

1 EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL  
2 TRUSTEE COUNCIL  
3 Public Meeting  
4 Monday, August 31, 2009  
5 9:00 o'clock a.m.  
6 441 West 5th Avenue, Suite 500  
7 Anchorage, Alaska  
8 TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:  
9 STATE OF ALASKA - DEC: MR. LARRY HARTIG  
10 (Chair) Commissioner  
11 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, MR. STEVE ZEMKE for  
12 U.S. FOREST SERVICE MR. JOE MEADE, Supervisor  
13 STATE OF ALASKA - DEPARTMENT MR. TOM BROOKOVER for  
14 OF FISH AND GAME: DENBY S. LLOYD, Commissioner  
15 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: MR. KIM ELTON  
16 Senior Advisor  
17 STATE OF ALASKA - MR. CRAIG TILLERY for  
18 DEPARTMENT OF LAW: MR. DANIEL S. SULLIVAN  
19 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MR. CRAIG O'CONNOR for  
20 National Marine Fisheries Svc: MR. JAMES W. BALSIGER  
21 Administrator, AK Region  
22 Proceedings electronically recorded, then transcribed by:  
23 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, 135 Christensen Dr.,  
24 Suite 2, Anchorage, AK 99501 - 243-0668

1	STAFF PRESENT:	
2	ELISE HSIEN	Executive Director
3	JENNIFER SCHORR	Deputy Executive Director
4	CERRI WOMAC	Associate Coordinator
5	CATHERINE BOERNER	Science Coordinator
6	MICHAEL SCHLEI	Data Systems Manager
7	JOELLEN LOTTSFELDT	Project Assistant
8	RENEE JAMES	Administrative Manager
9	LINDA KILBOURNE	Administrative Assistant
10	CARRIE HOLBA	ARLIS Librarian
11	PETE HAGEN	NOAA
12	CAROL FRIES	ADNR
13	DOUG MUTTER	US Department of the Interior
14	MARIT CARLSON van DORT	ADEC
15	VERONICA VARELA	US Fish & Wildlife Service
16	AMY WISCO	US Fish & Wildlife Service
17	DEBORAH McCLAIN	US Fish & Wildlife Service
18	DOUG WOODBY	ADF&G
19	Rebecca Talbott	Communications Coordinator

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	Call to Order	04
3	Approval of Agenda	05
4	Approval of May 29, 2009 Minutes	05
5	Public Advisory Committee Comments	06
6	PUBLIC COMMENT	
7	MS. NANCY BIRD	21
8	MR. ROB CAMPBELL	28
9	MS. JENNIFER GIBBONS (By Phone)	36
10	MR. R.J. KOPCHAK (By Phone)	38
11	Executive Directors Report	39
12	Appoint Executive Director	42
13	PAC Nominees for Vacant Seats	45
14	Habitat: Reauthorization of Funds	49
15	Draft Budget FY10	54
16	FY2010 Work Plan	99
17	Adjournment	212

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 08/31/2009)

(On record - 9:06 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Ready to get started. Are we online?

REPORTER: Yes, sir. On record.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, this is Larry Hartig. I'll be the state chair today and I guess we'll go around the table here and introduce the trustees and do the roll call here first. Do you want to start, Craig?

MR. O'CONNOR: Craig O'Connor with NOAA.

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

MR. ELTON: Kim Elton with the Interior.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Larry Hartig with state DEC.

MR. TILLERY: Craig Tillery, Alaska Department of Law.

MR. ZEMKE: Steve Zemke with the Department of Agriculture.

CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Has everybody had a chance to look at the agenda and can I have a motion to approve?

MR. O'CONNOR: So moved.

MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any discussion on  
2 the agenda?

3                   (No audible responses)

4                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposition?

5                   (No audible responses)

6                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. The agenda for  
7 today is approved. Let's go next to the approval of the  
8 May 29, 2009 meeting  
9 minutes -- or notes, I guess I should say. Do I have a  
10 motion to approve those?

11                  MR. TILLERY: I'll move we approve those.

12                  MR. O'CONNOR: Second.

13                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Second. Yeah, I don't  
14 want to rush anybody if they want to look at these some  
15 more, but any discussion?

16                  (No audible responses)

17                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any opposition  
18 then to the May 29th minutes or notes?

19                  (No audible responses)

20                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Hearing none, the  
21 May 29, 2009 notes are approved. Okay. I guess we'll go  
22 on to the PAC committee comments. Stacy, are you online?

23                  MS. STUDEBAKER: Yes, I am. Good morning.

24                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Good morning. How are  
25 you doing?

1 MS. STUDEBAKER: I'm great. It's a  
2 beautiful sunny day here in Kodiak.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Great. Well, could you  
4 -- would you like to tell us about the PAC meeting?

5 MS. STUDEBAKER: Sure. Can you hear me  
6 okay?

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hear you fine.

8 MS. STUDEBAKER: Great. Okay. Good  
9 morning, members of the Trustee Council. I hope you all  
10 have enjoyed your summer and have a good dose of the same  
11 sunny days we've been blessed with here in Kodiak this  
12 summer.

13 Since I last reported to you, the PAC has  
14 met two times. On June 25th we met in Anchorage to discuss  
15 the restoration work plan for FY2010. And then last week  
16 on August 26th we met again via teleconference to review  
17 and discuss the administrative budget, and it was not  
18 completed before the June 25th meeting. I hope you have  
19 all had a chance to review the minutes of both these  
20 minutes so you have a sense of our discussions and  
21 recommendations for the FY2010 work plan. I'll try to hit  
22 some of the highlights for you this morning and answer any  
23 questions you may have, and I'll also remain on the line  
24 during your meeting if you have any follow-up questions  
25 during your discussions.

1                   At the June meeting, we were scheduled for  
2 four hours to review all the proposal and there was a  
3 consensus that the meeting was rushed and that more time  
4 should be allotted next year. Since many of the PAC  
5 members are new to this part of the process, there was  
6 little time to bring them up to speed about the budget and  
7 provide some background and guidance for our  
8 responsibilities. For instance, it would have been helpful  
9 to have some direction from the staff on the amount of  
10 money that could be spent for both the restoration and  
11 administrative budgets collectively.

12                   In the past, both the restoration and  
13 administrative budgets have been presented at the same  
14 meeting to the PAC. Since both budgets were not available  
15 at this meeting there was confusion among the new PAC  
16 members about the total expenditures for the year and what  
17 we should be recommending. The five percent spending cap  
18 was discussed and brought up by some of the older PAC  
19 members and supported by the PAC as a reasonable goal to  
20 shoot for and sustain the restoration work that still needs  
21 to be done. In addition to more time, we could use a  
22 little better framework for our discussions and more  
23 background on the proposals. Hopefully we can improve on  
24 this next year.

25                   The PAC supports the entire suite of 10

1 herring proposals numbered 132. We think the suite builds  
2 a core monitoring program, offering a look at various  
3 approaches to information. And we also recommend a 10  
4 percent reduction in total costs as it was thought that  
5 more collaboration and sharing of equipment and boats  
6 should be encouraged.

7                   The PAC also supports the funding of nine  
8 additional projects that were responsive to the invitation  
9 and/or important for ongoing monitoring: Bodkin (808),  
10 Bychkov (624), Campbell (119), Irons (751), Matkin (742),  
11 Quinn (128), Rice (804), Vollenweider (806), and  
12 Weingartner (340).

13                   Our meeting on August 26th was to discuss  
14 the FY2010 administrative budget. Some of the most  
15 important questions raised and most lengthy discussions  
16 focused on the science management and program support  
17 elements of the budget. There was confusion about the  
18 difference in the roles of these and concern that there was  
19 some overlap. There was also an observation made and some  
20 concern that while the restoration program in general is  
21 downsizing, why are the program support positions of the  
22 agencies remaining the same? With fewer projects to manage  
23 and salaries -- with fewer projects to manage, the salaries  
24 haven't changed much over the years. Elise mentioned that  
25 she wished to examine the costs of doing some of the

1 project management in-house, rather than all through agency  
2 personnel and I encourage you to look at this issue more  
3 closely.

4                   PAC members were not happy about funds  
5 being cut from our budget when agency budgets were not  
6 showing a comparable decrease. Most agreed that face-to-  
7 face meetings are preferable and the PAC provides a unique  
8 and wide range of public views into the restoration process  
9 that is otherwise run by scientists.

10                   The PAC was unanimous about the need for a  
11 joint face-to-face meeting with the Trustee Council to  
12 discuss the future direction of the restoration program.  
13 We talked about possible timing and venues and thought that  
14 early January in Anchorage would be preferable for getting  
15 the most participation. One suggestion was a dinner  
16 followed by a morning meeting to roll up our sleeves and  
17 discuss where we are today with restoration and where we  
18 want to go from here. I think the general public is very  
19 interested in this, especially after the 20-year  
20 anniversary events this spring where awareness of lingering  
21 oil issue was heightened and revealed to the entire world  
22 through enormous media attention.

