 23and so what I'm trying to get a sense of, and I hate to put you 24on the spot too much, but that's your job so to speak, is do you 25have the sense that your firm opposition was passed over?

DR. SPIES: No, I don't think so by and large, that the projects were modified according to the peer review comments.

MR. COLE: You're comfortable with the process from your standpoint and those of the peer reviewers?

DR. SPIES: Fairly comfortable.

MR. PENNOYER: Could you be prepared on Monday to identify any areas of some discomfort and I think you'll receive those kind of questions as we go through these projects.

MR. COLE: Yeah, I think what you're saying, the 10specific projects which you -- the chief scientist and the peer 11reviewers were at disagreement with the Restoration Team, yes, 12had a general opposition to or objections to.

We need -- and -- I think we need in the public process 14this mechanism to satisfy ourselves and the public interest that 15this selection of project process is not solely driven, unduly 16driven by agency personnel. I don't necessarily think that it 17is, and I respect their professionalism and their integrity, but 18nevertheless I think it's incumbent upon us, you know, to look at 19that, to satisfy ourselves that such is not the case.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes,

20

21

22

23

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a great

MR. PENNOYER: That's exactly what I was saying.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

 $^{2}4$ MR. PENNOYER: Further comment or further $^{2}5$ question? Okay. I think what we'll do is we'll stand at recess

R & R COURT REPORTERS

until 5:00 o'clock when we'll start the public comment period.

And my intention is then at 7:00 o'clock to recess this meeting until Monday of next week. I guess I'm stuck with the chairmanship again, right? Thank you.

(Off record)

* * * * *

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

MR. PENNOYER: Are we ready to start the -- Trustee Council members, are we ready to start the public hearing?

Are we on line, ready to go to teleconference?

TELEPHONE OPERATOR: Well, yes. You have Kodiak, Homer, Valdez, Seldovia and Juneau on line at this time. We are barely hearing you, so

MS. EVANS: Barbara, is that better?

TELEPHONE OPERATOR: Yes. Please, continue for just five 10seconds, to make sure.

- MS. EVANS: Okay. We'd like to announce to those that 12might testify here or on-line at the different sites, please, 13each person who testifies, spell your name so that the court 14reporter will be able to record your comments and get your name 15correctly.
- Now, how is our sound, Barbara?
- $_{17}$ UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not too good, apparently.
- SHIRLEY: This is Shirley in Homer. I have to turn my set way up to hear you, but you're not as broken as you were.
- MR. PENNOYER: Who do we have on-line now with $_{21}$ communities, so I don't run through the whole list every time I $_{22}$ start down through it?
- TELEPHONE OPERATOR: As of this time, you have Kodiak, 24Homer, Valdez, Juneau and Seldovia.
- MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Would you tell us if any further

R & R COURT REPORTERS

communities come on-line so I don't repeat the list every time I start down

2

25

TELEPHONE OPERATOR: Yes, we sure will.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, we sure will. This is Steve Pennoyer, National Marine Fisheries Service, regional director for Alaska, representing NOAA and Trustee Council convening this Trustee Council Hearing at this time.

In the past, the way we've done this is to not show favoritism. We've done one from Anchorage, one held on the loconference network, so -- and back and forth, so I'm going to listart with Anchorage with a gentleman in the front row, who is locally raising his hand, Jerry McCutcheon, and after that locally go out and start with Kodiak, Homer, Valdez, Juneau, locally taking one and coming back and doing Anchorage until we locally be severybody taken care of.

- So, Mr. McCutcheon, will you spell your name?
- You gentlemen have finished the alleged threats to the 20various parts of Prince William Sound, and that's all very good.

 Now I just hope that you will set them aside because you have 20bviously determined you really don't have enough money to run 23around and take care of everything that somebody points to as 24another threat.
 - I think you have to go out and say, okay, this is nice,

but now if we're going to get into land acquisition business, we're going to have to pick out the very best -- pick out the best, not with respect to habitat but just plain best that is most representative. And then after you've got yourself a catalog and a list or prioritized as what's best, then sit down and say what kind of habitat did we get out of that? And then look and see what's after. Somewhere along the line, you're gonna have to decide also how much money is it gonna take to take care of that land. You're gonna have to know.

If you take your 600 million that you got left and divide 10it by two, that gives you 300 million. You put the 300 million 11 aside, and if you put the 300 million aside and you get inflation 12plus 3%, like the Permanent Fund's goal is, you're only talking about having roughly \$9 million available. And if that's only 14\$9 million available, then you take a million off for ₁ sadministration, and your administration is already running more 16than that much, then you've only got 8 million left. And 1/7 somewhere is that 8 million gonna be enough to take care of 18 spruce beetles and other such things if you're gonna keep this in \P_{0} pristine shape? I think you're gonna have to think about that.

After you've made your priorities and you've got your money spent in the rest of the things, do you have a balance? And I think you're gonna have to look at it. Now, I'm saying these things to take care of Charlie Cole's indirect criticisms and all I do is pick on you. I hope that I'm taking the suggestion, at least I'm not sure, and you have to look elsewhere

to see what it is you're doing.

You can't take Prince William Sound as an isolated event in which you got a billion dollars to spend of which a third of it's gone. You need to think about what am I doing elsewhere?

For example, in Juneau, you're going to take a pretty little valley and you're gonna make a tanning spot out of it. You're gonna wreck Sheep Creek for its use, its highest and best use for something that's barely marginal. They had recalculate to find out it went from a \$2 million loser -- I presume that's per year -- to a \$1 million winner each year. 100 let's suppose that you tow the line. You either have to dump 1/1your tailings in the ocean or you don't -- Gastineau Channel, or ₁₂you don't mine. What would this stream be worth as a fish Go across the road there from where the current 13hatchery? 14hatchery is and expand on that plain -- that alluvial plain out 15there, and put a hatchery in. That would be worth five to $_{16}$ \$8 million a year, is commercial fish. That's at the dock. $\sqrt{1000}$ 7That's not processed, that's not transported and that's nothin' Then if you think it in terms of sports fish, how much is I think you're gonna have to think that way. ₁|git worth?

20 Oh, I'm gonna drive the Greenies nuts, and I'm first, so 21they can all pick on me, but this is a typical example.

Now, who blew that? You people blew that. You'll say 23well, I wasn't on the -- wait a minute, who is represented here? 4You blew it. You know, it's not the only thing you blew. Let's 25take Paint River, for example. There's another example of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

something. Boy, you put a fish hatchery in. Thank God it doesn't work. You ought to dynamite it. I hope some Greenie goes down and blows it up. There's a higher and better use for that.

There's another hatchery site; perched water, couldn't (indiscernible), pristine water up above. And what did you do?

You built a -- you blew another hatchery site. What have you got? You've got down a McNeil River for all the purists, a nice bear watching operation, which most Alaskans, if they ever tried to get into that thing to ever watch it, would never get to see loit in their lifetime, even if they applied every damn year.

Why not plain old crass commercialism. You build a 12tower, like Wally's small tower down there, a hotel. You got 13people from all over the world coming in. You can run that thing 14as long as the bears can stand it. You can manipulate the fish 15runs, and the University of Washington has shown you can do it. 16So you can have the fish running from very start when the bears 17first come up till the time they go into hibernation. And you 18could have really cleaned up. But you put a fish ladder in. 19What did you do with the fish ladder? What you did is you 20introduced disease to the upper stream fish that they've never 21seen before. What you did is you took the same thing as Columbus 2did to America and the Natives is what you did to the native fish 3up there. You blew it. You could have had a good example of 24that.

And the same thing is gonna apply to logging. You're

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

gonna take areas and go out to protect 'em in Prince William Sound and these same areas you're gonna have in Southeastern Alaska, and the State and the Feds are gonna say we've got to log this area. But the area you're gonna log is worth a hell of a lot more unlogged than some of the stuff you're gonna be put upon by -- in Prince William Sound. Having said enough, I'll let the Greenies all shoot me. MR. PENNOYER: Please wait. Any questions for Mr. McCutcheon? Thank you, very much. Next we'll go to Kodiak. Anybody in Kodiak wish to 10testify? Yes, there is. MS. AKERS: 11 MR. PENNOYER: Well, please, go ahead. 1 2 Tracy Akers. T-r-a-c-y, the last name Akers; MS. AKERS: 13 Did you get that? $_{14}A-k-e-r-s.$ MR. GIBBONS: Yes, we did. Thank you. 15 Yes, we did. MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. 16 MS. AKERS: Thank you. I represent the Kodiak 17 18Environmental Network. We'd like to see habitat acquisition on an equal basis \mathfrak{A}_0 with all other options as shown in Figure 7, page 9, of the 1 Restoration Framework Supplement. We'd also like to 2 acquisition as soon as possible, and feel that this is proceeding 3a little too slowly. We'd also like to see lands judged under Aset A, in the Alternative Threshold Criteria. Sets B and C are

R & R COURT REPORTERS

√stoo narrow and would prove to be unworkable under the terms of

the settlement. We'd also like to see habitat acquisition throughout all affected areas.

Do you have any questions for me?

MR. PENNOYER: Any questions from the Trustee Council? Thank you, very much, Ms. Akers.

MS. AKERS: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Next, we'll take another person in Anchorage. Anybody else wish to testify? Yes, sir.

MS. EVANS: I'd like to request that anyone using the microphone here, please, pull the microphone close to your face loand speak right into it. That helps the people at the local local teleconference sites be able to hear better. Thank you.

MR. O'CALLAGHAN: Thank you for the opportunity of addressing you. My name is Mike O'Callaghan;

140-'-C-a-l-l-a-q-h-a-n.

This is the second meeting of this group that I have 16attended. The first one that I attended, I think, was the third 17meeting of the group. I heard the US Attorney General's Office 18address this group, and he said to the group, quote: This 19commission is not a legal entity. It can enter no contracts, it 20can spend no money. You have no legal basis for existing. How 21has this legal question been resolved?

MR. PENNOYER: Is that your testimony?

MR. O'CALLAGHAN: That's my question.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Mr. Cole, do you wish to respond?

MR. COLE: The view to which you refer, I think, is

R & R COURT REPORTERS

erroneous.

MR. O'CALLAGHAN: Then the US Attorney General's Office is incorrect in this statement and your correct in the statement you do have a legal basis for existing, you do have the right to spend money, and you are a legal entity? He was incorrect on all three points?

MR. COLE: First, let me say that I do not recall that to have been the opinion of the United States Attorney General William Barr. As I recall, it was a statement made by an attorney for one of the federal agencies, as they say, these lodays. Having said that, I think that the answer to each of your subsidiary questions is: Yes, we are a legal entity; yes, we lake the right to contract; and, yes, we have the right to spend money.

- MR. PENNOYER: Do you have further testimony?
- MR. O'CALLAGHAN: No. This is really quite interesting 16to me. I guess we will have to seek some other form of 17resolution. I consider this entity to be entirely illegal, and I 18think it's really quite interesting that you're carrying on as 19such. But
- $_{20}$ MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. No, we are legal entity.
- MR. O'CALLAGHAN: whatever you can get away with, 22right?
- $_{23}$ MR. PENNOYER: No, we are legal bi-steppers.
- MR. COLE: Let me respond to that, if you don't asmind,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: because, I mean, I think you deserve a straight-forward answer, and one of the things you may wish to do, if you feel that -- when we make application to Judge Holland for money, which is currently in the registry of the court, if you feel that way, you present your views to Judge Holland, and I'm sure he'd be pleased to receive them and to respond. I think that's the proper forum.

MR. O'CALLAGHAN: I have presented my views to Judge Holland. I have not received a response from him. I think that I would probably have to intervene in the case in order to light a response from him.

MR. COLE: Well, maybe when we file a petition for money, 13which if you follow these proceedings, as you've done, you can 4find out when we will present that, and, you know, file an 15objection there in court. That's what I would suggest you do. I 16don't fault you for having a contrary view, but I think that's 17the place to present your view.

MR. O'CALLAGHAN: All right. Well, I thought I would let 19all Alaskans hear my views. Thank you, very much. I appreciate 20that.

- 21 MR. COLE: Thank you.
- $_{22}$ MR. PENNOYER: Next, we go to Homer. Is there anybody in $_{23}$ Homer that wishes to testify?
- MS. PITZMAN: Yes, my name is Betsy Pitzman; P-i-t-z-m-a-25n, and I'm here representing the Board of Directors of the Pratt

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Museum. Have you folks -- can you hear me?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, we can. Please, proceed, Ms. Pitzman.

MS. PITZMAN: Okay. Good evening, gentlemen, and LJ. My testimony concerns the appropriation of funds to assist in the purchase of Seldovia Native Association lands, timber and mineral rights, within Katchemak Bay State Park.

In February of 1990, the Board of Directors of the Homer Society of Natural History, the sponsoring organization of the Pratt Museum, passed a resolution in support of the State of OAlaska's purchase of SNA lands and timber and mineral rights within Katchemak Bay State Park. The Society operates the museum In Homer. It represents over 800 individual family and business may member a residing primarily in the Lower Kenai Peninsula, the area May Most likely to feel the negative impact of logging of SNA lands a should reacquisition not occur.

We believe that funds received through the settlements 17with Exxon are best spent to restore and replace habitat that 18will support recovery of species of animals and birds lost in the 19Exxon Valdez Oil Spill in 1989.

The SNA lands on the south side of Katchemak Bay are 1 critical habitat for many species damaged in the Spill, including 2 the endangered or potentially threatened species such as the bald 2 seagle, the marbled and kiplet murrelets and the harlequin duck. 2 4 In addition, many nesting bird species and terrestrial mammals 2 such as black bear, river otter and mink would lose their habitat

completely. Logging operations would severely impact many other species on the shoreline and in surrounding waters, including whales, the threatened Stellar sea lion, sea otters, harbor seals, and many species of ducks and shore birds, and several species of sea birds that nest on nearby islands and coasts, and find food in coastal waters that would be contaminated by logging operations. Anadromous fish and marine fish impacted by the Oil Spill would be further damaged by contamination of coastal waters by siltation and pollution as a result of logging.

Archaeological sites known to be along the coast 10throughout the areas to be logged would also be lost.

- The SNA lands in Katchemak By are integral parts of a 12diverse and rich ecosystem that will be further damaged if the 13lands are allowed to be logged.
- You have the opportunity to preserve this habitat and sallow some of the species which were severely decimated by the local Spill to recover to pre-spill levels by assisting in the properties of SNA lands and timber and mineral rights in restoring sownership to the State.
- We request that you allocate the funds necessary to 20 initiate the buy-back before the October deadline presented by 21 SNA. I thank you, very much.
- MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Trustee Council members, any aguestions? Thank you, very much.
- We'll now proceed to Anchorage again, and the next person as in Anchorage that wishes to testify?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McKEE: Yes, sir. My name is Charles McKee, and during your break attorney Charles E. Cole asked me if I had any sage advice that I could offer you people in lieu of apparently the discussions I've had with you people before.

You know, take into historical account, if you can, the fact that other people, in a historical footnote, were laughed at for their looking beyond hate and developing things that you enjoy today that they had perceived to make life easier for us in the current day, and I might name a few: Thomas Edison, Nepotesla (ph), Albert Einstein, just to name a few, but they lowere all laughed at. They were all chided.

And, quite frankly, that's the current state of affairs 12with our present monetary system that our founding fathers have 13established. In my struggles, trying to increase the quality of 14education and quality of living in Alaska, I have been set upon 15by people in positions of authority and denied me the opportunity 16to help on an individual basis. And so I was told many times by 17private individuals, well, you've got the time, they've got the 18money. And I thought about that, so I started investigating the 19notary seal of the money. Sure enough, they defaced it.

So, now we have in a situation, double digit inflation, and I want to bring another historical footnote. There was a US 22Federal judge, and his name is Martin T. Manton (ph), and this 23was in 1939, another period in our history, a historical 24footnote, that they had double digit inflation. He was sentenced 25for two years in prison, with a heavy fine, because they found

out that he was selling court decisions.

In this particular situation, at the present, I wrote and made it a matter of court record with Judge Holland that the damage was in excess of \$3 billion. I said 3.5, and I was only \$100 million off, with a ninth grade education, from what Lloyd's of London actually paid out to the Crown of London.

So, we're arguing about a small amount of money to purchase restoration -- to deal with restoration in Prince William Sound and habitat purchase. Well, if we had \$3.5 billion, we would have the money to purchase the land acquisition loas well as deal with underwater oiling that has occurred and lastill exists.

And back to the original treasury seal. It's fraudulent.

They have no political authority to alter, i.e., deface the 4notary of the treasury seal. It was designed and ratified prior to the formation and ratification of the organic act, which is 6the Constitution and Bill of Rights. So when he -- Judge Holland 7agreed with a settlement, he was indeed acting on a fraudulent 8decision, and you are presiding over fraudulent monies. Then I 19hear that, indeed, you might not be even recognized as a legal 20authority. There's a lot of people in our society that have a 21position of authority that should not have it, because they're 22just, in current terminology, suck-up to the fraudulent entities 23that promoted this defacing of the original treasury seal.

I wish to bring about, and I will bring about, a coupon $_{25}$ with the original treasury seal, which I incorporated with the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

map that I have copyrighted and provided for monies for not only just restoration but all public works, because it does have the original treasury seal on it.

I might also add that a friend of mine said, well, how you gonna get a judge or other judges to decide -- rule in your favor against another judge, because they're all in it together. Well, that's where I come in and say, like I said last Thursday, at the symposium chaired by Reverend Green -- or Pastor Green on hate crimes. Oppression exists because we hang on to or hold on It feeds on itself. The only way we're gonna deal with 10 nenvironmental degradation, double-digit inflation, is get rid of $1 \mid 1 \mid 1$ the people that wish to maintain intimidation, i.e., oppression, $_{12}$ and bring back the controls to the people. I mean, that's what I 13filed this claim -- this complaint in US District Court. $_{\parallel 4}$ followed as an informer of the government, meaning we, the And then I hear a snide remark from a friend, saying ₁speople. 16well, how you gonna get them to rule in your favor when they're 17 just gonna be protecting themselves, indicating that they're in 180n it altogether. Isn't there any just people in positions of \P_{9} authority -- say the judicial branch, that will invalidate the other rulings, and also invalidate Congress's acts as well as presidential acts if indeed they are against the Constitution of 2the United States of America?

We need \$3.5 billion to deal with this problem that we're 23 4all sitting here today discussing, not 900 million. So I end my 5comment with that.

Thank you. Have a nice day.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. McKee. Any questions?

Okay, I think I will go on then to the teleconference network,

and anybody from Valdez who wishes to testify tonight?

MS. FISCHER: Hello, My name is Donna Fischer. I'm here in Valdez, and also a gentleman from KCHU, and we are just going to be listening in. I'm gonna be representing, I understand, local government on the Exxon Restoration Council, and I just want the Trustees to be aware that I am participating by listening.

10 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much, Ms. Fischer. We 11appreciate that. We'll move on and start the next testimony in 12Anchorage. Who wants to go next? Yes, sir.

MR. HARUN: Thank you. I'm Kevin Harun; last name is 14spelled H-a-r-u-n. I'm speaking today as director of the Alaska 15Center for the Environment. We're based here in Anchorage, but 16have members throughout the state, and as the name suggests, 17we're very concerned about the environment.

The purpose, I think, as to why we're here, is to discuss 19how we all can work together to restore and heal the Sound and 20other areas affected by the Oil Spill, and one of the things I'd 21like to address today, quite simply, is how well are we doing, 22and pose that question to the Council.

I'd like to make some suggestions that are positive, but $_{24}\text{I'd}$ also like to make some criticisms. I hope that the $_{25}\text{criticisms}$ are not taken non-constructively, because I do really

R & R COURT REPORTERS

mean to be constructive in criticisms that I make. I think out of the debate and the discussion of ideas, I think we can have a better framework for addressing these issues.

In terms of how well are we doing, I'd like to look at two issues. One is tangible restoration, how well are we doing in that area? And, secondly, how well are we doing in public office?

As far as tangible restoration to date, basically, we haven't had very much in the way of tangible results. There's been lots of paperwork, and I was kind of startled to see the 10mound today that was brought out. No reasonable person -- I 1spend, you know, my full-time studying things. I couldn't -- 12you'd have to really be a Nasa scientist on a sabbatical to 13really have the ability to analyze it and the time to get through 14it. But that's another question of public process I'll get to.

15 But, really, we haven't seen very much to date and I'm 16real concerned, as I mentioned before, about spending most of our 17money on bureaucracy and administration and really not getting to 18the main issue which is restoring the Sound and the damage that 19occurred.

There's been lots of administrative machinations, but there's really been no land that's been protected. And I realize that things do take time, so I'm not, you know, saying that there shouldn't be some studies. And I realize that we have to have the study before we act. But there are certain areas that, I sthink, we can act on.

My suggestion -- main suggestion is that we take action on Katchemak Bay, that we send a message to the public that really we are concerned about protecting lands that are threatened, that fit the criteria. The question is really what kind of legacy are we gonna leave if Katchemak Bay is lost. We tout ourselves as being Alaskans, at least, that we're able to manage our resources, and we say we can develop the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in an environmentally sound way, but really this would be a real gruesome symbol to our state and our country if this state park, one of our treasures, is logged.

The question is what kind of a legacy are we gonna leave. 1_1 As far as specific suggestions I'd like to make on Katchemak 1_2 Bay, I would like to see the Council conceptually approve 1_3 negotiating to try and buy that land or the rights or try and 1_4 protect it in the interim.

Another suggestion I have is that lot of а 15 Individuals involved in this are very hot right now. One thing 17that might help would be to bring in a mediator; someone that η_{8} could sit down and independently try and facilitate individuals. \parallel_{9} I think often, you know, the legal process and the clash in that ofashion is not necessarily the best way to resolve a conflict, and I think in this case, you're dealing with people that have pobeen working -- for instance, on the other side, some of them have been working for many years, and they're not very willing to 4negotiate right now or they're intransigent at this point. √5the other side, I see individuals on the Council that really want

to make sure that we don't get gouged by a corporation. Whether it be a Native corporation or a non-Native corporation, and I really respect that, and I think that you've got to make sure that in the public interest, we get top dollar for whatever we buy.

Finally, I'm trying to include the only -- the other major point I wanted to make is that there's a public process problem. The process is incomprehensible. The flow charts are things that you -- you know, would see in graduate school somewhere and try to analyze and figure it out to make it work.

10If I were running an agency, I'd be, frankly, embarrassed, labecause I think we can do a lot better job. I mean just basic things like having information simplified.

In the White House, for instance, I know under 14Ronald Reagan, which might not be a sterling example, but they 15did require that White House memos be in a one page format. We 16might want to put a page limit on what we're getting. But I 17think simplification, that's really what -- 'cause the staff's 18job should be to capsulize information. 'Cause we and you all 19don't have the time to go through every square inch of this 20stuff.

The other thing that I want to say, and I want to say it 22respectfully. I hope it's not taken the wrong way, but with the 33public members-at-large it was mentioned what we want to do is 24have disinterested parties involved here to give some balance. 25But I came back this afternoon -- I had to leave and I came back

and I saw, for example, two very fine gentlemen, Lou Williams and Paul Gavora, but that really -- Lou Williams is known as one of the leading proponents of logging in the state, through the Ketchikan newspaper, and I've read a number of his columns in the Times, and Paul Gavora, I know Paul Gavora, and Paul is one of the leading developers in Fairbanks. And I know that this is not really -- I've heard about some of these other members. This is not really balance here. And I think it needs to be pointed out that they're not disinterested, and they're gonna take a position, and we pretty well know that.

So I think we can all work together, but I think we need 1some real improvements in the public process, and I think we also 12need to send the public a message that, yes, we're gonna protect 1scertain lands, such as Katchemak Bay, that state park that's very 14much threatened right now.

- Thank you.
- 1_6 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.
- MR. COLE: Well, I want to focus on Katchemak Bay. Who show owns these lands in Katchemak Bay which you urge us to spacquire?
- 20 MR. HARUN: I understand there's some various parties 21that have different pieces of it right now.
- MR. COLE: Are they the Native organizations?
- MR. HARUN: Yes, and
- MR. COLE: And how did the Native organizations get this 25land?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. HARUN: Through selections under the Alaska Native Land Claims.

MR. COLE: All right. And -- okay, and what restrictions were placed on the use of those lands by Congress when they passed the Native Claims Settlement Act which allowed the Natives to select those lands?

MR. HARUN: Well, I'm not quibbling that

MR. COLE: Just hear me out. Let's stay with this.

MR. HARUN: Are you saying their intent was to allow them to develop?

MR. COLE: Well, of course. Of course they were. We 1know that. Congress gave the Native corporations the right, and 12I'm not being critical, but justifiably so, to take these lands, 13to develop 'em, and to improve their economic life in our society 14in Alaska. Okay? Now, what restrictions did Congress place on 15that? Did Congress say you can't log these lands? No. In fact, 16the purpose underlying it was just the contrary. In many ways, 17after a period of years.

Now, why don't you go to Congress and say you made a pmistake, you know, George Miller, and you ought to buy these lands back from them. Why do you come to this group here, who there charged with the restoration of Prince William Sound of the 20il Spill, and say buy these lands and protect them from us all.

I mean, that gives me a lot of trouble. I mean, you focus on us a land you should be focussing on Congress and those people who sallowed this, if you want to call it, as you say, tragedy, to

happen, and then it gets dumped in our lap and say, gosh, you've got to go do something. Come on, you guys. I mean, like they say in the vernacular, give us a break. It's Congress who was responsible for this. I mean, it's Congress who could have prevented this.

MR. HARUN: Could I

MR. COLE: Yeah, now just give me your answer to that, would you, please? I know winter's coming, and I'll cool off.

I don't think Congress really envisioned MR. HARUN: every specific implication of its action, and it's an ongoing noprocess, as we know, with any piece of legislation. And so in $1 \mid 1 \mid 1$ many ways these lands are currency, they're bargained for, and in ₁₂many cases they're going back to Congress to try and get money to $_{1}$ 3buy lands. But what I'm saying is I'm not a bureaucrat, and I 14 just want to make it happen, and I think what the people of this ₁state are saying is you tell us how to make it happen. I mean, 16we don't need to get into -- you know, if we get into the legal $\sqrt{1}$ 7realm and say, well, what's perfectly legal and what exactly was 18 Congress's intent, I don't think we'll ever know that. But I do $\P_{\mathfrak{I}}$ think that this area, Katchemak Bay, is definitely related to the 00il Spill, and it is something that the people want to acquire, pland so why can't we do it?

You know, it would be a tragedy if that land is logged, and I think -- you know, Charlie, you've mentioned to me -- you know, at one point you said, well, some day when I'm the low man sowith a cane, I don't want to leave behind a legacy that I didn't

do anything. And I believe you and I trust you, and so I look forward to you and the other counsel members to follow through on that; to leave a legacy for the state. Because if you don't put money into land acquisition, all you're gonna have left is a big pile of paper, only a mile higher than what we already have to date and nothing. And this also ties into the importance of Alaska. Alaska is important. It's unique in the world, it's unique in the country, and I think we have an obligation to protect some of it.

MR. COLE: Why don't you go to Congress and ask them to logive us a hand?

 $_{11}$ MR. HARUN: If I could do it, I would. Thank you, $_{12}$ though.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Sandor.

Kevin, I think you were here when we were MR. SANDOR: 14 Istalking about the values of the lands and the proposed 16 requisition. Everything from, I think, 300 million to 3.0 17billion, but many, many lands. But we talked about 18 prioritization process, and I quess the question I wanted to ask $\sqrt{||g|}$ since you've followed this right closely, to two projects that 20we did approve today with the Nature Conservancy. 1 intended and is intended to bring a systematic and scientifically pbased process of identifying the criteria, evaluating the 3criteria, and prioritizing these projects.

What's your assessment of those two projects; did we do asthe right thing today?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. HARUN: I think you did. I think the Nature Conservancy is a great organization. I think they have the skills and the ability to do an evaluation in a way that can simplify things, too. They have a history of working with private parties, and I think -- I think they can come up with real good framework.

I guess I'm just concerned, mainly, that there are some areas that we've identified as being important, and I don't want to see that fall through the cracks, 'cause they may not come out with a report until maybe the beginning of next year, right? Is 10that

- MR. SANDOR: Well, hopefully, before.
- MR. HARUN: You know how things go on. Sometimes things also and the state of the st
- 1_4 MR. PENNOYER: Further questions? Thank you, very much.
- MR. HARUN: Thanks a lot.
- MR. PENNOYER: Go on now to the field, to Juneau.

 17Anybody in Juneau wishing to testify tonight?
- 18 MR. THOMA: Yes. I'm speaking from Juneau. This is 19Mr. Thoma -- Chip Thoma; C-h-i-p T-h-o-m-a, #2 Marine Way, in 20Juneau, 99801.
- Mr. Pennoyer, if you're the chairman, are all the 22trustees present this evening?
- MR. PENNOYER: That's correct, Mr. Thoma.
- MR. THOMA: Have you taken any vote, sir, on the agenda 25items? That's all that I received today. I was just trying to

R & R COURT REPORTERS

see if votes have been taken on the habitat and the public group advisory nominations and the draft work plan and the rest of the things on the agenda?

MR. PENNOYER: Not entirely. We have taken action on the Public Advisory Group and have a Public Advisory Group of all sectors now complete; we have reviewed the habitat protection process; approved two projects, both contracts -- sharing contracts with the Nature Conservancy to speed up acquisition and selection on eminent threat primarily in the habitat arena; then we approved the Financial Operating 10Procedures; reviewed the draft Restoration Plan. We did not 11 finalize action on the 1993 draft Work Plan, and when we recess 1/2this meeting tonight, we will reconvene next Monday morning here 13in Anchorage to do that.

MR. THOMA: Very good. I appreciate that summary, sir. 15Are you up to 15 members now on your Public Advisory Group?

MR. PENNOYER: We have 17 total.

MR. THOMA: 17 total. Very good. So you appointed, 18 what, seven today?

MR. PENNOYER: That's correct.

 $_{20}$ MR. THOMA: Could you, very briefly, give me those names?

 $_{21}$ MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Gibbons.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. For the category of Recreational 23User, James Diehl; for the category of Sports Fishing & Hunting, 24Paul Andrews; for the nominees of the Public At-Large, 5James Cloud, Richard Eliason, Lou Williams, Paul Gavora, and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

185

Vern McCorkle.

I am extremely disappointed, as someone who MR. THOMA: has been involved in politics in this state for 20 years, to hear that these people have been appointed as the last seven remaining members of this committee. To me it completely politicizes this committee and puts on a slant to it that's inappropriate, and I will speak -- I will speak to Mr. Andrews and Mr. Eliason and Mr. Williams, all these gentlemen. Mr. Andrews has been a member of the Territorial Sportsman and also the -- was very active in the McDowell settlement, and Mr. Eliason and Mr. Williams, coming \parallel_0 from pulp mill towns, have opposed, for the most, I think, $1 \mid 1$ progressive thinking as far as the use of the Tongass in their \parallel_2 political careers, and I determined that Mr. Williams has, η_3 indeed, a political career. Mr. Williams has written extensively 40n not selecting habitat as part of the settlement, and backing 15the Governor in his decision completely. I think it's totally 16 inappropriate, and I do plan to complain to Judge Holland and 1/7whoever else wants to listen that this selection -- this added 18 selection, for whatever reason, obviously, was to get friends of $_{\parallel}$ 9the Governor's and the Attorney General's on this committee, and $\not |_{0}$ I think it's improper. And as much as I love Dick Eliason, and alas much as I respect some of the things that Rupe Andrews has 2 done, I think that it's very political and inappropriate.

I'll go on. I went today to the US Forest Service and 4Legislative Affairs offices, looking for a packet of information 50n this meeting, and they were not there. DHL had not arrived.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

And that should have been done a week ago. But I went there I think something could have been faxed, some kind of summary. I hear it's a very weighty tone (ph) that you have sent out, but I think that it should have been there a week ago. Ι found it striking that I went to Mr. Barton's office and his secretaries had no knowledge whatsoever of any kind of agenda or And as far as identifying for me who, indeed, works at the Oil Spill Office at the Juneau Headquarters here, they told me it was solely Mr. Gibbons, and I have a real problem understanding when so many people, to my knowledge, working out 100f Juneau are on the employ of the Forest Service and dedicated 1/1 directly to the Oil Spill as coordinators or some sort or $_{12}$ another, that there was not a packet of information in the 13 Federal Building in Juneau.