23                   I wish to thank the PAC and the staff for  
24 their hard work, as well as the Trustee Council for your  
25 time and dedication and I'd be happy to take any questions.

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   Okay.

2                   MS. STUDEBAKER:   Thank you.

3                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   Thank you, Stacy.   That  
4 was a good report.   Appreciate all the PAC's work.   Do the  
5 Trustees have any questions?

6                   MR. TILLERY:   I have a question.

7                   MR. O'CONNOR:   I have a.....

8                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   Okay.   Craig O'Connor  
9 first.

10                  MR. O'CONNOR:   Go ahead, Craig, if you.....

11                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   Oh.

12                  MR. O'CONNOR:   .....you've got something to  
13 say.   Go ahead.   I don't have a microphone I guess.   Do we  
14 need one?

15                  MR. TILLERY:   Yeah, Stacy, this is Craig  
16 Tillery.   I note that in your notes on one of the meetings  
17 that you indicate that the support for the Alutiiq Museum  
18 project failed by a vote of five to four.   Can you  
19 summarize that discussion?

20                  MS. STUDEBAKER:   Yes.   Well, yeah, it was  
21 brought up that archeological resources have been one of  
22 the resources that have been taken off the list as far as  
23 recovering, that they are considered recovered.   That was  
24 one of the issues.   And the other issue is that it wasn't  
25 part -- a call for archeological restoration was not part

1 of the invitation. And some PAC members from other  
2 communities felt that they would have liked to have had a  
3 shot at putting in a request for some funds for  
4 archeological resources in their communities as well. So  
5 that was pretty much it. Nobody -- I don't think anybody  
6 would deny the importance and effectiveness of the Alutiiq  
7 Museum as being one of the best investments. I think being  
8 from Kodiak I'm a little prejudiced, but I think it is --  
9 really gotten the most out of every dollar that was  
10 invested in creating that archeological repository and  
11 museum. It's been an amazing, amazing renaissance for the  
12 Native community in our area.

13 MR. TILLERY: Thanks.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, thank you. Craig  
15 O'Connor.

16 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, Stacy, how you doing?

17 MS. STUDEBAKER: Good. How are you, Craig?

18 MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, I'm great. And your  
19 weather is wonderful. Thank you very much. I wanted to  
20 respond just briefly to the concerns that the PAC seems to  
21 have regard to agency support costs.

22 MS. STUDEBAKER: Yes.

23 MR. O'CONNOR: Let me begin, we as well are  
24 concerned with how much it costs to get the work done and  
25 look at it on a regular basis. But I think that an

1 important consideration that we often times lose sight of  
2 is that when we resolved this case, as we do in all natural  
3 resource damages cases around the country, we look to the  
4 polluter to pay for the cost, the administrative support,  
5 for the work that's done by the Trustees and the public in  
6 restoring the environment. So we, at the time we entered  
7 into the settlement arrangement with Exxon and all through  
8 the course of this, we have attempted to be sure, to the  
9 maximum extent practical, that the taxpayer does not assume  
10 the burden, the financial burden of the work that's done by  
11 the Trustee Council. Now, admittedly we failed in that in  
12 many regards because much of the work that is done by the  
13 federal and state agencies is borne by the taxpayer. We do  
14 not get reimbursed for those efforts. What we're trying to  
15 do through the work of our liaisons is to provide with --  
16 provide the greatest amount of day-to-day engagement that  
17 we possibly can, recognizing that the Trustees themselves,  
18 when you talk about the Attorney General with the State of  
19 Alaska, he has got to function through others. He cannot  
20 be spending the time every day that is required to do the  
21 work, the agencies for the -- for restoration here. The  
22 same applies to each of us, so we function through a  
23 surrogate, and that surrogate is the liaison. And it's  
24 their responsibility to work every day with the council  
25 staff, with the PI's, with those who are requesting

1 information, with those within the word of contracting  
2 within the agencies and so on to make sure that everything  
3 that is done is kosher under federal or state law. We  
4 would very much be -- like to be able to reduce those costs  
5 to the extent we can, but the fact of the matter is that  
6 they burden our folks. If looked in aggregate, it would be  
7 far beyond the total amount that's actually being  
8 reimbursed to the agencies for the effort of agency staff.

9                   One of the things that I think is important  
10 to understand, which I'm sure you do since you've been with  
11 us for a long, is much of what we do is based on  
12 estimations of what's going to be required. And at the end  
13 of the year, if we have over-estimated what the costs would  
14 be for agency support for the money that was given to the  
15 agencies, those leftover funds are reimbursed to the  
16 council. So we understand the issue, we understand the  
17 concern, but trust me, we could not function without the  
18 interaction of our liaison. Just in my own agency, I don't  
19 know how many dozens of FOIA requests we receive every year  
20 that we are required to respond to. Our agency liaisons  
21 are required to prepare and defend through the audit  
22 process within the federal government the monies that are  
23 being spent by the Trustee Council on various projects and  
24 our accounting protocols and so on. So in the end I think  
25 what we're getting from our liaisons at the very least is

1 worth twice what we're reimbursing the agencies for. So  
2 I'm not suggesting that criticism isn't important, that  
3 critical oversight is not important, because it is. And  
4 I'm happy to see that Elise -- and she has talked to us  
5 about the idea of seeing how much we can reduce our  
6 administrative costs. And as you'll hear, she just told me  
7 that she's cutting the budget by another hundred thousand  
8 dollars beyond what we had originally looked at. So, we  
9 are paying close attention to that, but by the same token,  
10 I don't believe it's appropriate for all the costs of this  
11 undertaking to be borne by the taxpayers of Alaska or  
12 United States. This was the responsibility of Exxon.  
13 Monies were collected from Exxon to pay for these  
14 undertakings and we intend to continue to access those  
15 funds to support the efforts that we're engaged in. But  
16 once again, thank you for your concern and your comment and  
17 those of the PAC.

18 MS. STUDEBAKER: Thank you, Craig.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Is there anybody that  
20 want to comment on the possibility of the January joint  
21 meeting with the PAC? Is I understand a request by Stacy  
22 here.

23 MR. O'CONNOR: I personally think that's an  
24 excellent idea.

25 MS. HSIEH: Maybe early January. It would

1 be very -- fairly early January, was the date discussed.

2 MR. O'CONNOR: I guess one of the -- Mr.  
3 Chairman, if you will -- one of the -- would that be  
4 coincident with or at least following on when we're going  
5 to be getting some of the reports from the lingering oil  
6 work that's going on. Because I think that's going to be  
7 an important conversation with the PAC as well.

8 MS. HSIEH: I think there's -- Catherine  
9 can correct me if I'm wrong. I think there may be just  
10 some information coming in here in October and then not  
11 till April again. Is that correct?

12 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We can look more closely  
14 at the date, but I guess everybody is, I can tell,  
15 interested in having that joint meeting and we'll look for  
16 the right time to do it.

17 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, I think.....

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks for bringing that  
19 up, Stacy.

20 MR. TILLERY: Prior to the.....

21 MS. STUDEBAKER: You bet.

22 MR. TILLERY: .....legislature coming in,  
23 it would be helpful.....

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I was thinking  
25 that. Prior to the start of the session would be good for

1 the state people.

2 MS. HSIEH: That was our intent.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Yeah, Kim.

4 MR. O'CONNOR: I thought you were looking  
5 for any excuse to avoid visiting the legislature.

6 MR. TILLERY: Absolutely not.

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We don't get to use any  
8 excuses.

9 MR. O'CONNOR: Oh. They're your friends?

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Kim.

11 MR. ELTON: Well, I would just suggest it  
12 would be helpful to me and perhaps to others, including the  
13 PAC, if staff could maybe prepare an agenda so that -- in  
14 plenty of time so that the council can review it and maybe  
15 Stacy or somebody from the PAC can review it, so that when  
16 we arrive in early January we've got something in front of  
17 us that we can react to rather than kind of starting from  
18 ground zero. So, because I -- the impression that I got is  
19 the PAC wants to have some fairly substantive discussions  
20 with the council.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

22 MR. ELTON: That would be helpful to me.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: My understanding, Stacy  
24 -- Larry again -- that it would be somewhat in the nature  
25 of a retreat, talking about where do we go from here with

1 these projects, hearing among them, you know, what  
2 direction should we be going here in the next year or two.  
3 Okay. Let's see, we -- next is public comment and we're  
4 pretty tight on time, as everybody knows today, so I'm  
5 going to be watching it and try to keep people to three  
6 minutes. It's important because we have a very substantive  
7 meeting today. I know the Trustees want to spend whatever  
8 time we have today, you know, getting through the work plan  
9 and the budget, making sure we do the best job we can on  
10 it. So I would appreciate people themselves trying to  
11 self-police themselves to three minutes. Do we have a  
12 sign-up sheet, Elise, or.....