So, I asked and I asked and I asked, and Mr. Barton, as 15you know, you have three secretaries in that office, and they had 16no idea what I was talking about, and they couldn't tell me who 17works for Mr. Gibbons. I mean, why doesn't Mr. Gibbons, at 18least, have a secretary in the Oil Spill Office in Juneau? You 19know, at least for public information services. I mean, why 20can't we afford some kind of position, you know, to have at least 21two people that are out front identified with the Oil Spill 20ffice. If we're gonna spend this kind of money on staff, and 3Mr. Gibbons' office is ostensibly in Juneau, I think it's totally 4appropriate that we have a staff person in Juneau that is able to 25dispense information, basically, in a moment's notice that that's

their job. And especially now that we have Mr. Andrews, Mr. Eliason and Mr. Williams on the panel. Obviously, a very strong southeast influence here, I think it's even more appropriate.

My next -- I think I'll just go on to that I think it's -- I did testify about two weeks ago that I think there is a critical need -- and you may have discussed this in your habitat discussion today -- I think there's a critical need throughout the state for the eradication of foxes and rats on islands throughout the state. There are a few -- there's three or four, <code>↑OI</code> believe, in the Gulf of Alaska, and the majority, of course, $_{1}$ are in the Aleutians. And I think for the preservation -- and I 12do mean that word very strongly, the preservation of bird 13 colonies and species, I think that this is a threat that we have 4 in Alaska to migratory waterfowl that these foxes and rats need 15 to be approached directly, and we do have ways to control foxes 16in this state. I am told that biologists in New Zealand and $\sqrt{1}$ 7 Iceland have at least begun to pioneer how to take care of rats. 1/8 They have huge rats on these islands. I think it's absolutely $\P_{ extstyle 0}$ necessary that we concentrate what biology staff that we have oavailable to us through Fish & Wildlife/Department of Interior, 1 through our State Fish & Game, that we coordinate this effort and 2get on with the program. There are some 400 islands in the state 23that are overrun -- not overrun, but are controlled -- are 4predatorized by foxes and rats, and it's not right.

The other danger, of course, that is -- that happens

R & R COURT REPORTERS

worldwide is the -- when shipwrecks occur, the release of rats, especially on grain carrying ships of that nature, that this is where these rats solely are released, and I think it's important that we recognize this, just as we recognize oil spills. If we really are going to look at the restoration of bird colonies, then we should look at shipwrecks, the release of rats as being a reasonable, direct problem. And when this occurs, we should have the ability and the dedication to go out and approach these wrecks just as we would an oil spill, and make sure that rats don't get released onto these islands.

My next point is I have decided from a meeting this week labout this state administration opposing provisions of the House 2Energy Bill, I've decided that that truly is the way that this is 13gonna end up working out, and I think it's a sad commentary, of 14course, on this process, but I think that the House Energy Bill, 15where the majority of monies -- it directs that the majority of 16monies from the Exxon settlement be spent for habitat acquisition 17 is the proper course and that this really is the way that this 18 bill and the havoc that it's wrecked (ph) and continues to wreck 19 (ph) even at Cape Suckling (ph) on bird and wild species, has to 20 be done through habitat acquisition.

So I am going to identify with that bill -- with that 22provision of the bill, and see to it that our congressional 23delegation, if they do oppose those provisions in the bill, are 24identified for that throughout the coastal communities.

I think that if Mr. Young and Mr. Murkowski, in the next

R & R COURT REPORTERS

six weeks or so, decide to take up this banner and try to delete
these provisions that we should identify them, since it is a
political year. I think it's a very political issue. I think
that the -- and to be consistent -- I will be consistent. I
think the settlement and the framework involved are highly
political and they are manipulated by this decision by unanimity
that you gentlemen have where you basically don't take a vote,
you know, unless you've got the six votes, and especially on very
controversial issues, such as habitat acquisition. I would like
to see some of these votes on the record, you know, even if it's
loa three to three or a two to four, I would like to see these
livotes on the record.

- So, obviously, I have a lot of problems with this. The 13settlement and the negotiation of it are a part of the recall on 14Governor Hickel, and I think it's appropriate, of course, that 15that be there, that we will continue to identify these problems 16as being equal to the task of recall, and I think that's the end 17of my testimony.
- 18 If you have any questions, I'd be sure happy to answer 19them.
- 20 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Thoma. Any questions of 21the Trustee Council? Comments? Thank you, very much.
- I think we'll come back to Anchorage now and Mr. Knowles.
- MR. KNOWLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the 24Council, my name is Tony Knowles. I'm a resident of Anchorage. 25Did you want the address? Is that for -- 1146 S

MR. PENNOYER: You don't have to.

MR. KNOWLES: is my home address. I would like to urge the Council, in the very strongest of terms, to make it the highest priority, the habitat acquisition. And I would very respectfully say that I really think it's outrageous that the vast majority, if not all of the monies that have been spent to date, have been compensating the various agencies rather than insuring that the act of the Oil Spill, and to the extent that it was a criminal action was an act and a crime against nature, not against the DEC or Department of Interior or Fish & Game. $_{\parallel}$ Othe first ones to get paid have been -- to the extent that I $1 \parallel 1$ understand it, some \$55 million has been the agencies. 12 would just reflect on the fact that if hurricane Andrew or 13hurricane Iniki -- if the very first monies had been spent in $_{\parallel}4$ those situations to re-compensate the agencies rather than to 15rebuild the communities, there would be a very justified public 16uproar. And I would say, in this particular case, that the job 170f habitat acquisition is long overdue, and I would encourage you $_{18}$ to -- in the strongest of terms, to apply the monies to that.

- 19 Thank you, very much.
- 20 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Knowles. Questions or 21comments from the Trustee Council?
- 22 MR. KNOWLES: Thank you.
- MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much. Go out now to $_{24}$ Seldovia. Anybody in Seldovia wishing to testify tonight?
- MR. ELVSAAS: Yes. Are you hearing me all right?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: You need to identify yourself and spell your name, sir.

MR. ELVSAAS: Yes. My name is Fred Elvsaas; it's E-l-v-s-a-a-s. And I would just like to just clarify a couple of things from some earlier comments.

The comments on the Katchemak Bay acquisition, there seems to be an inference that the Seldovia Native Association, which I represent, as the land owner, are trying to sell this land to the State of Alaska. The fact of the matter is the state hopes that Seldovia Native Association in (indiscernible) land otrades and outright purchase lands. And we worked up an agreement for a purchase price with the price, of a fairly large discount on a cash value basis, and the sale did not go through abecause the Governor vetoed this plan. I heard Mr. Harun speak to the federal government coming into the picture.

The Seldovia Native Association did not make this plan available to the Federal Government; to the State of Alaska only.

And I think that that issue must be kept in mind as you go start as a start

20 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I would like to say that I personally favor 2the acquisition of Katchemak Bay State Park lands, and I have 3worked in the past and will continue to work to acquire those 4lands in State ownership. But I am troubled over the approach 5that so often seems to be made to the Trustees here that we're

somehow remiss or committing a cardinal sin by not acquiring those lands quickly. I think there is broad sentiment among the Trustees to acquire those lands. It's not easy to do within the terms of the consent decree.

I think what I would like to see more than almost a strident urging that we acquire those lands that some help in how we can acquire them within the framework of the consent decree, within the framework possibly of legislative action. where we're having some difficulties. I think that the Trustee Council will likely find, if it's not found, that difficulty in nospending \$22 million out of this fund itself to acquire Katchemak 11 Bay. And as I told Mr. Harun in the past, that I think that a ₁₂collective approach to the acquisition of Katchemak Bay, we can 1_3 get it done, we can get it done relatively soon. It is not an 14easy assignment. So, again, I urge, you know, probably less in 15the way of -- I don't want to say demands, but strong urging and $_{\parallel}$ 6help in our getting it done, and I think we can do it. That's my personal view. I don't necessarily speak for the other members 1gof the Council, but

I also want to say, and make it very clear, that the 20Governor has made it extremely clear that he favors the 1acquisition of Katchemak Bay State Park lands, with no 2equivocation on his part on that subject. 411 contains some 40 23to \$45 million plus or minus other expenditures. I think that's 24somewhere (indiscernible). So, anyway, I just wanted to make 25that clear.

Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Cole. Further comment or questions? Thank you, very much.

I'll come back now to Anchorage and the next person in Anchorage?

MS. RODERMAN: Lisa Roderman. I'm now an Anchorage resident. I've spoken to you before. I was principal investigator on damage assessment studies aimed at damage of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill to sea otter weanlings and hematology studies on adult females and sea otter pups, and collaborated on 10studies of reproduction and mortality of adult females in Prince 11William Sound. I've been studying, along with my colleagues, sea 20tters in Prince William Sound since 1984.

My first comment to the Trustees have to do with -- to 14thank you for your efforts regarding the workshops that you have 15planned to identify critical habitats. I think that's a great 16idea, and I think it will take you many steps forward in terms of 17identifying critical habitats very quickly, rather than going 18through a more lengthy process. And I particularly applaud some 190f you who, I do believe, have really been trying to solve the 20problems.

I have some comments which, again, given Mr. Cole's 22comments, I'll try to keep constructive, as much as possible. 23I've tried to keep that in mind when talking to the Trustees 24rather than just complaining to them.

The process, as it is right now, in terms of scientific

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

I'll give you some specific written comments within this week on my own particular case, which I think I won't go into now, but exemplifies some of the problems that have occurred rather nicely in terms of conflict of interest and some other issues, which I've raised to the Trustee Council before.

But there still is a tremendous amount of conflict of 10 interest problems, I believe, problems with scientific ethics, 11 which have still to be addressed by the Trustee Council, that are 12 ingrained in this process. Suffice it to say, some of the ideas 13 that have been presented to you in your Restoration Plan for 14 1993, as being agency ideas, may not have originated within the 15 agency, and are basically, in some cases -- at least in part, 16 proposals that were originally developed by other people such as 17 myself, and which propose to analyze data taken -- for instance, 18 in the case of myself, over a very long period of time, many 19 years before the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill.

This -- let's see. My viewpoint is that you need to 1 remedy the problem that at this time agency personnel are still 2 being allowed to basically insure their own job security and to 2 further their own careers based on the scientific talent and 2 4 recommendations of other people. And this year you did so rather 2 foliatantly, which was kind of strange, by saying that proposals

came in were non-proprietary.

In my own case, proposals had been -- I've been given, at the request of the Restoration Planning Team, proposals in 1990 and proposals in 1991, with the agreement that they were proprietary. These proposals now show up -- segments of these proposals now show up in so-called agency proposals, and I question your -- the thought that you can solicit proposals from scientists and say that the ideas are non-proprietary, wherein nearly every other situation, be it NSF, NIH, almost every other funding source, proposals are proprietary, because it's a lot of lowhat scientists have to offer; the data that they've already collected, the insights they have, the knowledge which they bring to bear about a particular problem and their advice on how to a solve and address a particular question.

So, I make the following suggestion to you that you 15 entirely open the process and solicit proposals which would be as 16 they always are, as I've said, treated and considered in a 17 proprietary manner. In this round, as I say, people were told, 18 and I was told explicitly that this was not the case, and when I 19 asked whether I could be given assurances by the Restoration 20 Planning Team that proposal grabbing would not occur, I was 1 basically told by certain members of the Restoration Planning 2 Team and others closely associated, that they could give no 2 assurances, and some folks said they actually thought this was 24 likely to happen.

And this -- so this doesn't result in a very fair

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

process. And I emphasize that in no case am I coming to you asking for consideration of my funding requests in general. My feeling is that the Trustees can either fund a project or not fund it, but that if a good proposal comes from someone, the person that should be funded to do the work is the actual scientist that should do the work, the people that came up with the proposal.

I'm not alone in my thoughts about opening up the process, and I would like to read into the public record a letter from Dr. Spies, the chief scientist to the Trustee Council. My locopy doesn't have any kind of a date on it, but I think it's limportant that the public at large know this has been raised, and locally just want to read a few excerpts from this.

So, it's to the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council, from 14Robert Spies, chief scientist: My primary duty, as chief 15scientist, is to advise you on the scientific information needed 16for assessment damages and for restoration and enhancement of 17natural resources in the Spill area. Part of my obligation is to 18insure that you receive the highest quality information on which 19to base your decisions.

And skipping down he talks in the next paragraph about the many qualified scientists previously were not able to paragraph about paragraph about paragraph about the many qualified scientists previously were not able to paragraph about par

And I am telling you that this has happened.

It seems to me -- then skipping down again: It seems to me, now that the litigation has been settled and we have moved into restoration, that there is an opportunity to potentially increase the quality of some aspects of the work we do through costs and increased public participation. This change would also greatly benefit the agencies as the competition would insure that the greatest emphasis would be placed on competence and quality of the natural resource work being done. Open competition would also greatly encourage the timely completion of reports and publications which have not received the attention they deserve $_{1}$ in many instances. Let me say to those of us that have been ₁₂involved in this process, that's an understatement. To encourage participation by highly qualified individuals and firms, however, $_{\parallel 4}$ that was my insert, just for the public record. That last little 15editorial was not in Dr. Spies' letter.

To continue on in Dr. Spies' letter: To encourage 17participation by highly qualified individuals and firms, however, 18independent review of the proposals is essential. Presently, the 19Restoration Team is voting on which proposals will be recommended 20to the Trustee Council. The members of the Restoration Team are 21representing agencies that themselves have proposed projects, and 22are clearly not without real and perceived conflicts of interest.

23 Several independent investigators have indicated to me they are 24skeptical about the outcome of the process.

And in the last paragraph, Dr. Spies recommends the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

following -- he says the following: Many of the peer reviewers and other scientists have told me that the restoration process should be more open to public participation. I have come to the same conclusion. I hope that you will seriously consider this suggestion in your future. There is, in my opinion, time to implement a competitive process for selections and an independent review process for much of the work you may wish to achieve in 1993.

In the response to Dr. Spies', the Restoration Planning
Team says, for instance: We envision an equitable mixture of
loagency and private activities and talks about how the team is
logoing to address the conflict of interest issues.

So, again, I get back to Dr. Spies' recommendation, and 13I'd like to put Dr. Spies on the spot, actually. I'm sorry I 14have to put you on the spot but it does come with the job, and 15ask him to comment on whether he does the following -- would you 16ask him to comment on the following: Does he think there is 17still time to implement a totally open process for proposal 18solicitation for the 1993 work process; whether he thinks the 19whole process in general would be served by putting -- if not, 20whether he thinks the process would be served by putting all of 21the proposed studies that you have before you out to bid. The 20nes that you decide should go forward, put those out to bid. 3The agency people -- you said the ideas were not proprietary, and 24yet in some cases agency personnel have written up the ideas as 25their own, put it all out to bid. That would be basically the

only thing that's left to do that would be equitable. And ask him if he would be willing to characterize -- this is what really puts him on the spot, and maybe he won't want to do this, for the Trustees and for the public, how his recommendations in terms of opening the process have been received, and to ask him to comment in general on whether this whole proposal and idea grabbing issue has been a problem, and if he thinks this negatively affected the process.

And then I'd just like to clarify, as I end, one other thing. I would like to clarify what proportion -- well, let me lobackup a second. Previously today, we were told that there was a lisignificant private sector element. I mean, what's coming from the Restoration Team to the Trustee Council. And I was curious if we could clarify what proportion of the PI's on proposed studies come to you are from the private sector, because -- well, I'd just like to know that: What proportion of the actual PI's. I imagine a lot of boat charters and other things are going to the private sector, but in terms of the people that will be sleading scientific studies, I would like some clarification as to lead to the stands right now in terms of your proposed work plan.

We are going to take up the '93 Work Plan, and we've 23 asked the Restoration Team and Dr. Spies to be present and answer 24 questions about the plan, how it was developed by the various 25 project committees in their priority.

Appreciate it. Would you, please, wait

R & R COURT REPORTERS

 $\frac{1}{2}$ for a second to see if there are further questions.

MR. PENNOYER:

Rather than get into that here, I'm not sure if Dr. Spies is prepared to get into that process at this time. I think I'd entertain questions from the Trustee Council. These questions have been raised, Ms. Roderman, and I think we can deal with them during the '93 Work Plan discussion. But I'll certainly yield to your preferences.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important these be dealt with. I presume it would be more logical to deal with next Monday. I think Dr. Spies' memo raises some important issues, you've essentially reinforced them, and raised some lological questions. I look forward to that discussion unless lowe would want to have that discussed at this time. It think lower than the logical next Monday.

- MS. RODERMAN: Well, can I ask on Monday will there be a 14public comment period on Monday? In other words, will we have 15the same people in line that are on line right now? Because I 16think that this is an issue that's come up repeatedly, and it's 17an issue that the public in general really needs to, I think, 18have clarified for them -- at least the research community needs 19to have this clarified, if at all possible.
- 20 MR. PENNOYER: Were we scheduling a public hearing 21session for Monday?
- MR. GIBBONS: We can, Mr. Chairman.
- MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think that might be appropriate 24then, and your questions are in the record and we will deal with 25Dr. Spies' letter then. Again, these are projects going out to

public review, and we'd like the broadest possible understanding of where they came from and how they were developed and what they mean.

So, if there are no further questions? Mr. Gibbons.

MR. GIBBONS: I'd like to make one comment. She referenced the response letter. I'd like to put that into the -- make sure that's in the record. We did respond to Dr. Spies' and we've had some discussions with Dr. Spies since then.

MS. RODERMAN: Would it be possible at this time to clarify my last question which had to do with the -- sort of the lopercentage of PIs that you are now -- in terms of projects -- in laterms of the breakdown right now that you're recommending, in laterms of private sector/public sector, does anyone have a -- at laters a gross idea to what proportion of the principal latinvestigators on theses studies are in the private sector?

- MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman.
- MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Montague.
- MR. MONTAGUE: I don't know if this is working. I can answer that. First of all, of the 60 or so projects, they're projects not studies, there's a lot of projects that aren't coresearched and the leaders of 'em wouldn't rightfully be called principal investigators, but of the 60, altogether, 10 would be, so you know, headed up by non-agency people, about 20%.
- MS. RODERMAN: What about the ones that you would 24consider scientific?
- $_{25}$ MR. MONTAGUE: I'd have to look that up. I'm not sure.

And then the amount of money to the public is 60%.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions have been asked and they're on the record, and we will try and deal with them next Monday. And thank you, very much.

MS. RODERMAN: Thank you. And, again, I do appreciate this -- some of the Trustees are working very, very hard, I know, to try to involve the public and try to offer remedies at getting at this whole question of how to protect critical habitats, and I do appreciate that.

Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Are there any communities that 1 that come on line since we've started? We had Kodiak, Homer, 1 2 Valdez, Juneau and Seldovia, or am I starting over again on the 1 3 list? Start over again, okay. Thank you. Anybody else from 1 4 Kodiak who wishes to testify tonight?

TELEPHONE OPERATOR: Cordova and Soldotna have joined 16you.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay, well, then maybe we'll finish the list first. Cordova, anybody from Cordova who wishes to testify?

MS. McBURNEY: Yes, there is. My name is Mary McBurney; 20M-a-r-y M-c-B-u-r-n-e-y, Post Office Box 464, Cordova, 99574.

And I appreciate the opportunity to at least have these 2public comment periods at the end of your Council meetings, 3however, we do kind of work at a deficit at the off-net sites 4since we don't have the benefit of sitting in on the rest of the 25proceedings and finding out what the actions are that have been

R & R COURT REPORTERS

taken.

So if you will forgive me for asking a few bonehead questions, I would just like to get caught up on what you've done today. First of all, I was wondering who the additional Advisory Group nominees are for the remaining seats that were left open.

MR. PENNOYER: Yes. We had a brief review, upon request from one other person, and normally -- and I'm sorry I omitted that when I asked Mr. Gibbons to review the actions taken during the day, we did not do that at this time.

And Mr. Gibbons, would you care to respond with the names 100f the additional nominees?

MR. GIBBONS: Sure, Mr. Chairman. For the position of 12Recreational User, James Diehl; for the position of Sports 13Fishing and Hunting, Rupert Andrews. It was moved to extend the 14Public-at-Large group from three to five. The fives names 15selected from the Public-at-Large group, James Cloud, 16Richard Eliason, Lou Williams, Paul Gavora, and Vern McCorkle.

MR. PENNOYER: In answer to the other questions, we also 18 dealt with habitat protection process and other review of the 19 process, including the eminent threat work that's been done for 20 us, and in that process approved two projects -- cost-share 1 projects with the Nature Conservancy for the acquisition of data 20 land acquisition. Those will go forward as part of the court 2 arequests for the balance of our '92 budget. We also discussed 24 the Financial Operating Procedures, and adopted those. We 25 reviewed the draft Restoration Plan and got an overview of it and

the timing on it. There were no action items on that. And we also discussed the 1993 draft Work Plan, but only as to how it's developed. We postponed taking action on the '93 draft Work Plan in regards to what's going to be sent out to public review till next Monday, and we will recess this meeting tonight after the public hearing and then reconvene it here in Anchorage next Monday to discuss the '93 draft Work Plan.

Dave, did I miss anything?

MR. GIBBONS: No, you got it all.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Do you wish to go ahead then, 10Ms. McBurney?

MS. McBURNEY: Yes. Secondly, it's come to my attention 2 that there is -- the Oil Spill Recovery Institute is, I guess, in 3 its formative stages right now, and I know that the Prince 4 William Sound Science Center is quite active in its formulation.

15 And I'm having a difficult time trying to figure out how this 60il Spill Recovery Institute and its mandate under open (ph) 90 17 is going to be interfacing with the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill 18 Trustee Council, and specifically how that organization -- the 19 Recovery Institute is going to be dovetailing with the Public 20 Advisory Group.

MR. PENNOYER: I believe this has been discussed by the 22Restoration Team. I know that the Oil Spill Institute has not 23had its first meeting of its board of directors but has appointed 24a board. It was originally scheduled for, I believe, this week, 25and it's been postponed now for an additional week or two to -- I

 $_{21}$ Mr. McVee or Mr. Barton, do you wish to add to that? Any $_{22}$ further testimony?

MS. McBURNEY: No, not at this time. Thank you, very $_{24}$ much, for your time.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. I'll come back to Anchorage

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

now.

MR. SELBY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Council. My name is Jerome Selby; that's S-e-l-b-y. I'm the mayor of the Kodiak Island Borough. I'm going to, for the sake of brevity, limit my comments tonight, pretty much, to FY-93 work plan, and then a couple of comments for you on the acquisition. I guess I should bring a longer list to beat up on you with, but I didn't tonight.

First of all, we appreciate some of the projects that we submitted that are, in fact, in the '93 Work Plan. And we'd like 10 for you to consider next week some projects that are not in the 11 draft Plan that's in front of you. At the moment, I don't know 12 why they're not there. We have been told now that we will be 13 able to see those review comments concerning the other projects, 14 and those should be mailed out to us Monday or so. But -- or 15 later this week, I guess, Dave was saying. But without that 16 knowledge, we would request that Monday when you meet that you 17 take a serious look at some other projects, and let me give you 18 just a bit of background.

We have a pink salmon fishery that's in serious trouble 20 in Kodiak that we just discovered this summer. We had a 21 projection of 12 million -- 12 to 15 million fish return for the 22 commercial fishing industry this summer. They were able to catch 23 something slightly over 3 million fish before they closed the 24 fishery.

To me, that's a pretty significant hit on a very

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

important fishery in our commercial fishing industry. We don't know why. I certainly can't sit here tonight and tell you that it is in fact a result of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. It is significant that, obviously, those adult fish returned in '89, through the Spill, may or may not have been impacted. I do not know.

But we do have some other projects -- five projects, in fact, dealing with pink salmon. A total of \$154,000.00 of expenditures for all five projects that we would really like you to take a serious look at next Monday, of adding to your Work 10Plan.

- There are two more pink salmon stream projects that add 12up to \$75,000.00 for the two of 'em. For some reason, two of the 13four that we had requested are in the Plan, and two are not. 14Again, I don't know why, but we would like you to look seriously 15at adding those other two projects in.
- MR. COLE: Mr. Selby, excuse me, just a minute. I'm able 17to use this fine work product here that's been provided to us, 18and under your name are listed two, four, six, eight -- I don't 19know, about 15 or 16 projects. If you could tell us specifically 20which ones they are, I think we will then have a good opportunity 21to take a look specifically at those ones that you want us to 22look at. Would you like to see this?
- MR. SELBY: I've seen the list. There's a little 24problem, Mr. Cole.
- 25 MR. COLE: Okay.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. SELBY: The list that we submitted in total, from Kodiak Island Borough, included all of the agencies on the Borough. What you have there are not all of the projects that were submitted under my name. The two that I'm referring to, particularly at this moment, are under the Fish & Game request, and it's back earlier in the document, so I'd be glad to give you that reference if it was listed in there, but those two, in particular, aren't.

One of 'em is the Horse Marine Pink Salmon project. I just blanked the other stream's name out, but they're all listed 10under Fish & Game together, the four of them, just straight down 11the page. So I think you'll be able to find 'em.

 $_2$ MR. COLE: Okay.

MR. SELBY: Another one, similar, is the Uganik River 14Fish Weir, and I think that one is listed under my name, for 15\$28,000.00. There's the Ayakulik Fish Evaluation project for 16\$6,000.00, a very small project, and there's the Kitoi Bay 17Hatchery, which is listed, I think, actually under the Kodiak 18Regional Aquacultural Association project, for \$45,000.00, which 19has to do with the pink salmon work there at the hatchery at 20Kitoi.

So, again, we'd really appreciate it if you could take a 22real close look at, perhaps, adding some, if not all five of 3those projects, for a total of 154,000 to your 1993 Work Plan. 4And certainly -- you know, I don't know where you sit on the 25money for '93, I haven't heard that today. I know Mr. Cole

usually has a running track of that, it seems, as far as what might be available. Certainly, though, all the projects are on the 1993 Work Plan list.

I'd put this project well ahead in priority of the 3.7 million that's targeted for the hatchery at Fort Richardson's pipeline. If you need to raise additional sockeye salmon, I think there may be some other more prospective alternatives. Particularly, we have a sockeye hatchery at Pillar Creek, in Kodiak, that -- for sockeye salmon, I think, you could put more fish out of that particular hatchery for a whole lot less than 10\$3.7 million. We haven't got \$3.7 million in the total for that 1 hatchery. And so I think there may be a more prospective way of 12coming up with some sockeye salmon to put in the Kenai River for 13the sports fisherman than spending 3.7 million.

 $_{14}$ So let me leave that thought with you, as you look at $_{15}$ that list next week also.

Also, I understand -- and the weir site acquisition -17the acquisition and habitat, I understand and appreciate the care
18with which you folks are working through that. That is a very
19significant issue for the state.

I would suggest to you, over on your habitat chart -21summary chart, though, that you take the \$120 million off the 412
22that you looked at today, because it's duplicatory on this list,
23and so you really have something less than 300 million worth of
24projects that you're looking at here with what you've got listed.

Now, I would suggest that you add -- target back

R & R COURT REPORTERS

210

somewhere around 400 million and put some projects on here from Prince William Sound, because there are none here. And I realize, again, that it's partly because you're more concerned about looking more into those in-depth.

I think that a lot of the comments that you're getting on folks on habitat has to do with the fact that the Council -- and I understand your reluctance, it hasn't really given any commitment at habitat acquisition, and basically to me that's a philosophical issue at the moment, more so than to say that you're going to buy a particular habitat acquisition project. In think what the people and the people in this room and the people line Alaska would like to see you folks say is that you're gonnate target and decide philosophically what you want to target for a shabitat acquisition.

In my mind, if Mr. Cole's number of 625 million is left 5to spend that he threw out earlier today is correct, then I'd say 6400 million out of that for habitat acquisition would be a pretty 7good target to hit. It doesn't mean that you're gonna spend 8exactly 400 million, but it would be a signal to folks that 9you're serious about committing a substantial amount of the oremaining funds towards acquisition of the habitat. Granted, we fall know that we could bring in two or \$3 million worth of 2acquisition projects. There's not that many to buy. So you're 3gonna have to go through and select the best out of what's 4available and what should be purchased, even with 400 million, 25but I'd encourage you folks to have that discussion and give it

the signal so folks know.

I think that would also help the people who own the land to know that yeah, this is a serious discussion taking place and they aren't sitting around hoping that this might be an acquisition and at the moment there's no commitment that there would really be any money spent on acquisition.

I would -- and there are two other projects that we would like you to consider, and that we were very disappointed did not show up on the '93 Work Plan at all, and that's the Fisheries Industrial Technology Center development in Kodiak and the museum oin Kodiak for the artifacts. And let me just comment, briefly, labout those and I'll go away and give somebody else a chance.

The Fisheries Industrial Technology Center, the expansion 130f that facility would allow us to do a lot of the analysis 14that's gonna need to be done on some of these other research 15projects here in the state of Alaska. At the moment, a lot of 16that work is gonna get contracted out Outside of the state of 17Alaska. And I would just ask you folks, while we're doing this 18research why don't we build something for Alaska that will still 19be here when we're through doing the research projects on the Oil 20Spill. We have that opportunity now. We've got a first class 21facility that could be expanded and be there forever. I 22mentioned before that it would give us the opportunity, the 23ability in the future, if there were -- and God forbid another 24oil spill -- to do a lot of the analysis on fish and other 25substances, other subsistence food, particularly, that we spent

all summer during 1989 and never did get an answer till November about whether folks should be eating the salmon or the clams or the other subsistence food. That facility could take care of that.

So, we would be building something that could handle a future of that nature. It could do a lot of the analysis or the research projects that are being funded right now out of these projects, and it would be there for other future events. It would also -- it dovetails in with the federal government in terms of what we're trying to get there is the National Marine of the set of labs and work, and that would be in conjunction with this project. That, again, is something that's positive for Alaska way into the future.

Now we've got the authorization through Congress and 14signed by the President for a million dollars a year lease for 15that part of a facility. So it's a dovetail project that we need 16the state piece for. It's got all these other pluses to it. So, 17again, please take a serious look at it, but I really think that 18we ought to -- instead of making a bunch of laboratories rich 19down in the Lower 48 with the Exxon Valdez money, why don't we 20build something that's good for Alaska, past the Exxon Valdez 21Spill.

The other one is the museum. I see that you folks have 23got a couple \$300,000.00 in the budget for them in the '93 24proposed plan to patrol and try to do something with the sites 25that are being pirated on a regular basis right now. And I tell

you folks that we need to learn something from the interdiction program that the United States Government has been spending millions of dollars on. You can patrol those sites till the cows come home and the artifacts are still gonna disappear. We need to find a place in Alaska that we can put some of these things so we will have them for the future generations, because they're continuing to disappear folks. I went by one of those beaches again the other day and there was a fresh hole on the beach. Now, you're not gonna be able to stop it. I support, for the purposes of trying to reduce it, patrolling and doing what we 10can. But the fact is, we're not gonna be able to protect a lot $_{1}$ of those artifacts. And, again, we are urging you to build a ₁₂place that we can keep a bunch of 'em and have 'em for all future 13 generations of not only Alaskans, but the rest of the Americans 14from this.

- So, please, consider that when you discuss your '93 Work 15 16Plan.
- MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Selby. Questions from the 17 1gTrustee Council? Mr. Rosier.
- Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. ROSIER: Mr. Selby, goyou mentioned five projects. I've only got four. You've got 1 Horse Marine, Uganik River, Ayakulik and Kitoi Bay. What was the 22fifth?
- MR. SELBY: The fifth one is another pink salmon project, 23 ₂₄Mr. Rosier, and I'll go back. I'll slip you the name. It's in $\sqrt{5}$ the list, but I'm blanking the name out on the stream. It's a

pink salmon project. There was Pink Creek, Cold Creek, Horse Marine and there was a fourth one that I've blanked out of my mind here, but I'll get that for you.

MR. ROSIER: Thank you.

Mr. Selby, I think, certainly at this MR. PENNOYER: Trustee Council meeting anyway, I think some of us taking the actions that we did to hurry up the process and two projects of the Nature Conservancy and approving this by December, getting a readout on eminent threat are, I think, trying to deal with what you are talking about. And when you said there's 400 million, Inthere may be, what where do you spend it, what do you spend it There's obviously a lot of land out there that we could buy, ₁₂and I think the Trustee Council is trying to send the message out 13that that's part of our restoration process and part of our kit. $_{\parallel 4}$ And I know some of those diagrams and things, perhaps, too 15confusing for people. We've heard that tonight, but I think $_{\parallel}$ 6we're trying to proceed in a very complex area to make decisions, $\sqrt{1}$ and, hopefully, we'll be able to show you the fruit of that 1 sbefore very long.

MR. SELBY: Well, we appreciate your pursuing it with all 20due speed. I'm sure most folks in the state do.

 $_{21}$ MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Mr. Selby, on the archaeological items, would 23you support or could you accept putting those in the University 24of Alaska Fairbanks? For example, to see if we could then go to 25the University of Alaska in Fairbanks where they may have some

R & R COURT REPORTERS

215

space and see if they wouldn't be willing to accept those artifacts.