13 MS. HSIEH: I don't believe, Cherri, that  
14 anyone has signed up.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. And then I guess  
16 we should maybe find out how many people here in the room  
17 want to testify, then I'll ask the people on the phone, try  
18 to figure out how many people we have on the phone that  
19 want to testify to get a feel for whether we're going to be  
20 able to do this.

21 MS. HSIEH: And if I could make one more  
22 comment. I think these -- work plan means we have a lot to  
23 get through today. We have to decide -- the Trustees have  
24 to decide on the budget and look at over 40 scientific  
25 proposals. Instinctively the desire is to have a lot of

1 back and forth debate, and of course you need to ask the  
2 questions that you need to ask, but I'd also like to note  
3 that these are professional scientific proposals that are  
4 written that have been submitted. Most granting agencies  
5 look at those professional proposals and make decisions on  
6 those proposals, which you all have reviewed and read and  
7 had in hand. For it to become an open debate with the  
8 people who happen to be here today or happen to be on the  
9 phone also may not be fair to those who couldn't make it  
10 today and it doesn't really lend sort of equity to the  
11 process. So although I know the temptation is there to  
12 engage in a big debate about someone's project here, in the  
13 past that has undone the meeting and hasn't been very  
14 effective. And also, unfair for those PI's who have  
15 written a stand alone proposal, which is as they should be  
16 submitted. So.....

17                                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, my plan -- the  
18 Trustees can certainly debate this -- would be to get  
19 through the public comment, which would include any comment  
20 people have on the work plan and not open it up for public  
21 comment again when we actually start discussing the work  
22 plan. And my plan would be before we start talking about  
23 the work plan, you know, poll the Trustees and how they  
24 want to approach that in terms of trying to structure that  
25 discussion. But this would be the one chance to get

1 comments in on the work plan from the public, during the  
2 public comment.

3 MS. HSIEH: And there are PI's here today,  
4 but again I ask you to resist the temptation to engage in a  
5 back and forth unless it's absolutely critical. There --  
6 all the information should have been in the proposals and  
7 our science coordinator is Catherine, is here today. She  
8 knows them quite intimately and is available for your  
9 questions as well.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
11 questions or comments from the Trustees before we go into  
12 public comment?

13 MR. O'CONNOR: And the liaisons have been  
14 through all of these; right?

15 MS. HSIEH: Yes, I believe so.

16 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. And have given us  
17 meaningful guidance on that.

18 MS. HSIEH: They also represent some of the  
19 projects, as you know.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. How many people in  
22 the room here in Anchorage want to testify during public  
23 comment today? Let's see, we got two. Okay. How many --  
24 I guess, on the phone. Or not quite -- this is always  
25 difficult to do. I guess do we have anybody on the phone

1 in the Anchorage area? Probably not. How about Cordova?

2 MS. GIBBONS: This is Jennifer Gibbons,  
3 Prince William Soundkeeper and PAC member.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. And Jennifer, do  
5 you.....

6 MS. GIBBONS: I think our electricity just  
7 went out here and so I dialed back in on my cell phone and  
8 I don't know if anybody else who is in Cordova may have  
9 been cut off.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Were they going to  
11 try to get back on, do you know? Does anybody in  
12 Cordova.....

13 MS. GIBBONS: Well, I don't know. I'm  
14 guessing that there was probably somebody from the science  
15 center on the phone. I'm just guessing that. And I don't  
16 know if they've been cut off. But maybe before you end  
17 public comment I'll just let you know whether or not the  
18 electricity has come back on.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Yeah, and Cherri  
20 is going to go out and try to check on things too. We'll  
21 make sure we don't Cordova off. And if we have to, we'll  
22 open up public comment again a little bit later if we  
23 missed Cordova. Okay. Anybody from Kodiak?

24 (No audible responses)

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Seward?

1 (No audible responses)

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Valdez?

3 (No audible responses)

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Anybody else on the  
5 phone?

6 (No audible responses)

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, maybe we won't be  
8 so pressed during public comment. Okay. So I guess we'll  
9 start in the room. Nancy, do you want to start?

10 MS. BIRD: I will be brief. Do you want me  
11 to wait for a time frame?

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, I think you won't  
13 have to hold quite as tight to the three minute rule,  
14 but.....

15 MS. BIRD: Oh, I will. You have a long  
16 agenda, looks like, for a short time period. My name is  
17 Nancy Bird. I think I know most of you. I'm president of  
18 the Prince William Sound Science Center and I wanted to  
19 speak in support of the 10 projects that are submitted by  
20 five organizations comprising the integrated Prince William  
21 Sound Herring Survey Program. For the record, I will note  
22 that last week I did submit in writing a two page letter to  
23 all of the Trustees and the council office and had some  
24 attachments. I just want to add today a few more comments  
25 regarding two of the project, D and H. Project D,

1 submitted by Ron Heintz of Auke Bay Lab, will collect data  
2 on feeding and growth by juvenile herring. Food is  
3 potentially one of the limiting factors in this project,  
4 along with Project C, submitted by Tom Kline of the Prince  
5 William Sound Science Center, provide complimentary  
6 approaches to determine how prey availability can influence  
7 the year class strength of herring. While the two projects  
8 use different approaches to determine energetics, they are  
9 linked through the sample collection being done by the  
10 Kline project and they're also linked in sharing the  
11 different measurements and analysis. The different measures  
12 of herring conditions have never been simultaneously  
13 applied. And by the end of this study, we believe the team  
14 will be in a position to provide a good recommendation on  
15 core monitoring that will be most cost effective and  
16 capture the factors best characterized in the role of food  
17 and herring survival.

18                   To further explain, the Heintz project  
19 applies a new metric RNA/DNA ratios on herring health which  
20 has been previously validated through an EVOS supported lab  
21 project. In its review of that lab work project, the EVOS  
22 science panel was quite supportive. They noted that the  
23 ratio showed that herring could be feeding in winter, when  
24 the conventional thinking is that they typically do not do  
25 that. It is this type of information we need during the

1 upcoming juvenile surveys in order to tease apart what  
2 might be limiting factors for juvenile herring. One final  
3 note regarding a concern over late reports by Heintz, I  
4 understand that those concerns have been addressed as well  
5 as the question about the sample sizes proposed.

6                   Turning to Project H of this integrated  
7 program, I want to reiterate that this seabird predation  
8 study proposes to collect for the first time data on  
9 nighttime seabird predation on herring during both winter  
10 and summer months. The co-PIs, Kathy Kuletz of US Fish &  
11 Wildlife Service and Mary Anne Bishop of the Science Center  
12 also addressed the data gap regarding marine mammal and  
13 seabird abundance and distribution in the bays where  
14 juvenile herring are found. Commenting on this project  
15 Scott Pegau, the program's coordinator, stated the  
16 following in his response to science panel questions.  
17 Quote, similar to the disease program, these components of  
18 the seabird predation project address a potential recovery  
19 bottleneck and the loss of the program will hamper any  
20 modeling effort to understand the survival of juvenile  
21 herring and our objective to identify limiting conditions.

22                   In closing I want to thank you for the  
23 significant time and resources that EVOS has committed to a  
24 long term herring research program. The Prince William  
25 Sound herring survey program is far more integrated than

1 those we've done in the past. It includes commercial  
2 fishermen, education components, and more regular meetings  
3 for all involved to share their results bait analysis, in  
4 addition to the sharing of vessel charters and samples from  
5 the cruises. The results from these studies will provide  
6 what's needed to determine the most cost-effective  
7 monitoring program that would be necessary for potential  
8 restoration activities. The results will also give us the  
9 data needed for any modeling effort to understand the  
10 survival of juvenile herring and our objective of  
11 identifying the conditions that limit survival of herring.  
12 We're very excited to be at this point today and I thank  
13 you.

14 I would also note that in Cordova there's  
15 no one at the science center who would be speaking. They  
16 might be listening in. The one other person in Cordova who  
17 I thought might be commenting was Rochelle van den Broek  
18 from Cordova District Fishermen United.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you.

20 MS. BIRD: So, thank you.

21 MR. O'CONNOR: Can I ask a question?

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Craig.

23 MR. O'CONNOR: You feel pretty comfortable,  
24 it sounds like, with the package that -- with the adding on  
25 the Heintz and the other project, that we have a good

1 comprehensive package that is going to provide an adequate  
2 predicate for the council in moving into the future to be  
3 making decisions with regard what's going on with herring  
4 and what can we do about herring and is there any  
5 restorative effort that we can engage in. That would be  
6 our focus as the Trustee Council, recognizing that herring  
7 are a critical component of the food chain and critical to  
8 the restoration of many of the other species that were  
9 affected by the spill. But you feel pretty comfortable  
10 with the comprehensiveness of this package that we're going  
11 to be able to move forward?

12 MS. BIRD: Yes. Yes. I mean, I speak as a  
13 non-scientist, but I feel like the folks involved in  
14 planning the herring planning study -- I always forget the  
15 full title of it -- but they spent 18 months in meetings  
16 trying to tease out what are the important critical  
17 components.