MR. SELBY: Mr. Cole, there have been a number of Kodiak artifacts in that collection. I think what we were suggesting, and what we thought would be appropriate is that those are Kodiak Island artifacts

MR. COLE: I understand it.

MR. SELBY: Folks that come to Kodiak Island or whether they're tourists or people who live there, they're an important part of the culture of the people who live on Kodiak Island. 10They've been trying to get back and have an agreement now from 1the Smithsonian as well to bring home some of the stuff that's in 12-- been back in Washington, D.C. for the last 200 years. They've 13agreements with even the folks in Russia to bring some of the 14stuff back that the Russians took over back in the Czar's days to 15Kodiak, if we have a place to put them. And to us, it's more 16appropriate -- those folks' culture is tied to that. So we would 17appreciate it if we could have 'em displayed in Kodiak where they 18can make it a part of their culture and part of their pride and 19their history. It's been kind of stolen from them, and we'd like 20to put it back.

MR. COLE: Well, I -- you know, I understand that, and 2that's why I asked that question. If, you know, we could -- if 23we don't have the money, for example, if the money has a higher 4priority someplace else is determined by this process, I mean, 25what about Fairbanks as an alternative of less sort? I mean, I

don't expect you to answer that question today, but

MR. SELBY: We'll answer it from the perspective that if that's the best we can do and it means that we can preserve some of these artifacts and the rich archaeology that is there, then we better do that. Let's at least do that. If we can't do any better than that, then let's at least do that, 'cause otherwise they're leaving the beaches.

MR. COLE: It may be something we could do quickly, even temporarily put them in Fairbanks, you know, and preserve them temporarily until a longer solution can be reached.

MR. PENNOYER: Any further questions of the Trustee 11Council? I'd like to go back then to the net to Seldovia. 12Anybody in Seldovia wishing to testify? Okay, fine. Kodiak, 13again, anybody from Kodiak wishing to testify?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, there is. Can you hear me okay?

MR. PENNOYER: That's fine. Go ahead.

MR. PETRICH: Yes, my name is Greg Petrich, and the 17Conservation chair for Kodiak Audubon. First of all, I'd like to 18comment on -- the last name is P-e-t-r-i-c-h. First, I'd like to 19comment on the July 1992 Restoration Framework Supplement, and 20under the Habitat Protection Acquisition Process, I'd like to see 21the entire hierarchal chart on Figure 7 adopted. This would 22place habitat acquisition on equal footing with all other 23restoration options. I believe that this is appropriate to 24achieve the terms of the settlement.

Also in the same document you list Alternative Threshold

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

Criteria. Under this, I'd like to see Set A adopted. B and C produce criteria that are progressively more stringent and would make -- given the fact that there's a lot of -- there's a lack of pre-existing data in some areas on the Sound, I believe that the process would be unworkable, and so as a bottom line, I'd like to see Set A adopted. It's the only one that will produce a good product that will meet the terms of the settlement.

Now, Mr. Cole has brought up some subjects tonight, and I'd just like to say that this is a public comment forum and not a political forum. He commented on the transfer of the lands to 10the Native corporations in ANCSA as if there was some directive 1 to develop these in some manner. There isn't. These people own 12these lands, they can do whatever they want with them. If they 13choose to sell them for conservation purposes or just sell the 14rights -- the timber rights, they have the perfect right to. 15There is no Congressional directive. So, I find that he's using 16this as a political forum -- it's just not the purpose that this 17meeting was intended for, and I think we can let that go at that 18point. In the future, if you just keep it simple, this is public 19comment.

Now, I'd like to address the letter which Mr. Cole sent the Governor. It's an advisory letter on HB 411. These projects that are included in this bill are from the public, and I see a slist of so many of these land areas and projects that Mr. Cole tecommended as not lawful. Now, these lands, I know -- I mean, significant the instances on Afognak Island that they're a tremendous

murrelet habitat on the northeastern corner of the island, and I believe there are some federal studies that will show that to be true. And they definitely need the terms of the settlement under the acquisition of equivalent resources.

Now, Mr. Cole had demonstrated his biases tonight through his comments, and I'm just not sure how to proceed at this point other than to say if there's some ideological problem in adopting land acquisition proposals from the public, then excuse yourself from the Trustee Committee, and let someone else judge these criteria. This is public comment.

- 1_0 I'd like to hear a response from Mr. Cole. Thank you.
- MR. PENNOYER: Have you completed your testimony then?
- MR. PETRICH: No, I haven't. I have more comment for the 13 federal trustees.
- MR. PENNOYER: Any questions or comments from the Trustee 15Council? Thank you, very much.
- MR. PETRICH: Now, the next area I want to comment on is 17-- this will be addressed to the Department of Interior's 18 representative Curtis McVee.
- I'm aware of the fact that the federal trustees have all 20 received Freedom of Information Act requests for information 21 relating to the Federal Criminal Settlement. Now, in previous 22 meetings, there's -- very little information has been given out 23 on the subject. Questions have been more or less dodged and 24 people were given the impression that there's very little work 25 being done in this area. In this FOIA letter, he's denied an

individual from Cordova, a Professor Steiner, 27 documents that were withheld under the auspices that they were either pre-decisional or that they're attorney/client privilege. Now, all of these documents show communications between the federal trustee agencies on the subject of the Criminal Settlement.

I'd like to ask Mr. McVee how these can be withheld and still stay within the terms of the settlement which say this has to be a public process. Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. McVee.

10 MR. McVEE: I can respond to that that documents under 11the Freedom of Information Act, you know, documents can be 12withheld if they are pre-decisional documents, and I believe that 13reached the point where we've got, you know, draft documents -- a 14draft plan or a draft proposal or reached that point, and 15Mr. Pennoyer talked about that a few moments ago, that at that 16point, we will ask for public involvement. I expect that our 17draft plan will include a public participation phase or portion 18of a plan, but, you know, we just started those discussions -- 19start to develop something that we can go forward to the public 20with. I guess the other option we have is, you know, go public 1 and ask for their comments before we have something for them to 2 shoot at. But I think it's more worthwhile and time would be 3 better spent if we can give them a product to address.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Mr. Petrich, does that 25complete your testimony?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PETRICH: No, sir. I'd like to go back to this same subject. We're looking at pre-decisional documents here, draft interagency agreements, faxes from the Governor's office for inquiries from the Department of the Interior, these give clues as to how this process is working. We see decisions made all the time for the roster of projects that go forward that during 1992, but little reflection of public requested projects. Now, these go all the way back to October 1991, and go month by month showing that there's been extensive discussions between the agencies.

- Now, I'm going to ask Mr. McVee again, do you believe 11that the public process is best served by withholding these 12documents, and if you're challenged legally, do you feel strongly 13enough that you would still withhold them? Go ahead.
- MR. PENNOYER: Again, as we come -- I'll let Mr. McVee 15comment on it. I know of no decisions that have been made for 16the federal restitution funds at this time, so I -- Mr. Barton.
- MR. BARTON: I was just wondering if he was going to 18 testify, Mr. Petrich. Is Mr. Petrich going to testify or is he 19 going to ask us -- interrogate the Trustee Council?
- MR. PENNOYER: I think we are approaching 6:50. We're algoing to have to talk about how late we want to go here. I always about even gone around the net one time yet.
- Mr. McVee, do you wish to comment or just proceed?
- MR. McVEE: The comment was that he had -- we have our specifications -- our legal people review the documents and the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

process we're going through.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Petrich, do you have anything additional?

MR. PETRICH: No, sir. I'm gonna request these documents through another means, and I expect them to be released. It's part of the public process to understand what the agencies are saying, and I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. I understand that I skipped or wasn't informed that Soldotna was on the line. Is there anyone in Soldotna that wishes to testify?

MS. WILSON: Yes, we are here. Thank you. My name is 1Narda Wilson, and Soldotna did not get a lot of the information 2that's been under discussion tonight, and one of the primary 3interests that I have is the Katchemak Bay State Park State 4buy-back. I got a letter from Steve Gibbons stating that it 5would be under discussion as a component of the 1993 Eminent 6Threat Analysis project. Can you tell me if -- in what way, if 7any, was Katchemak Bay State Park buy-back discussed by the 8Council today?

MR. PENNOYER: Except to identify it as a possible 20project in a list that has been sent us by the public process, it 21has not been discussed specifically whether to put money into it.
2 Mr. Cole indicated at one point that he personally favored it, 23and that the Governor favored some form of Katchemak Bay State 24Park land buy-back as well. But we took no action on it -- we 25took no action on the '93 draft Work Plan at this time, which has

R & R COURT REPORTERS

some dollars set aside in the draft we've received for a possible land purchase for eminent threat.

We did take action to review the habitat protection process, and the request we've made to the Restoration Team to find a way to expedite review, particularly of lands that might be classified as the subject to eminent threat.

We did fund two proposals of the Nature Conservancy to speed up the acquisition of data on such lands, and have been informed that we will have a report and recommendations some time in early December.

And other than that, we took no specific action on land 1_1 acquisition.

MS. WILSON: Okay, thank you. I'm here to express 13 support for the buy-back as, you know, you probably are already 14 aware. I found a couple things rather disturbing tonight that 15 came out. One of 'em is the reluctance on the part of the 16 Council to fully embrace the concept of how that acquisition is 17 part of the replacement and enhancement criteria that was set 18 forth in the agreement.

Another thing that I found disturbing was Mr. Cole's comment that someone needs to come up with a way to fund these projects. That seems to me that that should be the job of the Legislature and the Council. We are simply citizens attempting participate in a public process. Last year during the Legislative session it was an extremely frustrating process for those of us to try to see the project through. We thought we'd

come up with a plan and something that was feasible and agreeable to all parties, and then we get into some sort of legalese, under Mr. Cole's interpretation, that this wouldn't be allowed for one reason or another. Well, like I come back to, our job as ordinary citizens of the public is not to try and figure out what's gonna fly and what's not gonna fly legally. I think that that's unfair of the Council to expect us -- us, meaning the public, to come up with a way to acquire these lands.

Another thing that -- and I don't mean to complain, but I do think that there are ways around this, such as Seldovia's 10Native Association request that a 10% down payment be made in 1good faith by October 1st in order to secure future negotiations 12for these lands. I don't think that's unreasonable. And I do 13think that SNA and Timber Trading Company have attempted to 14negotiate in good faith with the State. However, I'm beginning 15to question the good faith on the part of the State. It seems 16like they're just stringing this thing along and hoping that 17maybe one day it will die for lack of action. But, hopefully, 18that won't happen.

And the reason that we are appealing to the Council at 20this point is because we have been shot out of the water by 21Governor Hickel, by Charlie Cole, and by the attempts of the 22Republican Party during the legislative session. So the reason 23that we are so strongly appealing to the Trustee Council at this 24point is you're like our last hope.

I do think that habitat acquisition falls under the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

enhancement and replacement criteria that was outlined in the agreement. Katchemak Bay State Park was heavily oiled, although not in the specific area that is under consideration for purchase.

Just one more technical detail, as far as the decision making process of the Council goes, I don't understand how a body of more than three people would hope to approve projects on the basis of unanimous consent rather than a majority. It just seems like it would be really difficult to get anything done, and I question how that came about.

 1_0 Can I get a response to that?

MR. PENNOYER: Before we continue, we only have the 12teleconference net through 7:00 p.m. It's now about three 13minutes to 7:00. I don't know the Trustee Council's desires 14here, and ask the moderator if we can continue past 7:00 and then 15inform the network as to how long we want to continue. Do you 16have a feeling from the Trustee Council members?

MR. BARTON: Mr. McVee and I have a subsistence board smeeting this evening.

MR. PENNOYER: Okay. So how late do you wish to go then?

20 MR. BARTON: Not very much longer.

MR. PENNOYER: Shall we try and keep the net until 7:30 2then? Is that very much longer in your criteria, too, or is very much longer five minutes from now?

MR. McVEE: That will be fine.

MR. PENNOYER: Moderator of the teleconference network,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

can we continue through 7:30?

TELEPHONE OPERATOR: Yes, that's fine.

MR. PENNOYER: Fine. Thank you. Anybody want to respond to Ms. Wilson's question? Would you care to continue your testimony?

MS. WILSON: Really, that practically concludes my testimony, but I would like the Council to reconsider their position on trying to get a unanimous consent on getting these projects through because it just seems like a very -- it's a cumbersome enough process to begin with, as far as public participation and diversified interests and what should be priority, what the money should be spent on. I'd like them to process to begin with the money should be spent on.

- And, again, is there some sort of a legal reason that this was adopted or was this simply a matter of preference as far 15as the Council members go. Can anybody answer that question for 16me?
- MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, would you care to answer where a sthe unanimous consent came from?
- MR. COLE: No.
- MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. We've certainly heard your ltestimony, we've listened to the remarks in regard, particularly, to the land acquisition, and I think that is a topic for our discussion next Monday in terms of the '93 process, and I think lacontinuing in regard to the eminent threat and other processes.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

we want to approach that, except that I think we have agreed it is certainly in our kit of restoration tools.

Do you have further remarks, Mr. Rosier?

MR. ROSIER: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I didn't get the name of the last individual that testified.

MS. WILSON: My name is Narda Wilson. I'm a resident of Soldotna. I'm P.O. Box 3206, Soldotna. I've written letters to the Trustee Council and I'll be in further touch in the future. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Just for notice, I've been 10 around the net once. Kodiak has had two opportunities. I'm 11 probably not going to have time to do that more than one more 12 time. I think I'll take one from Anchorage and then try and go 13 around the net completely. Yes, sir.

MS. MILLER: I'll make this brief. I'm pleased that the 15Trustee Council approved the two projects for the Nature 16Conservancy's work to assist the Trustees in this cumbersome 17habitat acquisition process. I'm pleased there.

In terms of looking at what the Trustees were faced with, 19these reams of paper, I think the thing that is lost in the reams 20of paper is the voice of the people, which I'm pleased you're 1able to hear, especially from the outlying communities tonight.

2The reasons why people care so much about seeing habitat 2acquisition, the rationale for why it makes sense, some of that 24is in there, and I think it gets translated into a series of 25tables and machinated this way and that way by the computer, and

the human element of the public interacting with the Trustees is lost.

I would like to say that 90% of the just plain comments from the public related to habitat acquisition, and that over \$2 million worth of projects were proposed by both agencies, I assume, and the public for habitat acquisition. There are tremendous opportunities that we have not seen for the region that unfortunately was affected by the Oil Spill, and that the species that were injured stand to benefit over the long-run by having habitat available to them.

I guess I'm concerned because of the bureaucratic process 10f OMB's involvement and the Trustees needing -- at least on the 2federal side -- needing to get a list to them by a certain date 3 and if indeed what will be decided on Monday is what's going to 14go to OMB, then the fact that there's only the \$5 million 15proposal for habitat acquisition which is not enough, we believe, 16would be a start to do eminent threat analysis, may not even get 17on there is quite disturbing. What's more disturbing is the 18chart has little asterisks for the fact that habitat acquisition 19projects are just not listed. So instead of having price holder 20on a proposed budget to OMB for 200 -- well, it can't be 21\$200 million. You only have \$100 million this year, but you need 2to have a place holder up about 50% of your total product money 23for habitat acquisition.

Now, you may not be able to spend that in this time $_{25}$ period, and that will be fine. You can go back and say we did

not spend that, we've got it for something else for the next year, but if it's not in that place holder in your budget, we've already ruled out what we might spend money on next October or December or whenever the fiscal year ends.

So I urge you to seriously look forward for what opportunities you may have to do restoration work. And I realize that Trustee Council doesn't want to speak back to the public. It's our opportunity to present some things to you. I will present a proposal by the public for a proclamation that the people in the outlying areas may not have the benefit of seeing. I will give a copy of it to the public record so that it will go in, but it's something we thought would be tangible steps that Trustees could take to show that they are committed to habitat acquisition as a part of the restoration process, that there are accorded to the process of the concrete opportunities we can take now.

Finally, I'll say our society and all the people in this 16room share many values. We share concern about the environment, 17we share that American trait that money talks, money has value, 18and what the Restoration Plan is to me right now is that is that 19Trustees do not value habitat acquisition if there's no money 20shown for it.

21 Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Would you, please, state your name for the 23record?

MS. MILLER: Oh, I'm Pamela A. Miller. I'm representing 25the Wilderness Society in Alaska.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I'd like to say that we had some concerns about federal OMB's involvement in the process, and as we did State appropriation process through the legislature, budget and audit committee. But we satisfied ourselves that we could work through the federal OMB process. Frankly, I guess, there was no way around it. But I think that it will work out right.

Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with so gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with so gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about where we were with the gentleman? Isn't that about want of the set of the

- MS. MILLER: Well, I appreciate that, and hope you'll put 15the place holder in there for habitat acquisition.
- MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Next, I'll go back out to 17Homer. Anybody else from Homer wishing to testify?
- MS. WIELAND: Yes. As a matter of fact, there have been 1914 people here, and there's several of here still left. This is 20Anne Wieland; and that's A-n-n-e W-i-e-l-a-n-d. And I would like 21to thank the Trustee Council for this opportunity to address you.
- My testimony today is about the need to purchase habitat 23eminently threatened by logging. Perhaps, the most highly 24visible and of greatest concern to the public are the private 25lands within and adjacent to Katchemak Bay State Park. Private

R & R COURT REPORTERS

lands within this park are eminently threatened by logging by Timber Trading Company. This is pristine land of great value to wildlife injured in the Oil Spill, as well as to humans.

The coastline on both sides of Katchemak Bay was oiled in 1989. The Center for Disaster Assistance in Homer documented the arrival and impact of the Exxon Valdez oil in as far as Bear Cove, which is way up at the head of the bay, and daily bulletins from May until June. Many species of wildlife were injured by the oil in Katchemak Bay, including quite a number that are outlined in your three green volumes.

Murrelets, in particular, would be injured again if 10 private in-holdings were not acquired and logging were permitted ₁₂on Seldovia Native Association land. Marbled and kiplet 13 murrelets congregate at the mouth of Shady Cove, in Neptune Bay, $_{\parallel}$ 4at the mouth of Wosnesenski River, off Glacier Spit, as well as √selsewhere in Katchemak Bay. It's not surprising that no nests 16have been found in Katchemak Bay uplands in all those trees, as 17there's only been about 30 nests ever found in the entire region η_8 from Northern California to the Gulf of Alaska in the last 18 But juvenile marbled murrelets are seen in Katchemak Bay $\mathbf{1}_{0}$ every year, and they undoubtedly nest in both private and park As Prince William Sound populations were damaged 1uplands. 22considerably, Katchemak Bay uplands can serve as an excellent d₃equivalent habitat for maintaining sufficient numbers 4murrelets in the Gulf of Alaska while Prince William Sound √spopulations slowly recover. I guess they only have one egg a

year, at the best.

Archaeological resources were damaged elsewhere in the Spill area. Katchemak Bay archaeological resources are numerous and contain evidence important to the records for all of the Gulf of Alaska pre-history. Some of these resources are threatened by inundation. Others would surely be harmed by associated activities if logging were to occur on the south side of Katchemak Bay where the great concentration of known and yet undiscovered sites occur.

Recreational interests were damaged in the Oil Spill.

1 OFOR example, the Center for Alaskan Coastal studies had to cancel

1 lits entire summer's program in 1989 because of a lack of

1 2 transportation to its field station. Above all, the heart and

1 3 soul of Homer was damaged by the Oil Spill. Many here spent the

1 4 summer of 1989 concentrating on trying to heal the damage done to

1 5 Katchemak Bay State Park, Katchemak Bay State Wilderness Park and

1 6 surrounding areas by the Oil Spill.

We and other volunteers collected oiled, dead and living 18sea birds and otters from the beaches of Katchemak Bay, from 19Bishop's Beach to Diamond Creek and elsewhere. We collected 20plastic bags full of oil and oiled debris from Homer Spit, Mud 21Bay, Neptune and China Poot bays and other beaches. Some of us 22experienced first-hand a task involved in cleaning up 100% oiled 23beach and volunteer work at Mars Cove in Port Dick within 24Katchemak Bay State Wilderness Park. Many of us were left with a 25deep sense of violation and despair.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Now, here is a means at hand to make at least a partial restoration for the damage that was done, and that is, of course, the Exxon Valdez civil penalty money. Our backs are to the wall. Private owners of the land and timber rights within Katchemak Bay State Park may no longer be willing sellers after October 1, Timber Trading Company is aggressively pushing forward to obtain permits to log on private lands within the Park in direct line of sight from Homer, and they were in Seldovia working on the layout of logging roads just two weeks ago. The time to negotiate with them is now, not after they have their permits in 10 hand, perhaps as early as this winter. And why would they want $_{1}$ 1 to sell their timber rights after they have gone through all the 12time and expense of obtaining permits? Surely that extra work 1 3 would cause them and other logging companies around the whole 14spill region to want to sell to for a higher price is at all. 15Waiting until the permits are issued is playing a dangerous game 16of chicken. One where the stakes are too high. It's like $\sqrt{100}$ 18We must have funding now to keep the option of purchasing the ¶gland, timber and subsurface rights and preserving the integrity

Scientific studies are fine, but we're concerned that 2there will be no more habitat and wildlife left to study if the 3current trends continue. Logging in Katchemak Bay State Park 24will be like a second oil spill to many of us whose hearts were 25broken in 1989.

Please, help us. Don't turn us away. The purchase of private uplands, timber and subsurface rights in their entirety within Katchemak Bay State Park are exactly the kind of project that the penalty money was intended to fund. Future generations of Alaska will appreciate your wisdom in funding this project, and the wildlife injured in the Oil Spill will be given a new lease on life instead of a new death sentence.

Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Any comments and questions from the Trustee Council? Thank you, very much. I'll come back nonow to Anchorage.

My name is Karin Holser; K-a-r-i-n H-o-l-s-MS. HOLSER: 12e-r, and I'm just a concerned citizen, representing myself. 13 going to make it real brief because I know you're running out of $_{\parallel 4}$ time. I would like to go down the budget items, 'cause I know 15you were gonna do budget. I won't do that. Instead, I will 16throw out a quick comment. The American Heritage Dictionary 17defines a trustee as a person, agent holding title or property properties and sense ficiary. Looking at your budget, your beneficiary ∥gare your agencies, and I don't think that's right. I think the obeneficiary is Prince William Sound. And Prince William Sound 1 includes Natives. I don't see them represented here. includes all wildlife, includes water. It includes the people of 3the villages and the areas of fishermen that were affected. 4I see this whole budget pretty much as a funding process for your 5agencies, and I don't really think that's what a trustee is meant

to do, to fund their own agencies. Every single one of 'em that I looked at, I didn't have time to write it all down, but your agencies are all representative here, and I think -- I think the public deserves a little bit more than that.

MR. PENNOYER: Questions, comments from Trustee Council?

Thank you, very much. Go back out to, I think, Valdez had nobody the last time. Juneau, any further testimony from Juneau tonight?

MR. THOMA: One last comment, Mr. Chairman. This is Mr. Thoma. Just a quick question. Has the Public Advisory Group 10met yet, and have they adopted a rules of order?

- MR. PENNOYER: They've still not been up to -- we're not 12going to get around the net anyhow to -- other people haven't 13testified yet. The answer to your question is no, there's a 14charter; they have not met yet.
- MR. THOMA: Very good. Thanks for your time.
- 16 MR. PENNOYER: Anybody else from Juneau that wants to 17 testify?
- 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, that's it for Juneau.
- MR. PENNOYER: Okay, thank you. Seldovia, anybody else 20 from Seldovia? Cordova, anybody else from Cordova? Coming back 21 to Anchorage. Anybody else from Anchorage? Yes, sir.
- MR. COX: My name is Bill Cox; C-o-x. I'm a resident of 23Anchorage here. I'm a radiologist over at the Alaska Native 24Medical Center. I'm here just for myself. I just want to make 25some general comments.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

I supported House Bill 411. It was not a perfect bill, but I think it was a consensus bill that went through the entire political process with a lot of citizen input, and I was -- I just want to say I was disappointed in the Governor's veto of that bill. I just want to let you know I support using the majority of these funds for habitat acquisition, including the buy-back of timber rights, and I think this should go a long way towards protecting fishing streams, wildlife, and also enhancing recreation.

I would urge you to confine most of your repurchasing and 10efforts to Prince William Sound area, which is where the spill 11occurred, and that would also include Kodiak as well.

Identify critical areas for repurchase as quickly and as acarefully as possible, and then go ahead and complete the 4purchasing as quickly as possible. I think Katchemak Bay 5buy-back should be your first priority. This this has been 6lingering now for over 10 years. It seems to have defied all 7attempts at resolution. I think Koncor Forest Products and the 8Native Association have been more than patient, and I think it's 19about time to get this thing taken care of. And you have -- as I 20understand it, the power to do that. I would urge you to make 21that your first project.

Governor Hickel wrote a book a while back. I think it 23was called, "Who Owns America?" And in there, he criticized the 24US Congress for first authorizing to purchase land which would 25then drive the price up, and then the appropriations process

I just want to -- I don't really support the idea of an endowment. I think that would just drag things out. Waiting for it to accumulate sufficient funds, you would have inflation, administrative costs working against you. Also, during that to land prices would be going up, and it would also create lanother bureaucracy.

- And to just summarize real briefly here, as we're running 13 out of time, I would just say, please, be careful of doing too 14 much research, and furling away money into administrative costs, 15 if possible. And I would say spend this money that's available 16 as wisely as humanly possible. And then, you know, put yourself 17 out of business. That's all I have to say.
- 18 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Cox. Any questions or 19comments from the Trustee Council? Thank you, very much.
- I'll go back to Soldotna. Is there anyone in Soldotna 21wishing to testify?
- MS. MULLEN: Yes. My name is Peggy Mullen; M-u-l-l-e-n. 23I'm a Soldotna resident, and I just have a quick comment.
- I got here late, and as I was driving over I heard the accomments of Attorney General Cole on the radio, and so I thought

why am I even bothering to come here, this is just a farce. If get here and I'm wondering if we're all not wasting our time. I was surprised when I got here to hear that there wasn't any acquisition of habitat in any major way on your list of projects you're now considering, and I would just comment that when we look at the independent relationship between the air, the land, and the water, we're just beginning to know how the health and productivity of one is dependent on the other in ways we're only remotely beginning to understand. So ignoring acquisition of land around the affected areas makes no sense to me.

 1_0 Thanks.

- 1 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Questions or comments from the 12Trustee Council? Thank you, very much.
- $_{13}$ MR. COLE: I'd like to explain to this listener what we $_{14}$ have decided to date to do with respect to acquisition.
- MR. PENNOYER: Ms. Mullen, did you hear the review of 16what we did do today?
- MS. MULLEN: (Pause no audible response)
- MR. PENNOYER: I guess not. Well, again, I will repeat 19that we did review habitat acquisition process -- protection 20process today. We heard a detailed review. We have decided to 1proceed with two cooperative projects with the Nature Conservancy 2to hurry up the acquisition of data regarding a property out 3there and that it might be available and threats to that 24property. It is our intent to have that report back sometime 25early in December and proceed in the process of where we go from

there.

We had it pointed out to us there is a very large amount of habitat out there that is potentially available to development, and the choice of which parcels to buy to get the most bang for the bucks is not yet clear to us.

We also have the question, the '93 Work Plan, where we haven't taken action yet to purchase property, but the -- a project is listed there as a place holder to provide funding for such acquisition of property that might be subject to eminent threat. We have not yet decided on the amount of that place holder or exactly how we're going to -- whether we're going to ladopt it or how we're going to advance it. That will be decided here to provide funding for such acquisition of property that might be subject to eminent of threat. We have not yet decided on the amount of that place holder or exactly how we're going to -- whether we're going to holder or how we're going to advance it. That will be decided here to provide funding for advance it.

- So, could we continue with Anchorage -- anybody else in 14Anchorage? Yes, sir.
- MR.: Excuse me. I haven't been following today, I've leben pretty busy, but I would like to say
- MR. PENNOYER: Your name, please?
- 18 MR. SPARLIN: My name is Drew Sparlin. I'm a commercial 19 fisherman and 15-year resident in the Cook Inlet area.
- $_{20}$ MR. PENNOYER: You need to spell the last name, please.
- MR. SPARLIN: Sparlin; S-p-a-r-l-i-n. With regards to 2your last explanation, I think that stands pretty prudent that 3you would investigate the property before you go buy 'em. I'm 4not against acquisition, but I definitely think that the wise and 5slow manner taken in purchasing property without spending all the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

money we got.

25

What I'm here to explain real quick, we've had, in the fisheries, -- basically, that's what I know, of future forecasting. I'm sure Mr. Rosier is aware of it. It is due to an over-escapement problem, and we're gonna -- also, it's actually in the Inlet, and in-river problems keep going up to the Northern District -- but what I'm trying to get at is that due to the Oil Spill we have a future set of cycle that's died in a declining manner, and it needs to have -- I'm not saying it. d think we had it laid out before of the appropriate funds for 10 research, but we're looking for some sort of coverage for the 12to -- and I know that this is what they want in their process, 13but we could get this declining return rate under some sort of 14knowledge. Nobody really has a good handle on why. We think 1 5it's over-escapement, but it also -- who knows what. We've got a $\sqrt{6}$ declining rate of 500,000 to 250,000 -- this is in the next three $\sqrt{1}$ 7 years, and then possibly under 200,000 return in the Cook Inlet, ngor as far as the Kenai River system. And that's somethin' I have $\P_{ extsf{q}}$ onever seen before, and I've been fishing there for 15 years. \neq_0 It's somethin' we have to watch out for. We had a fair season 1 this year -- I mean, it's one of those things, but I'm hoping 12 that some of your funds are played towards the bio-stock. 3basically, some sort of data research so we can start figuring 4this thing out.

That's about it. As far as the land appropriations, I

R & R COURT REPORTERS

know there's a lot of people all over the countryside that want this piece and that piece to be purchased, and it's gonna be a hard time to ever get anybody happy, but definitely make the best investments.

Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you, very much.

I'll go back out to Kodiak. Anybody further from Kodiak who wishes to testify? Kodiak?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Kodiak has no further testimony.

10 MR. PENNOYER: Okay. Thank you, very much. Homer, 11 anybody further from Homer?

MS. HIGHLAND: Yes. My name is Roberta Highland; and 13R-o-b-e-r-t-a H-i-g-h-l-a-n-d, and I'm representing myself and 14the Katchemak Bay Conservation Society.

And once, again, we urge you to give priority to funding 16land acquisition in spill affected areas in danger of 17clear-cutting or loss through other development. And the subject 18has been brought up a lot, and I think all has been covered. So 19we just want to go on record supporting that, and urging careful 20 and responsible use of the Exxon funds.

21 Thank you.

25

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much. Comments from the 23Trustee Council? Thank you. Anybody else from Anchorage? Yes, 24sir.

MR. DEBUSMAN: My name is Richard Debusman; D-e-b-u-s-m-

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Thank you.

10 MR. PENNOYER: Questions? Thank you, very much. Homer, 110ne last try?

MS. HILLSTRAND: Yes, this is Homer. Can you hear me 130kay?

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, we can.

MS. HILLSTRAND: Yeah, this is Nancy Hillstrand; H-i-l-16s-t-r-a-n-d. And we really -- we need to think on a large scale 17what will do the most good for the longest periods of time to 18enhance the diversity of as many of injured species. The obvious 19choice is acquiring essential habitat and ecosystems. But if 20resource agencies have faulty mandates, regulations or motives or 21if they do not work together to keep in mind all of the 22cumulative effects of decisions or lack of decisions, we end up 23with a toxic, fragmented environment which alienates fish and 24wildlife, regardless of what we do to restore, rehabilitate or 25enhance.

One thing we have to remember is that we're nowhere close to being immune to future oil spills which can once again degrade our ecosystem. So restorative activities may be short-lived. We must begin to think in terms of ecosystems, river systems, watersheds, peninsulas, continents. We have to start thinking large. Systems which work together as a whole to provide a living community of unfragmented working order, which we are a part of, not a part from. Ecosystems are like a helicopter. Tiny cotter pins hold all the bolts in place from shaking loose. If one of these essential components are taken away, the entire nosystem may crash. The more components lost, the more likelihood the system will, for certain, crash.

Resource management has evolved through the years 13tripping over mistakes and learning the hard way at a tremendous 14loss. Alaska is in the unique situation to revolutionize our 15methods of resource management ahead of crisis management 16situations.

Do we have the knowledge and wisdom to take the lead and spioneer a new sustainable direction while our ecosystems are spitial relatively intact in Alaska? I have faith that we do.

Mr. Cole, you were wondering why the people are asking 1 for land acquisition such as in Katchemak Bay State Park. Upland 2 areas are some of the most important areas we have. It's a 3 trickle-down effect, and it has -- we have to have the ability to 2 4 develop a broader landscape context; precise, specific forest 2 5 practices to shape the future health of our ecosystems.