18 MR. O'CONNOR: Right.

19 MS. BIRD: And the RFP was prepared and the  
20 PI's involved in this Prince William Sound herring survey  
21 program I think have pulled together some of the best  
22 experts that we have in this field at this point. So.....

23 MR. O'CONNOR: Thanks.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Let's see, Nancy, was  
25 there any kind of prioritization that you did on the

1 various herring projects? I wonder if you weight them all  
2 equally, you look at them as a package, or were there some  
3 that stood out more than others?

4 MR. BIRD: I guess that I wasn't involved  
5 in that much detail in the meetings myself personally. My  
6 sense from reading the notes from meetings is that there  
7 might have been a few projects that would be, you know,  
8 absolutely necessary, but as Scott Pegau put it in his  
9 eight page attachment that I sent to you last week where he  
10 tried to identify, okay, if this project is not done, what  
11 will the whole program lose? Every single one of these 10  
12 projects is putting input into the whole program and there  
13 will be some losses. So I think that the group as a whole  
14 feels very strongly that they need all the components of  
15 this project at this point.....

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

17 MS. BIRD: .....in order to answer the  
18 questions that the RFP has put forward.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Craig.

20 MR. TILLERY: The PAC recommendations, I  
21 understand, is just kind of 10 percent off the top and let  
22 the programs sort that out. What do think about that?

23 MS. BIRD: That's certainly not our  
24 preferred direction. You know, we feel like we tried hard  
25 to stay within the 1.5 million dollar figure that had been

1 suggested by the Trustee Council last year as through what  
2 the program might cost. The -- yeah, the true cost of  
3 doing business with vessel charters, with fuel costs going  
4 up, with other parts of the program, it did come out to 1.7  
5 million. And it will -- you know, our preference would be,  
6 I think, to take a 10 percent cut across the board, but not  
7 lose any one of the projects if we had to. You know, we  
8 aren't going to necessarily do everything that is laid out  
9 then and as great, in the same way.

10 MR. TILLERY: How would that functionally  
11 work if you were given a 10 percent cut? Who would  
12 determine where that came from? I mean, is there some  
13 kind.....

14 MS. BIRD: I.....

15 MR. TILLERY: .....of an overall group that  
16 everybody would listen to and -- besides us?

17 MS. BIRD: Well, Scott Pegau is the overall  
18 coordinator for the program, I think is the person who  
19 would have to pull the group together and, you know, either  
20 -- and say, hey, you've really got to look at this or we  
21 could also take a look at, in the vessel charter area,  
22 trying to see if we could go out to bid for a long term  
23 charter. You know, one of the beauties of this program to  
24 me is that if it is funded, it gives us assurance for the  
25 good three years, four years of the cruise season that

1 we're going to want a charter. And so we can go out and  
2 should have a leverage to get some of the charter operators  
3 to come in at more reasonable rates than they might come in  
4 if it was done on the, you know, sort of shorter basis than  
5 it has been in the past. So there could -- you know, there  
6 could be some areas of some cost savings, and that area is  
7 about the only place I see.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. BIRD: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Good morning.

11 MR. CAMPBELL: I have a letter here from  
12 Scott Pegau that I think will address some of the questions  
13 you just asked. Scott couldn't make it today. He is on a  
14 research vessel about a hundred miles south of Hawaii right  
15 now -- nice work if you can get it -- and he couldn't join  
16 us today. My name is Rob Campbell. I'm an oceanographer  
17 at the Prince William Sound Science Center. I participated  
18 in the integrated herring restoration plan working group  
19 and I have a couple of proposals that I submitted for this  
20 year's work plan as well. I'd like to take this  
21 opportunity to read a few excerpts from this letter:

22 Dear EVOS Trustee Council, I am writing in  
23 support of PWS Herring Survey proposals. A team of us  
24 developed a series of 10 joint program -- proposals to  
25 address the request for proposals' stated interest in an

1 integrated herring survey program. These proposals can be  
2 identified by PWS Herring Survey at the beginning of their  
3 title. In the draft work plan, not all of the 10 proposals  
4 included in this program are being recommended for funding.  
5 I'm requesting that you examine the proposals in the  
6 context of a fully integrated program and consider funding  
7 all components of the PWS Herring Survey Program.

8                   The portion of the EVOS request for  
9 proposals dealing with herring was developed from the draft  
10 Integrated Herring Restoration Plan. In this draft plan, a  
11 three-prong approach was described as necessary for  
12 developing a restoration effort. The three prongs of a  
13 successful program were described as a core program that  
14 includes monitoring activities, research programs, and  
15 restoration activities. The PWS Herring Survey proposal  
16 package addressed the needs of the first component.

17                   Four of the projects in this PWS Herring  
18 Survey Program are led by members of the Integrated Herring  
19 Working Group (Pegau, Campbell, Brown, and Hershberger).  
20 We pulled together a team that addresses the needs outlined  
21 in the RFP and the goals outlined in the draft Integrated  
22 Herring Restoration Plan. We took a hard look at what  
23 needed to be done so that at the end of the program we can  
24 make solid recommendations for the future and then be able  
25 to build an appropriate program. By removing pieces of the

1 program, you risk the ability to achieve the overall goals  
2 of the program.

3                   Through the review process there's been  
4 some concern with the cost of the program. It is not our  
5 contention to recommend funding monitoring activities at  
6 this level far into the future. The cost of this program  
7 seems high because of the large number of projects  
8 included. The purpose of this large number of projects is  
9 to determine best for monitoring efforts and to guide an  
10 overall reduction of monitoring in the future. We were  
11 very conscious of the cost and restricted the amount of  
12 funding any individual a principal investigator could  
13 request. We worked hard to ensure that logistical costs  
14 were minimized by working together to maximize any vessel  
15 time. There appears to be some redundancy in requesting  
16 two projects that look at juvenile content, but this is by  
17 design. The two projects take different approaches to the  
18 same problem and we intend to determine the appropriate  
19 approach for future monitoring. Comparison of techniques  
20 is part of determining the best practices.

21                   We hope the cost is not a driving factor in  
22 your decision process. As Dr. Rice pointed out in  
23 February, the estimated cost to get a herring restoration  
24 program underway would be approximately three to four  
25 million dollars a year for the first three or four years.

1 We are requesting about half that to lay the foundation for  
2 future efforts. As I stated earlier, we fully expect that  
3 monitoring costs will be reduced in the future. Please  
4 consider funding all 10 of the proposals that are included  
5 in this program. Funding of the full program will help  
6 ensure we make the observations needed for the permitting  
7 process and will allow for responsible and effective  
8 restoration effort in the future. Thanks for your time, W.  
9 Scott Pegau. And if you have any questions, I'd be happy  
10 to address them.

11 MR. BROOKOVER: Rob, I guess following  
12 along the line of the PAC's recommendation to cut by 10  
13 percent, what in your assessment would that mean for the  
14 projects as a whole?

15 MR. CAMPBELL: We would have to reduce  
16 things. As Nancy said, we can look for efficiency wherever  
17 possible, but in the process of putting together all of  
18 these integrated proposals, we spoke a great deal about how  
19 we can share things like ship time or facilities to keep  
20 costs down. So it really would be a reduction in the  
21 program and that's something that Scott and myself were  
22 worried about, is if you remove 10 percent of the program,  
23 you don't necessarily get 90 percent of the answer.  
24 Sometimes you wind up with not enough data to come up with  
25 the recommendations that you need.

1 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Kim.

3 MR. ELTON: Mr. Chair, you can ask me to  
4 ask this at the end of the public comment period, but I'm  
5 kind of curious because one of the things that has been  
6 mentioned a couple of times now is that the proposers put  
7 together an integrated package. And I guess I have a  
8 question for staff as -- I mean, when the science panel  
9 reviewed these proposals, did they look at them as  
10 individual projects rather than as an integrated package?

11 MS. HSIEH: They were presented under the  
12 marker of an integrated package; however, upon actually  
13 reviewing the proposals, they really didn't explain -- some  
14 of them didn't explain work they had done in the past, what  
15 they were doing now. People who had been funded in years  
16 past, there was a -- there wasn't a lot of information  
17 about how they were integrated, both with the boats, et  
18 cetera. So we went back and asked Scott, who was very  
19 helpful and sent in what we forwarded to you, which was his  
20 explanation of how these proposals were integrated. So the  
21 science panel at the time, during the larger meeting,  
22 really discussed the merits of each proposal and also had  
23 some discussion over how did these overlap and they really  
24 couldn't answer it at that. They did review Scott's  
25 response, which we're very grateful to Scott for. They

1 didn't really shift any of their funding recommendations  
2 upon review of that document. So we sort of looked at it  
3 like a flock but it had individual members, so.....

4 MR. ELTON: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any questions for Rob?

6 (No audible responses)

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I'll ask a  
8 question. Rob, as these proposals were being put together  
9 as kind of an integrated package, what was the driving  
10 objective? I mean, you know, I notice here at the end  
11 several times you mentioned that it talks about a  
12 responsible and effective restoration effort. Do they have  
13 in mind what that effective restoration effort might be and  
14 that these are all designed to get there or are these  
15 designed to decide what that would be?