The upland areas act as a reservoir, storing surplus runoff and dampening discharge fluctuations. The associated
vegetation has a profound effect on the physical makeup of the
stream habitat as well as a biological communities who utilize
these areas. This helps maintain perennial slows during dry
periods. Low flows reduce the availability and quality of stream
-- in-stream habitat for fish and wildlife populations.

Can you see the connection here? The two areas which I think should be set aside is one on Afognak Island. This is an essential ecosystem which embraces a multitude of wildlife and of 10 this. It's sustains life in a balanced design of precise 11 detailed integrity. Please, consider this north Pacific rain 12 forest which was heavily impacted by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill 13 as a choice of quality habitat acquisition. And, please, contact 14 me if you need any additional information on this area, 'cause 15 I've spent the last 14 years observing this tremendous living 16 ecosystem.

Also, the other place is the Katchemak Bay State Park.

18This land will be fragmented if logging is allowed. This

19translates to the fragmentation of an ecosystem not only utilized

20by wildlife, waterfowl and fish species affected by the Oil

21Spill, but also by this ecosystem as a living testimony to we

22humans so deeply, deeply affected by the Spill here in Homer.

I really cannot explain how deeply we were affected. I $_{24}$ hope you are listening to us, as we are the public, and we are $_{25}$ trying to get to you and try to explain to you how we are

feeling, and the overall judgment of the people right now is that we feel that habitat is the best way to go. So, please, do listen.

And I think you, very kindly, for all this time you're spending listening to us. Good-bye.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much. We're running out of time on the network. I'll take one more from Soldotna, and then we'll come back to Anchorage. I would say we have already agreed to a public hearing on next Monday as well, so for those of you who haven't had a chance to testify, hopefully, you will 10then. Soldotna, do you have anybody else?

- 1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, we have no one else at this 12time. Thank you.
- 13 MR. PENNOYER: That's fine. I'll take one more from 14Anchorage then.
- 15 MR. GIBBONS: See if there's anyone else on the line.
- MR. PENNOYER: Yes. The question was is there anybody 17else on the line before we go off? That's fine. I circled all 180f the communities. Yes, ma'am.
- MS. McBRIDE: Thank you, Trustee Council members. I'm 20Diane McBride, a resident of Homer. I wish to thank you for 1 considering my name for a nomination to serve on the Advisory 2 Council. I was disappointed to see that of the 17 members 2 serving on the Advisory Board, only two are women. I think -- I 2 4do not feel that this is totally representative of our population 25 in Alaska, and I would like to encourage you to consider

R & R COURT REPORTERS

replacements, when they come in. I was distressed that three of the public at-large selections today were nominated or endorsed by Attorney General Cole or Mr. McVee.

It was an incredible shock to many Alaskans when Governor Hickel vetoed House Bill 411 last July. He had stated he supported Katchemak Bay State Park buy-back, but it appears that's only through his endowment plan. It indeed is the end of the road for Katchemak Bay. It's becoming a logging road in '93.

Katchemak Bay wasn't documented as oil spill affected, and the habitat is critical to wildlife and fisheries, and lodeserves protection before logging permits are issued, which locally as this winter. If December 1st is the date locally that Fish & Game will submit their list of eminently threatened locally are short on action time for protecting locally action and the spill affected, and spill affected, and the habitat is critical to wildlife and fisheries, and locally action to be spill affected, and spill affected, and spill affected, and spill affected, and the habitat is critical to wildlife and fisheries, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action to wildlife and fisheries, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action to wildlife and fisheries, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action to wildlife and fisheries, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action action to be spill affected, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action to be spill affected, and locally action action to be spill affected, and locally action to be spill affected.

- I urge you to put Katchemak Bay State Park buy-back at 16the top of your '93 Work Plan, and let Katchemak Bay have the 17first dollar spent on restoration. But let's see more than 18\$5 million spent on habitat acquisition, and right now it appears 19to be closer to zero dollars funded.
- Please, begin communications with private land owners along, please, promote restoration through habitat acquisition.

 Thank you.
- MR. PENNOYER: Any questions? Mr. Gibbons.
- $_{24}$ MR. GIBBONS: Just a correction. The December decision $_{25}$ will come from the Restoration Team, not the Alaska Department of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Fish & Game. So it will be by the trusteed agencies on the eminent threat processes.

MS. McBRIDE: And I'll accept that correction. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much. It's now 7:30. What are your wishes?

MR. COLE: I think we should hear out everyone who is here, even if they're off the line. I would like to do that.

MR. PENNOYER: How many more wish to testify here? Okay, fine. Goodness. Yes, sir.

MR. BURKHOLDER: My name is Jim Burkholder; B-u-r-k-h-o-11l-d-e-r. I'm a resident of Anchorage. I've lived in Alaska my 12entire life.

After listening to Mr. Cole's comments earlier and the 14evidence of the budget with lack of money, and I would have to 15say unfortunate will on the part of the Trustees for land 16acquisition, I think it's a sad case. It takes land to have a 17habitat. Once old growth forests, as in a case that we have in 18Katchemak Bay State Park or Afognak Island, or any place, once 19that's gone, it's gone, period. Your lifetime, your son's 20lifetime, your grandson's lifetime, and maybe even their 1great-grandson's lifetime, that's it. They're not gonna see that 22again. And I would especially urge you to try to see your way to 23saving some of these habitats. And I have always had a 24philosophy of doing something for the greater good for the 25greater number. And I think of Katchemak Bay State Park, it is

the end of the road where people see it, perhaps, from any other area that we're talking about, as far as impact on the Spill, and I would hate to see a sign at the top of the road, coming into Homer, that would say: This has been renamed. It's the Walter J. Hickel clear-cut. And I think that's a sad testimony. The Governor, Mr. Cole has stated they're in favor for it. Well, fine. Let's have more than just be in favor for it. Let's see you work and do something about it. It may be the last chance we have, because once the trees are cut, they're gone.

Thank you, very much.

10 MR. PENNOYER: Questions? Thank you. Who's is next? Go 11ahead, ma'am.

MS. TAYLOR: I'm Connie Taylor, and I'd like to address, 13briefly, the land acquisition and timber buy-backs. I see 14something missing from the whole equation that I hear discussed, 15and I've been watching the Trustee Council since it was 16disappointed, and that is the jobs that are going to be lost as a 17result of this land acquisition and buy-back. These jobs are 18going to be lost, essentially, forever, and yet I hear no talk 19about any method of replacing jobs for the people who are going 20to be displaced. Once the land is removed from the potential of 21development, no one has an opportunity to work, and those logging 2jobs -- the other jobs that might be available as a result of 23that land. I think timber certainly is a renewable resource, and 24we need to consider it as such.

Thank you.

25

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. GRAHAMS: Hi. My name is John Grahams, and I was born and raised around here, and I was curious why you didn't entertain public taking in eminent domain. And I have a letter here to you that you should consider that as an alternative, and particularly like in the Katchemak Bay State Park that would be a fair and equitable means of acquiring that property.

The property right across the street, the Municipal parking lot, was acquired by Mayor Tony Knowles from Chancy Croft. The big advantage to the seller is that they don't have to pay taxes on that money, which is a tremendous advantage.

1 So they're usually happy.

Now, when I was -- I lost property on Fourth Avenue after 13the Earthquake, and they took our property by eminent domain to 14build a buttress there between E and C Street. The only problem 15with that was that they used post-Earthquake prices. So in case 16there's -- the values are down after the Oil Spill, then I would 17recommend that you take pre-Oil Spill prices as well as present 18comparable sales in order to get a fair market value, and here's 19my letter.

20 Thank you.

 $_{21}$ MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Next? Yes, ma'am.

MS. POST: My name is Sue Post; P-o-s-t. I grew up in 23Homer, so I've spent quite a bit of time down there. I know the 24area very well, and I don't believe that logging is the answer. 25I think there's a lot more than can be gained with the tourism

R & R COURT REPORTERS

and the education aspect of it. I currently am the director of Trailside Discovery Camp, an environmental education camp based here in Anchorage. And we have used Katchemak Bay, and most recently Prince William Sound quite a bit this summer, probably one-fourth to one-fifth of our camp residents spent their time down in Katchemak Bay.

I can't explain the joy to you that seeing those children's faces after a week of kayaking and also camping out in the Katchemak Bay area, also in the Prince William Sound area. The children are like flowers that blossom in their week down 10 there, and when they get back up to Anchorage, they're a whole $1 \mid 1$ new person. They've found a whole sense of joy and peacefulness I also have spent a lot of time in the public schools --12 within. 13teaching in the public schools up here in Anchorage, and don't 1/4see that same joy. The kids need to get outside, they need to 15see that. We spend a lot of time at our camp trying to teach 'em 16about habitat, teaching them about how everything is all tied in 17together. The plants are all tied into the people which are all $_{18}$ tied into the water which are all tied in to the Earth. It's \P_9 really hard -- it was -- I talked about the joy I saw on these 20kids' faces after a week. At the same time it was really hard to describe the disappointment I saw in their faces when we told 12 them that this area might possibly be logged here in the future. 3 I am an educator, and I do believe that the children are our 24 future, but I don't think that it's fair for us not give them a 5future to look forward to.

Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Any questions? Thank you, very much. I'm told that through some miracle of modern technology, Homer is still on the line. Is there anyone from Homer that wants to testify?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Everyone from here now has testified. There were several others, but I did fax their testimony to your office, and they have left at the present time.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much. Appreciate that. Who is next from Anchorage?

MR. COUMBE: My name is Mike Coumbe; it's C-o-u-m-b-e.

1 And I just wanted to say that if you want to do something to show

2 that you're interested in getting this repurchase of lands within

3 the state park at Katchemak Bay going, put something -- when you

4 meet on Monday, put something in the budget. Make a statement.

5 I mean, put -- put some money in for a negotiator to meet with

6 the parties to come up with the proper price for the land, the

7 land of timber and subsurface rights. Let them know that you

8 actually do want to get this process going.

19 That's all I have to say.

20 MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Let me say that the process has not been 22allowed to lie fallow. The Governor's former chief of staff and 23senior counselor, Max Hodel, has been meeting with people from 24the owner groups, and I'm sure he's continuing to do that. I 25don't know where it is right this date. The last I knew about it

R & R COURT REPORTERS

was a week or 10 days ago, but I do know that efforts are continuing.

MR. COUMBE: I applaud that. Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you, very much. Other testimony? Yes, ma'am.

MS. DAWSON: My name is Belle Dawson; D-a-w-s-o-n. I've been an Anchorage resident for 20 years, and I continue to be frustrated and I just feel like it's a waste of time talking to people who are really not interested in enhancing the environment or in preserving the habitat or anything. They are totally $\mathbf{1}$ ninterested in their own greed, as it were. I really am just very $1 \mid 1$ frustrated about it. It's very magnanimous of Mr. Cole to listen 12to us, getting past the time, but I find it appalling that you've 13been working on this for a number of months and -- how long has $_{\parallel}4$ it been now -- over a year, and nothing, apparently, has Has it? I can't see that. You say it's being ₁5happened. 16 negotiated, but I don't see anything happening. I certainly urge $\sqrt{1}$ 7you, as everybody else has, to fund what needs to be funded and seriously consider the buy-back of Katchemak Bay. I just feel η_{0} what somebody else said, without habitat there is nothing, obecause wildlife needs a place to live, and here you have an 1 opportunity to do something concrete that would show the people 20f Alaska, many of whom you have heard representatives today, and 33I'm sure it has gone in one ear and out the other. I watched ₂₄Mr. Cole twitching and squirming, but I don't think any of it 5really sunk in. And I just -- I just feel very frustrated about

it, and I would love to have you prove me wrong. I would love to see some serious -- you know, some serious action to acquiring critical habitat and making a difference. I know the government and the Governor doesn't want to do that, but he -- you know, in the political process, he should be able to get around that. I don't think we can look for any help from Mr. Cole. Prove me wrong.

Thank you for listening, if you are, indeed, listening. If you have any questions, I don't imagine what they would be, but if you have any questions, please ask them.

- 10 MR. COLE: Do you think you've helped the process by your 11 remarks this evening?
- 1_2 MS. DAWSON: I hope so, but I doubt it very seriously.
- 1 MR. COLE: I would suggest that you might be right.
- MS. DAWSON: Yeah, I doubt it. Because I have come from 15similar meetings and I always have the same impression, that 16people are conducting the meetings are doing it because it's a 17requirement and that they're required to have public input, and 18they just go on and do what they were going to do any way. So, 19well, I probably haven't helped, but I -- I don't know. What 20would help, Mr. Cole? Well?
- $_{21}$ MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much.
- $_{22}$ MS. DAWSON: Well, what would? You tell me, $_{23}$ Mr. Pennoyer.
- $_{24}$ MR. PENNOYER: Well, I think that we certainly have -- $_{25}$ although we didn't buy anything today, I think we certainly

R & R COURT REPORTERS

initiated some projects and some steps, and I don't think it's -- I know we certainly have a lot of public input as to property they want to see bought. We also have maps shown to us that have a lot of other property that could be bought that also will be subject to potential development at some point down the line.

MS. DAWSON: Good, well,

MR. PENNOYER: We still need bang for the bucks in terms of restoration, and I hope that we will show you it within the next few months that we have the will to do what information shows us we should do.

MS. DAWSON: I know, but the time is so short. You know, 11it's practically October 1st, and, you know, the summer is not 12around the corner, and here it appears, you know, you're still 13dragging your feet, trying to decided amounts and this and that.

MR. PENNOYER: I think the recognition of a rather 15massive amount of information out there on the various types of 16lands that are available, what they may be subject to, is some 17indication that you can't just go out and look over your shoulder 18and write a check.

19 MS. DAWSON: Well, is it possible then to extend the 20deadlines?

MR. PENNOYER: Well, that's been suggested tonight, the 2question of whether in fact what the time angle is for some of 3these developments and what we might to do about it. There have 4been suggestions of various types of moratoria that have been 5brought up and

MS. DAWSON: Yes, well, you can do something about that.

MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Well, thank you.

MS. DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. PENNOYER: Any other questions? Mr. Sandor.

MR. SANDOR: Yes. You mentioned time, and the settlement actually was made late last year. The settlement itself, I think, was a step in the right direction to

MS. DAWSON: I don't think it was merely enough, but that's my opinion.

MR. SANDOR: Well, the reason I asked the question was 10because the Amoco Cadiz, which spilled six times as much oil off 11the coast of France 14 years ago was in litigation for 14 years, 12and it was just settled, and settled for only something less than 13\$280 million.

MS. DAWSON: That's a point that I don't think they -- I 15don't think you can really make a comparison because this is a 16totally different kind of situation.

MR. SANDOR: Well, I guess, the question though is it asseems that that was a theft, and I share your frustration that symbol you put that in perspective, the Governor and Attorney General negotiated this settlement in a remarkably short time, and the alternative of that dragging on for years in litigation must be some sort of consolation to all of us, and that's, I aguess, the question: Isn't that an accomplishment that we can apput some hope in?

MS. DAWSON: Well, I think if the motivation had been

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. PENNOYER: Next from Anchorage? Yes, sir.

MR. MAHAFFEY: My name is Jim Mahaffey. I'm a resident

810 N STREET 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 277-0572 272-7515 272-3022

24

25

of Anchorage. The spelling on that last name is M-a-h-a-f-f-e-y.

Most -- practically every point that I would make tonight has already been covered and covered very well, and so I don't intend to take any more of your time to go into that.

There is one point that I -- one exception that I would make, that being that if you look at logging as an alternative to jobs and economics, that's true, but it's true only in a very, very short run. What are we talking about, four, five, six, seven years on logging?

Conversely to that, there's one point that I would bring 10up and make, and that concerns tourism. Tourism, too, is a 1/1 viable industry, and I haven't heard that spoken to tonight, and 12I'm not in the tourism business. It's inconceivable to me, in η_3 terms of common sense, maybe not in terms of political machinery $_{\parallel}$ 4and mechanics, but certainly in terms of common sense, it's 15inconceivable to me that the administration -- the present $_{\parallel}$ 6administration which has been -- and I don't have figures in the notion of dollars, but I know it's more than one, on promotion $\eta_{\rm g}$ by television ads in the Lower 48 to promote tourism in Alaska. \P_{Q} And then on the other hand, turn around and consider and allow oclear-cutting in one of the most beautiful, pristine areas that $\mathbf{1}_1$ is readily accessible to tourists who are not on tour ships, who 2don't have to take a state ferry to get there, they can drive 3there, if that's the only means that they have, and with a short 24water taxi that costs 25 or \$30.00, not hundreds of dollars, can √sbe in one of the most pristine, clean environments that we have

in the state of Alaska. I haven't hear that spoken to tonight.