16 MR. CAMPBELL: Right. The Integrated  
17 Herring Restoration Plan does talk about that at length.  
18 As well as restoration activities there was the recognized  
19 need to have a really good monitoring program. So to know  
20 what the status is right now, and that will in turn drive  
21 restoration activities. Restoration activities right now  
22 are at the level of feasibility studies. Those are going  
23 to need that kind of information to assess feasibility.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: At the end of these  
25 studies, are we going to know what the limiting factors are

1 to recruitment in the -- for the herring?

2 MR. CAMPBELL: That's the intention, yes.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Are there any concerns  
4 that -- are there any gaps that would be left after all  
5 these studies are completed?

6 MR. CAMPBELL: No, I don't think so. It's  
7 fairly comprehensive. It addresses every -- of all of the  
8 possible limiting factors that are addressed in the  
9 restoration plan.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Tom.

11 MR. BROOKOVER: Rob, I guess a follow-up on  
12 that. In reading through the proposals and some of the  
13 comments and the response for more clarity on the  
14 integration from Scott, it seemed to me that the objectives  
15 of the program were to identify nursery bays and collect  
16 information regarding limiting factors. And there was an  
17 additional one. But in reading the response from Scott, it  
18 sounded like, you know, the program would successfully be  
19 able to collect information on limiting factors and  
20 thereby, you know, identify a core set of monitoring  
21 parameters that could lead to a reduced program continuing  
22 in the future.

23 MR. CAMPBELL: Uh-huh.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: But I also sense some  
25 recognition on Scott's part in the response that there

1 still remains to be a really synthesized model that can  
2 specifically identify those limiting factors, but then take  
3 the next step and test for them to see what effect  
4 predation, what effect other limiting factors might really  
5 have either singly or in combination, which is probably a  
6 more likely role. I mean, do -- is that kind of how you  
7 see the program as well? I know Scott is not here. I'm  
8 asking for your.....

9 MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

10 MR. BROOKOVER: .....your sense.

11 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. The RFP didn't  
12 specifically mention models but obviously that is probably  
13 the best way to assess the kind of questions we want to  
14 ask. I know that the Trustee Council is funding ecosystem  
15 modeling efforts in Prince William Sound. Scott and myself  
16 have also been working on a parallel program, the Alaska  
17 Ocean Observing System that's been developing physical and  
18 ecosystem models for Prince William Sound. So they're out  
19 there. One of the big problems, especially with ecosystem  
20 modeling is, is we don't have good parameters for the  
21 ecosystem; who's there or how things are being transferred  
22 through the ecosystem. And that's the big challenge right  
23 now and this is the kind of data that we need in order to  
24 make those models a little more realistic and more  
25 effective and so we'll have more confidence in them.

1                   MR. BROOKOVER: Okay. So that would be a  
2 logical next step, I mean in addition to identifying a core  
3 monitoring program with monitoring a subset of these  
4 parameters you may be looking to the future to take that  
5 next step as well.

6                   MR. CAMPBELL: Definitely. To talk like a  
7 scientist, the current program addresses a number of  
8 hypotheses, but all of that data then becomes available to  
9 the -- fed into a model to be used to answer what-if type  
10 questions.

11                  MR. BROOKOVER: Okay. Thanks.

12                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions?

13                  (No audible responses)

14                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Rob.

15                  MR. CAMPBELL: Thanks.

16                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Anybody else here  
17 in the room in Anchorage wanted to testify during public  
18 comment? It doesn't look like it, so I'll go back to  
19 Cordova. Anybody in Cor.....

20                  MS. GIBBONS: It might just be me.

21                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay, Jennifer.

22                  MS. GIBBONS: This is Jennifer. This is  
23 Jennifer Gibbons, I'm a PAC member and I just want to thank  
24 everyone, the Trustees and the PAC members and the staff  
25 for their work. And I want to thank staff -- Stacy for the

1 great PAC report. We've got a really good group of PAC  
2 members and I think everybody really takes their role to  
3 heart and we've got a really nice, broad sort of expertise  
4 and skills on the PAC which is great. It's fun to be part  
5 of that group.

6 I'm very excited about the herring work and  
7 the potential to address this issue and I just so  
8 appreciate the fact that the Trustees decided to put this  
9 RFP out there. And I also really appreciate the response  
10 that was presented by this herring working group. This is  
11 suite of work, this comprehensive look at the issue. And I  
12 think that the PAC was very supportive of the entire suite  
13 of proposals. It was interested in seeing if there was  
14 some possible efficiency, and I think that's where the 10  
15 percent came from, just it was being conservative. But  
16 anyway, this is great. This is exciting.

17 And I just also want to say that I  
18 appreciate the positive response to the PAC's request for a  
19 meeting and look forward to helping make that happen and  
20 hope everyone is having a good day. So, thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you,  
22 Jennifer. Any questions for Jennifer? Trustees?

23 (No audible responses)

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It doesn't look like it.  
25 Anybody else in Cordova?

1                   MR. KOPCHAK:  If I might, yes.  This is RJ  
2  Kopchak and I'm actually sitting at the science center but  
3  I'm going to fill in for Rochelle, who's unable to call in  
4  this morning on behalf of the commercial fishing industry.  
5  I sit on the board of directors of the Cordova District  
6  Fishermen United and previously was on the PAC as a  
7  commercial fishing representative.  I was very involved in  
8  the early development of an effort to put together the  
9  herring restoration planning team.  It kind of just led  
10 through that evolution over the last four years almost to  
11 today.

12                   One of the things that I just like to add  
13 to the conversation for your contemplation today is the  
14 fact that fishermen are really interested here in Cordova  
15 in restoration.  I own two herring permits.  I know a  
16 hundred other people with herring permits.  We're all  
17 interested in whether or not there's an opportunity to  
18 engage in direct restoration.  One of the questions that we  
19 have is how do we get permits.  We can only get permits  
20 engaging restoration if we have enough information and  
21 science done to actually legitimately apply for the permit  
22 and get it under way.  So I think that the package in front  
23 of you is the result of several years of effort to come up  
24 with a good program in science that can lead to some  
25 contemplation relating to restoration.  So I'd encourage

1 you on behalf of the commercial fishery to support the  
2 proposals to get this science underway. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you. It doesn't  
4 look like any questions from the Trustees. Anyone else in  
5 Cordova that would like to testify?

6 (No audible responses)

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Anybody else on  
8 the phone like to testify?

9 (No audible responses)

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thanks. We'll  
11 close public comment at this time and I will check back to  
12 make sure we didn't miss anybody in Cordova. Okay. We'll  
13 go on to the Executive Director's report.

14 MS. HSIEH: I know we have a full agenda,  
15 so I'll be very brief. The Integrated Herring Restoration  
16 Plan last fall, if you recall, was revised somewhat when I  
17 came in October. I made some revisions to it. By many  
18 accounts it's an intermediate document that needs further  
19 revision and consideration, so in our budget on Page 8 I  
20 have a -- what we plan to do is the staff here will start  
21 to revise that document to try and take it to final and  
22 we'll be guided in those revisions by a small panel, Doug  
23 Woodby of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Jeep Rice  
24 of NOAA, and Doug Hay, who's an independent consultant who  
25 has been on the integrated herring committee and has that

1 background as well. So we'll be embarking on that in the  
2 next few months and that's pretty much all I have to say.  
3 So, keep it short.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: You did. You had 10  
5 minutes and I think you brought us almost back to schedule.

6 MS. HSIEH: I'm trying.

7 MR. O'CONNOR: Could I ask the Executive  
8 Director a question?

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead, Craig.

10 MS. HSIEH: You get one.

11 MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, I get one? Why? I  
12 know, that was my one; wasn't it? The 10 percent that the  
13 PAC talked about, you were in attendance at that meeting.  
14 Was that basically a let's whack this by 10 percent without  
15 going into each project? Was that an arbitrary reducing  
16 the budget or was there some specificity to that 10 percent  
17 reduction that they were suggesting?

18 MS. HSIEH: There was one member of the PAC  
19 who towards the end of when the motion had already started  
20 rolling on the table who said, well, why don't we cut a  
21 couple of projects that we perceive as weaker? But someone  
22 said, well, you can't say that now, we already have the  
23 motion on the table. So the discussion was left at an  
24 arbitrary 10 percent without regard to individual projects  
25 or any sort of -- that was my recollection on this. It

1 wasn't directed in any way, so.....

2 MR. O'CONNOR: Nor the input -- nor were  
3 the implications of the 10 percent reduction discussed?

4 MS. HSIEH: No.

5 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Kim.

7 MR. ELTON: Kind of a follow-up to Craig's  
8 question. So given the -- I mean, given that discussion  
9 with the PAC, I mean, what do you anticipate as the  
10 process, if in fact there is a 10 percent reduction? What  
11 do you anticipate is the process on how it is -- who makes  
12 the decisions on where the money will or will not be spent?  
13 Is that staff? Is that staff working with the PAC? Is  
14 that staff working with the council?

15 MS. HSIEH: No, I think it would be -- and  
16 Catherine can correct me if I'm wrong -- I think we would  
17 ask Scott Pegau to get his group together and they -- we  
18 would let them decide where to cut the 10 percent because  
19 they're the most familiar with their individual projects.  
20 We wouldn't try and impose that upon them. We wouldn't  
21 direct that effort.

22 MR. ELTON: Okay. So they wouldn't be  
23 coming back and saying this is our recommendation, that it  
24 would just be handled by Scott then?

25 MS. HSIEH: That's correct.

1 MR. ELTON: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It seems like we would  
3 have to delegate the Executive Director or somebody in  
4 authority to make that final decision, because I don't know  
5 that you would assume that there would be a hundred percent  
6 agreement in the PAC. But you would rely on -- or the.....

7 MS. HSIEH: PI's.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: The PI's that if we --  
9 that would be the first step, is hear from them, and then  
10 if you couldn't resolve it, I guess it would come back to  
11 the Trustees.

12 MS. HSIEH: That's right. I believe the  
13 science coordinator recommended funding all projects fully.  
14 And I believe my recommendation was to fund all projects  
15 but two, which were by most accounts the -- I culled the  
16 two weakest from the flock, basically, versus an arbitrary  
17 10 percent, which yields, I believe more than 10 percent.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Other questions  
19 for -- relating to the Executive Director report?

20 (No audible responses)

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I guess we'll go on to  
22 Agenda Item 6, appointment of an executive director. Is  
23 there any lead-in to discussion from Trustee members here?  
24 I know Craig and Denby have been working on this, but.....

25 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

2                   MR. TILLERY: The -- Elise has been working  
3 as the interim executive director or in an acting position  
4 budget-wise for quite awhile now. We have -- those are  
5 designations that can go for 60 days. They're not supposed  
6 to be extended. We've been able to get them extended but  
7 we're kind of just on a personnel level at the point where  
8 we need to make it a full designation and not any more of  
9 an acting or interim designation. So it's really almost  
10 more of a personnel matter at this point. My understanding  
11 from the last meeting or so was that we had decided to do  
12 that and not to continue to advertise the position, but  
13 rather -- and Elise has agreed to sort of take it for the  
14 foreseeable future.

15                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

16                  MR. TILLERY: So that's I think the reason  
17 that this is coming up now.

18                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So it sounds like  
19 to me that we need a motion.

20                  MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair. I would move we  
21 appoint Elise Hsieh as the EVOS Executive Director.

22                  MR. BROOKOVER: And I'll second.

23                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Effective date?

24                  MR. ZEMKE: I guess it would be August 1st,  
25 2009.

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Which would be  
2 retroactive.

3                   MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, I just -- if you're  
4 looking to me to respond, I think we got to get her before  
5 she runs screaming from the room. So if this means a  
6 permanent commitment -- a fuller commitment on her part,  
7 I'm only too happy to go with this.

8                   MR. TILLERY: And Mr. Chairman, the reason  
9 for the August 1st date is I -- that was when the last  
10 acting expired, so this would just.....

11                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Pick up from there.

12                  MR. TILLERY: Yes.

13                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other discussion on  
14 the motion?

15                  (No audible responses)

16                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I guess we'll.....

17                  MR. ZEMKE: Is there a second?

18                  MR. TILLERY: Second.

19                  MR. BROOKOVER: There is.

20                  MR. TILLERY: Yeah.

21                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Tom seconded it.

22 Okay. All those in favor, say aye.

23                  IN UNISON: Aye.

24                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposed?

25                  (No audible responses)

1 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. The motion passes.

2

3 MR. O'CONNOR: What do we do with the  
4 interim deputy acting executive director?

5 MS. HSIEH: She remains in that position.

6 MR. O'CONNOR: That's not a personnel  
7 problem to keep Jen?

8 MR. TILLERY: It is a personnel problem,  
9 but we're going to discuss that, I think, when we get to  
10 the budget. I've got a sticky over here.

11 MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, you got -- oh.

12 MS. HSIEH: Uh-oh.

13 (Laughter)

14 MR. O'CONNOR: Really. Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Well, my plan is  
16 to keep moving here through the agenda but I am mindful  
17 that we are going to take -- need to take a break here, but  
18 I thought we'd get one or two more items out of the way  
19 before we do that. So with no objection, I'll go to item  
20 number 7, the PAC nominee selection for vacant seats.  
21 Let's see, Doug, do you want to address that?

22 MR. MUTTER: Sure. Okay. I'm Doug Mutter,  
23 Department of the Interior designated federal official for  
24 the Public Advisory Committee under the Federal Advisory  
25 Committee Act, FACA. And you have a sheet of paper after

1 the meeting summary of the last PAC meeting, the June PAC  
2 meeting. And we've had several vacancies, four vacancies  
3 on the PAC. And if you'll recall, the PAC is set up under  
4 FACA to last for two years. Every two years we renew the  
5 whole membership and we have to redo the charter. That  
6 comes up next year. So next summer you'll get a charter  
7 revision and a new PAC process. In the meantime, we still  
8 have a year of PAC activities, which will probably be at  
9 least three meetings, it sounds like, over the next year.  
10 So we've solicited to fill the vacancies and we've got  
11 three of the four vacancies ready to be nominated.  
12 Commercial fishing, tribal government, and one of the two  
13 public at large. The other public at large is already  
14 filled.

15                   The process is, you as a trustee council  
16 make the nomination and we take that back for approval and  
17 official appointment by the Secretary of the Interior.  
18 That usually takes some processing back in Washington to go  
19 through the department's process, and the administration is  
20 also involved in appointment of all advisory committee  
21 people, so it takes a little bit of time. So anyway, the  
22 action you need to take today is to recommend or to  
23 nominate these folks to fill the vacancies for the next  
24 year on the PAC and then I will take that and process it.

25                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any questions for Doug?

1 Kim.

2 MR. ELTON: Doug, has somebody explained --  
3 have you explained to the nominees, you know, what service  
4 on a FACA committee is and what restrictions or what  
5 responsibilities kind of accrue with appointment to a FACA  
6 committee?

7 MR. MUTTER: Yeah, we have a package that  
8 is available for folks when we solicit nominations that  
9 explains what the PAC is all about and how the works. And  
10 then also have a conflict of interest statement they have  
11 to sign. That doesn't limit their participation, it just  
12 identifies any potential conflicts that might come up. And  
13 then we have a briefing and we have notebook that we give  
14 new members and brief them on what FACA is all about and  
15 what their role is and -- so they get plenty of  
16 information.

17 MR. ELTON: They haven't run screaming from  
18 the room yet?

19 MR. MUTTER: No. But we've tried to fill  
20 the -- get a nominee for local government and we've sent  
21 out information and Cherri and I have talked to people  
22 personally, but we don't have any takers at this point in  
23 time.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I was wondering -- Doug,  
25 this is Larry -- why we haven't been able to get a local

1 government person on the PAC?

2 MR. MUTTER: Well, we had one at one time,  
3 but it turned out he was an employee of the US Forest  
4 Service, so that didn't work out too well.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But what's the problem  
6 now?

7 MR. MUTTER: I'd say lack of interest or  
8 time available to spend on it.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions for  
10 Doug? I guess I need a motion then.

11 MR. O'CONNOR: I move the approval of the  
12 slate as recommended or suggested by Doug.

13 MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
15 discussion?

16 MR. ZEMKE: Doug, these appointments would  
17 end with the rest of the appointments and have to be  
18 reappointed ag -- or if they.....

19 MR. MUTTER: Right.

20 MR. ZEMKE: .....wanted to.....

21 MR. MUTTER: They'd last till next  
22 October.....

23 MR. ZEMKE: But you.....

24 MR. MUTTER: .....and we'll go through the  
25 whole process with everybody again. And they know it's for

1 a year.

2 MR. ZEMKE: Hopefully it would be -- get  
3 through the process back in DC before they actually --  
4 appointments actually end, but.....

5 MR. MUTTER: With Kim's great help, we're  
6 going to speed it up.

7 MR. ZEMKE: All right.

8 (Laughter)

9 MR. ELTON: The pressure is on.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any opposition to  
11 the motion?

12 (No audible responses)

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Hearing none, the  
14 motion passes.

15 MR. MUTTER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Doug.

17 MR. MUTTER: Uh-huh.

18 (Off record conversation regarding  
19 telephonic beep)

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Well, I think  
21 we'll take one more item before the break if people can  
22 tolerate that. Let's see, Carol, do you want to come up  
23 here and talk -- Item 8, habitat reauthorization of Funds.  
24 And again, this is one again that takes a motion. So --  
25 you want to introduce it?