Cutting it off short, the man from Anchorage, I didn't get his name, who admonished you to do something -- do something, even if it's a 25 cent allocation, do something to indicate to Seldovia Natives and Timber Trading that the State is in good faith and is proceeding forward with some sort of procedure. I have to go by whatever means of information is available to the average citizen, which is a newspaper and a news release, and if I hear correctly, October 1st is the deadline. If those guys are serious, you better do something.

- And I would close by saying that you are the trustees, 1 you folks do have the power to do something, and I would admonish 1 you to do so.
- 13 MR. PENNOYER: Thank you. Questions of the Trustee 14Council? Thank you, very much. Anybody else from Anchorage 15tonight? Yes, sir.
- MR. LEVINE: Hello. My name is Jim Levine. I'll say I
 17just wish to speak to -- add my own weight to the testimony that
 18I've heard tonight regarding acquisition of habitat; be it Prince
 19William Sound, Katchemak Bay or Kodiak, and any of the other
 20areas that were affected by the Spill. I personally spent time
 21in (indiscernible) Cove, which is Katchemak Bay State Wilderness
 22Park, as everyone spoke to, and -- well, I lost a lot of
 23heartfelt times down there. And I'd like to see some of this
 24money -- quite a bit of this money, I should say, spent on that
 25acquisition types of proposals.

Thank you for listening to us.

MR. PENNOYER: Any questions? Thank you, very much. Anybody else? Yes.

MS. BRODIE: I'm Pamela Brodie; that's B-r-o-d-i-e, representing the Sierra Club.

I'd like to thank you very much for appointing me to the Public Advisory Committee. When I first submitted my name, I did not expect that. I would also like to thank you for staying so long to listen to us, and particularly to thank Attorney General Cole, who consistently protects the public's ability to comment.

10 I think, perhaps, Mr. Cole has been unfairly attacked this 1 evening.

But I would like to speak to some things that Mr. Cole 13has said that I disagree with, and one is a matter of Congress's 14intent in passing the Native Claims Settlement Act. I believe 15Congress passed that act to compensate the Native people of 16Alaska for their legitimate claims to land. I don't believe that 17Congress had an intent for the land to be either protected or 18logged, that that was to be left to the owners. Since then, 19Congress has, on some occasions, shown some intent to protect 20some of that land, including by buying some of it in Southeast 1Alaska, and recently the House of Representatives certainly has 22shown an intent to protect some land with the Energy Bill, and it 23remains to be seen whether the Senate will agree with them.

 $_{24}$ Mr. Cole also mentioned the fact that -- he said that $_{25}$ Governor Hickle is very much in favor of protecting Katchemak

R & R COURT REPORTERS

1 syour chain saws.

could have vetoed some parts of those appropriations and not other parts, including keeping the full 11 million or some part of that for Katchemak Bay.

Going on to other things regarding what has happened today, I was very disappointed that the agencies do not -- are not, in their proposal, supporting the proposals for habitat 10acquisition, except for threatened lands, and I do think that $_{1}$ 1 $_{1}$ 5 million for threatened land is completely inadequate. But I ₁₂also think that it's a very bad precedent to spend money only on 13 land which has an eminent threat, because I think then the $_{\parallel}$ 4message to the owners is you will get action only if you warm up

I would like to see the Trustee Council this winter spend 16 $\sqrt{100}$ 7 some money to acquire habitat, some of it that is threatened and \parallel_{8} some of it that it is not eminently threatened. I think that -- \P_9 and this is very, very important -- I think that the Trustees do onot have to go through the entire process of prioritizing the pland before they buy some.

do applaud your actions in funding the Nature 22 3 Conservancy's projects. I think that that workshop that will get 4together, the experts, they will be able to agree on some habitat √sthat's very valuable and that the Trustees can go ahead and

acquire some habitat in each of the regions that was affected by the Oil Spill -- the actual areas of the Prince William Sound, the Kenai Peninsula, including Katchemak Bay, and the Kodiak area.

It's okay to go ahead and buy some good habitat even if it isn't necessarily the very best that you will find in your ultimate process. I also think that it's important -- very important to start talking to all of the land owners and get the process moving before you decide which is the best land to buy. I think that the flow chart that the agencies have submitted 10 which has talking -- beginning negotiations with the land owners, $1 \mid 1$ very far down in the process. It's a very bad idea because what ₁₂will happen is you choose the land that's the best habitat, but 13that particular land will become very expensive, whereas, I $_{\parallel}4$ think, if you talk -- if the agencies are talking to land owners 15and asking them for prices, and also for conditions under which 16they will sell their land or development rights, that we can get $\sqrt{100}$ 7 some prices out on the table before certain areas are selected as pleing extremely valuable for habitat.

When I talk about the parameters, I mean, for example, 20 some corporations will say "we will not sell fee simple title, we 21 sell developing rights." It would be helpful to know that right 22 away. It would also be helpful to know which owners are not 23 willing to sell portions of their properties, they will sell only 24 an entire parcel and not portions of it. There's no use for the 25 agencies spending money to find out exactly the best acre on the

parcel.

Another problem with the process that the agencies are proposing is, for one thing, I think the list of species that were -- that use uplands was inadequate, not including harlequin ducks, as Mr. Sandor pointed out, or bald eagles. Also did not include shell fish in estuaries which will be affected if there is logging and erosion, and also, therefore, the animals that live off shell fish, like sea otters, as well as, of course, the humans who use these resources for subsistence and commercial and sport.

The damage services seem to have been forgotten by the lagencies. They talk about animals, wildlife that has been lost, but they are not proposing studies of the damaged services or compensation, and that would include subsistence and recreational tales as well as sport fishing and recreation and tourism that was smentioned in some testimony.

I think Mr. Cole's suggestion for a more informal 17dialogue with the staff is excellent, and I would hope that the 18Trustees would give the staff directions -- as has been said by 19some other people to simplify what they give the Trustees, 20because when you come in to find two inches of pieces of paper of 21lists and lists of things, it certainly becomes very difficult to 22make a decision, and I think that the staff could be more helpful 31in putting forward different choices that you can make.

Oh, regarding the land values. I would respectfully a specific speculating on the prices

that forest lands will command. After all, the prices that have been negotiated on Katchemak Bay and the prices that are being asked on Afognak average about \$1,000.00 an acre less, and yet the gentleman who testified suggested \$1,000.00 an acre was at the lowest end of the price range, and I think it's unlikely that the price that Afognak would be asking in the Katchemak is negotiated at the low end. There is no reason to think that this would not be average prices or more. If we base these -- our ideas of what these lands are gonna cost on timber that has been sold already, remember that the corporations are likely to have logged their most valuable -- most profitable areas first, and that that should not at all be considered average of what forest land will cost.

Also, I think Montague Island would be -- would raise the 14value of -- the price at the high end of the scale, but it is 15not, according to its owner, even for sale. So that should not 16be considered as part of the average prices. And certainly the 17prices that should be considered in determining lands, should be 18the net profits the companies would make from logging their 19lands, and some companies have been logging lands and ending up 20with net losses. And so, in those cases, timber lands ought to 21be pretty cheap.

Finally, in Mr. Montague's presentation, he said that of $_{23}$ the proposals, 50% of the money that was being proposed would be $_{24}$ for public and 50% for private proposals. And maybe I'm not $_{25}$ following that very well, but it seemed to me strange the way

Thank you.

acquisition.

10

11

24

25

MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I may have missed something here in the day's adiscussions because in light of much of the public comment, I aseem to -- my understanding was that with respect to the money savailable in the forthcoming year for the acquisition of habitat, and no matter what process we employ, was that there was to be no roumber put in there, that there was to be a provision in the sbudget in the form of sort of a contingency plan of undetermined amount so that we would essentially have no limit, that the odiscussion was that \$5 million may be regarded as inadequate by many people, might be regarded as inadequate by the Trustees, and a decision was, as I understood it, was to have that amount annimited.

Now, did I misunderstand what we did?

MR. PENNOYER: Mr. Cole, I think we did not take an

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: That it was not to be zero. It was not to be 105 million, but it was to be such a number as after we got some 11preliminary information we could come up with a number that 12seemed appropriate. So I think everybody should -- I would like 13them to have an understanding. That was my understanding.

We did not make that decision.

- MR. PENNOYER: We did not adopt that proposal at this 15stage. It's on the schedule for next Monday.
- MR. COLE: It's an open, sort of, issue right now.
- MR. PENNOYER: It's an open issue right now, that's agreement. The testimony is germane.
- MR. COLE: We're not boxed in at zero or five or anything 20else, it's still an open. And, you know, as I recall, let's talk 21about the public and the private, those expenditures. As I 22recall, during the last legislative session when we got this 23approval of the process through the State Legislature that the 24legislature insisted that all contracting, except for 25administrative expenses, be through state and federal agencies.

It was not, I think, well received by members of the Trustee Council, but that was a legislative requirement.

Am I not right on that? I think so. So that was sort of foist dishonest by the Legislature. And it was, as I recall my testimony, we wanted to write the contract, you know, outside the state and federal agencies where it might be appropriate and didn't get that. So -- and that the decision was well, if it didn't work well during this year, we might go back to the Legislature next year and try to be freed of that restraint. That's item two.

Item three is, with respect to this habitat or land 10 $_{1}$ acquisition. In a broader sense, it's been my thought that we 12should try to be creative with respect to habitat acquisition and 13 seek various types of agreements with owners so as to enable us 14to get a broader bang for the buck. I mean, you know what's 15troubled me is you look at these lands, Sheet (ph) A and so $_{\parallel 6}$ forth, where we saw on the slides there would be three red -- you $\sqrt{1}$ 7know, for threatened acquisition. If we go in and we buy that, 18 you know, then the land owner the next year, I'm sure, will go to $\P_{ extstyle 0}$ the next bay over and say, well, I'm going to log it this year, oand then the next year, and we'll be chasing that respective 1 logging area, you know, interminably. So, it's long been my not to look maybe geven in some checker boarding. I'm not sure that's a solution. 4More than simply seize this particular tract of habitat and have 5everything else, you know, alongside it six months later or the

next year, subject to the chain saw. I mean, we just have to be very, very careful of how we go about the acquisition process. Not only the selection of lands themselves but the selection process.

You, in part, touched upon it, but we don't want to get trapped into, you know, paying highest dollar value for some. We have to proceed very carefully if we're going to be able to require the greatest amount of habitat, and it troubles me, and, frankly, I'll say this as we talk about habitat along streams, are we only going to go out -- you know, are we only going to go out -- I mentioned a half-mile or quarter-mile on each side? So 1 that what we have is some strip of greenery along streams and the 1 2 rest clear cut? I mean, you know, I just -- we just can't do 1 3 that, in my view.

So, I would like people, generally, to know that the sacquisition process has to be very carefully done. In my view, how experts as to how to do that. What splanning should be done so when, in my view, we only identify shis habitat, et cetera, et cetera, as how long ago is about the spacquisition process. I think we need expert counsel, because how 're -- we need people who do this, as I've said before, for a splitting to help us formulate what I still call a grand plan.

So that's what I will be talking about when we get to that next time, when we get to there in November or something.

MS. BRODIE: May I say

24

25

MR. PENNOYER: Yes, go ahead.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MS. BRODIE: I did understand that the Trustees have not yet decided how much money to put into land acquisition, and I was saying I was disappointed in the agency's proposals, that the amount was that limited, and I hope that the Trustees will allocate much more than that.

MR. COLE: Excuse me. The reason I mentioned it, I think some of the other people who spoke earlier expressed the view that there was zero there was not enough money aside, but that's an open issue.

MS. BRODIE: I've also been disappointed that agencies' 10proposals, in terms of process, have been, I think, so 11complicated, and make it difficult, but that's in my written 12comments.

- I can't remember what else I was going to say.
- MR. PENNOYER: I'll give you another shot in time next 15Monday, I think.
- MS. BRODIE: I won't be able to be here.
- 1_7 MR. PENNOYER: Oh, okay. I will.
- MS. BRODIE: Thank you.
- MR. PENNOYER: Yes, thank you, very much. Anybody else anothere who wishes to testify? Mr. Parker.
- MR. PARKER: Good evening, gentlemen. My name is 22Jeff Parker. I think most of you probably know me by now as a 3frequent spokesperson before the Council. I have just walked in 24late, but I did catch the end of Attorney General Cole's remarks, 25 and I would like to simply reiterate a point that I think I've

R & R COURT REPORTERS

made at various times in prior testimony before the Council, and that is, I think, if you are focussed on acquisition, as I think in substantial measure you will be and should be, there are two questions involved:

There's acquisition of lands, where? Habitat bears some relationship to the resources that are injured, and there is acquisition to land -- of lands where the services from the resources that are acquired bear some relationship to the resources or the services that are injured. Because most of the injuries are below the high tide line, it is very difficult to loacquire privately owned resources. In fact, there are probably linone to replace lost or injured resources, and similarly, even labove the -- I'm sorry?

- 13 MR. COLE: I missed that last sentence. Would you 14 restate that?
- MR. PARKER: Okay. Because
- MR. COLE: It's difficult to acquire
- MR. PARKER: It's very -- lands below the ordinary high a swater mark are public lands -- all that?
- MR. COLE: Okay.
- MR. PARKER: Are subject to public trust. You don't have lands out there to acquire below the high tide line -- the lands out there to acquire below the high tide line -- the lands are uplands that bear some relationship to resources that are injured, such as fish or some labeled species such as harlequins and, perhaps, murres -- excuse labeled murrelets, but the resource -- the habitats there to

acquire are probably fairly narrow. And I think you will do much better to focus on acquiring upland lands where those -- the resources upon those lands bear some relationship to the services that were injured and the consent decree accommodates that. Otherwise, you'll be in a position where you will not really effectively be able to spend \$900 million. In other words, I think it's very difficult to buy \$900 million worth of lands or conservation easements on privately owned lands that bears some relationship to the injuries to resources, but it's very easy to buy \$900 million worth of lands that bear some relationship to

- That's my sole point. I think we all understand the 12concepts of services and baseline, and we're storing services to 13baseline condition. If we don't, I'd be pleased to try and 14explain it further.
- MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, Mr. Parker. Questions from 16Trustee Council? Thank you, very much.
- MR. PARKER: Thanks.
- MR. PENNOYER: Anybody else tonight?
- 19 MR. COLE: Well put. Thank you.
- MR. PENNOYER: Thank you, very much. We'll see some of 2 1you back here next month, I presume, 8:30 in the morning. 2 2Trustee Council, any further observations before we quit -- 2 3 recess? Mr. Sandor.
- $_{24}$ MR. SANDOR: Yes, I have a mandatory in Juneau Tuesday $_{25}$ morning, and I would trust that the public comment period would

R & R COURT REPORTERS

be scheduled at a time in which I could at least catch the last plane to Juneau.

MR. PENNOYER: I would hope so, too. I have a mandatory meeting here Tuesday morning, and I don't know how long it's going to take us to go through the '93 Work Plan, but we sort of have to do that first. We will do our best.

Thank you all. Good night.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

R & R COURT REPORTERS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) SS. STATE OF ALASKA I, Rebecca Nelms, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, residing at Anchorage, Alaska, and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify: THAT the annexed and foregoing is a Transcript of the Teleconference Meeting of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Settlement Trustee Council, taken on the 14th day of September, 1992, commencing at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m., at the Simpson 10Building, 645 G Street Building, Anchorage, Alaska; THAT this Transcript, as heretofore annexed, is a true ₁₂and correct transcription of the proceedings, taken by Meredith Downing and thereafter transcribed by Laurel L. Kehler. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and 14 ₁ saffixed my seal this 17th day of September, 1992. 16 17 REBECCA NELMS Notary in and for Alaska. 18 My commission expires: 10/10/94 19 20 21 22 23

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 1135 WEST EIGHTH AVENUE 277-0572 272-7515 272-3022

FAX 274-8982

24

25

CERTIFICATE

7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
2	STATE OF ALASKA)
3	I, Mary E. Miller, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R $\&$ R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:
5 6	Settlement Trustee Council meeting taken electronically by Meredith L. Downing on the 14th day of September, 1992, beginning at the hour of 10:00 o'clock a.m. at the offices of the Oil Spill
8 9	requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by
1	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested lin any way in this action.
1 1	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 17th day of September, 1992.
1	4
	Notary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires: <u>06/23/94</u>
	6 7
	8
	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
	4
2	5

R & R COURT REPORTERS