1 MS. FRIES: Yes, thank you. My name is  
2 Carol Fries. I'm with the Department of Natural Resources.  
3 And before you this morning you have two draft resolutions,  
4 09-11 and 09-12, that reauthorized funds that were  
5 previously authorized for the purchase of the Capjohn  
6 parcel on Northern Afognak, which is located on the north  
7 shoreline of Kiliuda Bay. It's a Native allotment and Mr.  
8 Capjohn is represented by the Department of the Interior,  
9 through BIA. One of the conditions of the previous  
10 resolution of March 17th, 2000 was that a purchase  
11 agreement needed to be executed by June 30th, 2009 and  
12 we've not been able to get to that point yet, so we're  
13 requested reauthorization until June 30th of 2010 so that  
14 we can continue to work through this with BIA. The  
15 acquisition itself should be fairly straightforward, it  
16 just takes a little while to work through BIA's process.

17 MR. BROOKOVER: Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Tom.

19 MR. BROOKOVER: Is this an appropriate time  
20 for a question? I don't know.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, go ahead.

22 MR. BROOKOVER: This would not obligate any  
23 additional funds over the funds previously.....

24 MS. FRIES: No.

25 MR. BROOKOVER: .....authorized then, it's

1 just a reauthorization?

2 MS. FRIES: Just reauthorizing what you've  
3 previously agreed to move forward with.

4 MR. BROOKOVER: Thanks.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions on  
6 this?

7 MR. ZEMKE: And I guess would you  
8 anticipate it would be done by 2010 or.....

9 MS. FRIES: I'm hopeful.

10 MR. ZEMKE: So would there be a problem of  
11 not -- I mean, happening out of 2011.....

12 MS. FRIES: If you would like to authorize  
13 it until June 30th, 2011, that would be acceptable as well.

14

15 MR. ZEMKE: So.....

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do you want to make a  
17 motion, Steve?

18 MR. ZEMKE: Well, I guess if there isn't a  
19 problem, rather than have it come up again next year if it  
20 does resolve, it seems like it would logical to extend it  
21 to 2011. I don't know how other council members feel about  
22 that.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Kim.

24 MR. ELTON: This is an artifact of my  
25 history, I guess, but you know, I -- unless somebody can

1 convince me otherwise, I think it's a good idea to maybe  
2 leave it at 2010, because if something hasn't happened by  
3 then, it would be nice to get an update or to compel an  
4 update on what has happened and -- or what hasn't happened  
5 and why it hasn't happened.

6 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I.....

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Craig.

8 MR. TILLERY: Just for the purposes if you  
9 give BIA until 2011, they'll take until 2011.

10 (Laughter)

11 MR. TILLERY: And it seems to me.....

12 MR. ZEMKE: So noted. I won't make a  
13 motion then.

14 MR. ELTON: I should object, but I can't,  
15 Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Do I have a motion  
17 to approve the reauthorization of the funds for the small  
18 parcel KAP 3002, extending the current authorization until  
19 I guess June 20, 2010?

20 MR. O'CONNOR: So moved, Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do I have a second?

22 MR. ZEMKE: I'll second.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you. Any other  
24 discussion on the motion?

25 (No audible responses)

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any opposition to  
2 the motion?

3                   (No audible responses)

4                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hearing none, it passes.

5                   MS. FRIES: The -- thank you. The next  
6 parcel is the Mutch-Jacobs parcel. It is located on -- at  
7 Anchor Point, down on the Kenai Peninsula. This parcel was  
8 the subject of a National Coastal Wetlands grant and the  
9 nature -- that was awarded through ADF&G and being  
10 implemented by The Nature Conservancy. The Nature  
11 Conservancy has accepted title to these two parcels they  
12 have not yet transferred to the state. Fish and Wildlife  
13 Service has extended the grant award period till June 30th,  
14 2011. And the restoration in front of you is requesting  
15 reauthorization of the matching funds in the amount of  
16 175,000, which is consistent with what you approved before.  
17 And the request is to extend the authorization till June  
18 30th, 2010.

19                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any questions?

20                   MR. O'CONNOR: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

21                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any second?

22                   MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

23                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Tom. Any other  
24 questions or discussion? Any opposition to the motion?

25                   (No audible responses)

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Hearing none,  
2 motion passes. Thanks, Carol.

3                   MS. FRIES: Thank you.

4                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Would people like  
5 to take a break at this point? Or do we march on?

6                   (No audible responses)

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Because we're going to  
8 get into the budget and the work plan next, so these are  
9 going to be longer items, so why don't we go ahead and take  
10 a break here for about, I don't know, till 25 after. That  
11 gives us about eight minutes or so, then we'll get into the  
12 budget.

13                  MR. O'CONNOR: That's the beauty of having  
14 old men sit on the board. We can go just so long and then  
15 we got to take a break.

16                  (Laughter)

17                  (Off record - 10:12 a.m.)

18                  (On record - 10:25 a.m.)

19                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I took everybody  
20 off mute now, so we're going to -- it's about 10:25, so  
21 we'll start up again. And we're on Agenda Item 9, Draft  
22 Budget Fiscal Year of '10. We got Renee up here.

23                  MS. JAMES: Hello.

24                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Hi.

25                  MS. JAMES: Make sure I get all my

1 paperwork here organized. I guess it's still morning, so  
2 good morning. I'm Renee James, the Administrator Manager  
3 for EVOS. I thought I'd start by just going through the  
4 budget request comparison, '09 to FY-10, if that would be a  
5 good place to start.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes, please.

7 MS. JAMES: There are the nine different  
8 components, starting with the administrative management.  
9 We -- that was probably the area that we had the largest  
10 change and didn't really show any reduction. We're  
11 requesting 807,336. That changed or it actually increased  
12 by 86,000. That was due to an increase, some in salaries,  
13 some in our lease costs, and some equipment purchases that  
14 we're anticipating. Data management actually went down.  
15 We lost a position in that area and will be re-classing  
16 that under science management. We -- so the bulk of that  
17 was probably salary. We did ask for some additional  
18 funding in that area to purchase an air conditioner for our  
19 server room and a few other software items.

20 Science management is showing a reduction,  
21 even though we're adding a position. That will be the  
22 assistant executive director position.

23 MS. HSIEH: Deputy.

24 MS. JAMES: Deputy. And that's reflected  
25 in your backup paperwork on the APDI budget. Public

1 information outreach is actually reduced. That is due to  
2 the IPA costs going down from full time to one-half.  
3 That's primarily -- the bulk of that is in contractual. I  
4 think that was reflected in personnel last year but it  
5 really is more of a contractual item.

6                   The PAC went down 10,900. That money was  
7 budgeted for a PAC field trip last year, so there's not one  
8 planned this year, so it's not -- that was reduced. No  
9 difference in the Trustee Council member expenses. Nothing  
10 has changed in the habitat. Program support is one of  
11 those areas that until we know what's going to be  
12 authorized in projects, that is really a draft number at  
13 this point. I would expect that's going to go up  
14 significantly once we know how many projects are funded.  
15 And we had a slight reduction for the ARLIS due to salary  
16 recalculation. I'm not sure that it was actually  
17 calculated correctly last year. When I pulled those  
18 numbers off of ABS, I came up with a totally different  
19 scenario. So we have a total of 340,540 less, I believe  
20 was the change between '09 and '10. Does anybody have any  
21 questions on that? Do you have a que -- anybody?

22                   MR. BROOKOVER: Mr. Chair.

23                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Oh, yeah. Go ahead, Tom.

24                   MR. BROOKOVER: Are we going to go through  
25 the work -- I'm just curious whether to ask this now or

1 whether we're going to be going into more detail on each  
2 component?

3 MS. JAMES: I can, if you'd like me to go  
4 through them that way.

5 MR. BROOKOVER: I just have a question on  
6 one of the components.

7 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, I got a list of stickies,  
8 but how do you want to do this?

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, let's see. What  
10 were you planning, Renee? Were you planning to get into  
11 more detail or do you want us to just start asking  
12 questions on these various components?

13 MS. JAMES: If you want to just ask  
14 questions, we can do that. If everyone's had a chance to  
15 review it, it might save us some time if you just have  
16 certain things that you've highlighted.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, I think it would be  
18 helpful to at least hear about the changes. That's what I  
19 was most interested in. So maybe we -- you could kind of  
20 walk us through the highlights of it and then we'll go to  
21 questions from there.

22 MS. JAMES: Okay. Get on the right budget  
23 here. So starting with administrative management, we have  
24 personnel costs of 438,495. That includes full time salary  
25 for an executive director, the administrative manager, and

1 associate coordinator, and an administrative assistant. We  
2 have some travel costs projected at 6,000. And let me know  
3 if I'm going too fast through here.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No, what I think what  
5 I'll do is stop after every component. So we're done with  
6 administration management. We'll stop there for a question  
7 and we'll go to the next one and.....

8 MS. HSIEH: And Renee, you should note that  
9 although it's budgeted for full time for both the Deputy  
10 Executive Director and the Executive Director, we are both  
11 part-time positions.

12 MS. JAMES: Part-time. So that's actually  
13 higher, those costs are higher, estimated higher.

14 MR. BROOKOVER: In other words, we won't --  
15 wouldn't expect to spend that full amount.

16 MS. JAMES: Unh-unh. (Negative)

17 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

18 MS. HSIEH: In fact, many of these amounts  
19 as you go through them, for example, travel for the  
20 Executive Director, some of the other things, we haven't  
21 been using all the money that's been budgeted, and that's  
22 sort of -- but we have it so we don't have to come to you  
23 for \$2,000 for travel, but it's my intent to try and have  
24 money left over at the end of the year.

25 MS. JAMES: Okay. So back to travel -- so

1 we have \$6,000 budgeted for travel. That's to support the  
2 Executive Director and administrative staff to attend  
3 meetings and trainings. We have 261,180 for contractual.  
4 That includes \$3,000 for professional development. And  
5 then 189,660 is budgeted for the council office space.  
6 That has increased by about \$17,000. Some of that is due  
7 to the fact that our lease is maturing and will end in  
8 2011. And we had increased costs for homeland security, so  
9 that did go up quite a bit. Annual parking fees went up  
10 about \$220.

11 MS. HSIEH: Renee, do you mind if I make a  
12 comment?

13 MS. JAMES: Sure.

14 MS. HSIEH: Also, the office space here we  
15 believe is too much space for the number of people here, so  
16 Renee is working very hard -- it has to go through USGS.  
17 We've had them come here and we've made suggested  
18 construction revisions to cut off a third, half of the  
19 space. And I don't know if that's -- we're going to get  
20 their numbers and also go look at other office space and  
21 whatever we can reduce our costs is what we'll go with.  
22 And we've started that process because it's through USGS  
23 and we work through several different entities then it's a  
24 slow process, but Renee's been bird-dogging it as much as  
25 possible, because I feel like the space here is excessive

1 for the number of staff that we currently have.

2 MS. JAMES: Okay. So we currently have  
3 budgeted for our annual audit \$20,000. That is going to go  
4 for a one-year period. Right now our current contract has  
5 expired, so we're going to go out for one year and then  
6 we'll go out for three more years after that cycle is over.  
7 And that actually went down by about \$7,500. Telephone  
8 service is budgeted at \$8,500. Trustee Council meetings is  
9 about 3,000. Public notices are -- publications are  
10 expensive to advertise in the newspaper, and that's about  
11 5,000. Postage is 2,500. Equipment maintenance and  
12 agreements are about 1,400. Transcription services are  
13 about 6,500. Inter-agency contract services are budgeted  
14 about 15,500. That covers a variety of things.  
15 Reimbursable service agreements, telecommunications,  
16 computer services, a variety of items there.

17 Commodities for office supplies went up a  
18 bit. I think that they had been under-estimated in the  
19 past, so based on the actuals of what we actually spent, we  
20 bumped that up a bit. About \$10,000 actually, and that's  
21 going to cover some of our costs for outreach to the  
22 public. We've budgeted \$20,000 for replacing some of our  
23 equipment that has aged out. That there was nothing  
24 budgeted last year for that at all. Let's see here. And  
25 that pretty much -- other than -- and that covers the

1 administrative management. Anybody have any questions?

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any questions on  
3 administrative management? Guess not.

4 MS. JAMES: Okay. Moving on to data  
5 management. We have budgeted 149,991. The bulk of that is  
6 in our personnel costs. As I said, we did lose a position  
7 from data management. That was Brendan's position. He's  
8 resigned and that is the position we'll be taking to  
9 reclass for the Assistant Deputy Executive Director. That  
10 title is long. So we've also budgeted \$2,000 for travel.  
11 And contractual, we have \$1,500 for some professional  
12 development and \$10,000 for some hardware and some upgrades  
13 to our computer system. And we also have \$15,000 budgeted  
14 for the air conditioner that we need to add to our server  
15 room. And some security, additional security items that we  
16 needed to keep the server room secure, locked. Some of the  
17 house bill, I believe it was House Bill 65 had some  
18 requirements that we needed to fulfill for that. We also  
19 tried to add a little bit in there in case we do end up  
20 moving this year. Just to kind of -- to get that started  
21 so we can plan for that a little bit if we are moving or if  
22 we have to downsize as well. Is there any questions on the  
23 data management?

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I don't see any --  
25 or no.

1                   MS. JAMES: Science management, we have  
2 budgeted a total of 507,651. That includes the new  
3 position for the Deputy Executive Director. Again that is  
4 budgeted at full time, although that will be a half-time  
5 position. That was sort of in anticipation of if that  
6 changed somewhere during a year. We have the science  
7 coordinator position and a project assistant. \$5,000 for  
8 travel. That's a little higher than normal. We have an  
9 international trip budgeted in there. We have 1,500 for  
10 professional development. There's \$10,000 for the annual  
11 marine science symposium. And \$35,000 for the herring  
12 research and restoration planning. That includes money for  
13 contracts with Doug Hay, Jeep Rice and Doug Woodby, I  
14 believe. That's -- and then 22,000 for the herring  
15 workshop and 1,300 -- or 13,000 for the panel, review  
16 panel. There's another 60,000 for contractual for the  
17 science panel and 17,500 for peer review contracts.

18                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Craig.

19                   MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman. On the Deputy  
20 Executive Director, you've reclassified a PCN?

21                   MS. JAMES: We did. We took Brendan's PCN  
22 and reclass -- it has not been done yet. We're in the  
23 process of reclassifying that position.

24                   MR. TILLERY: How's that going to work,  
25 because the person is currently in a Department of Law PCN?

1 MS. JAMES: Uh-huh.

2 MR. TILLERY: How do you have different  
3 PCNs for the same person?

4 MS. JAMES: Well, as with Elise, I believe  
5 -- my hope is that we can put that person in acting status.  
6 We may end up doing that. I haven't quite worked out the  
7 details yes. Before we had difficulty because we didn't  
8 have a PCN, so to put her in acting status and pay her at  
9 the correct rate. The thought is to have that PCN,  
10 reclassify to the correct range, and then put her in there  
11 acting part-time.

12 MR. TILLERY: But before that would have  
13 worked because she was full time. But now that she's half-  
14 time and in one PCN, can you have a person that's half-time  
15 in a PCN in one department and half-time in an acting PCN  
16 or something in another department? I -- how does that --  
17 I don't.....

18 MS. JAMES: Well, isn't that what we did  
19 with Elise basically, she's -- she was.....

20 MR. TILLERY: No, Elise was -- is only  
21 half-time in a half-time.....

22 MS. JAMES: Oh, on the Department of Law.

23 MR. TILLERY: .....PCN at the Department of  
24 Law. So, again, it was sort of -- that was all of her then  
25 became acting. I still -- I'm happy to do it if I know how

1 to do it. I'm not sure.....

2 MS. JAMES: I'm not really even sure how to  
3 do it either. It was an approach that we were going to  
4 try. We hadn't worked out the details yet. I don't  
5 actually know how we're going to do that right now.

6 MR. TILLERY: Okay. But in any event, it's  
7 your view to budget this as full time?

8 MS. HSIEH: It was Renee's suggestion that  
9 we budget both positions full time, even though we are both  
10 part-time. I don't know if that's because of some of the  
11 uncertainty as to whether one or both of us would have to  
12 increase our schedules sometime because our tenure here has  
13 been somewhat uncertain, but -- or I don't know if it was  
14 just sort of traditional in budgets, but we could.....

15 MS. JAMES: It just seemed to.....

16 MS. HSIEH: .....cut it down.

17 MS. JAMES: .....make more sense to budget  
18 a full time and then try to go back and fix it halfway  
19 during the year. It's -- it could go either way.

20 MR. TILLERY: Is there -- what happens, if  
21 it doesn't go past half-time, to that money? Does it get  
22 returned or is that money somehow flexible and can be used  
23 for something else? I just recall we had some problems in  
24 the past several years with money being budgeted for one  
25 thing in personnel and it seems like it was then used for

1 something else.

2 MS. HSIEH: I don't think we could use it  
3 -- if you approve it for this purpose, I think you would  
4 have to roll over to the next budget's use.

5 MR. TILLERY: Is that right?

6 MS. JAMES: It would be budgeted for  
7 personnel only.

8 MR. TILLERY: No, but I mean for only for  
9 this position though?

10 MS. JAMES: Oh, yeah. Right.

11 MR. TILLERY: I mean, it couldn't.....

12 MS. JAMES: That's.....

13 MR. TILLERY: .....be used to hire someone  
14 else or to.....

15 MS. HSIEH: Not.....

16 MR. TILLERY: .....augment someone else's  
17 salary?

18 MS. HSIEH: Not unless you approved it.

19 MS. JAMES: Unh-unh. Yeah, it would have  
20 to be approved.

21 MS. HSIEH: The transfer of funds or  
22 reauthorization, I guess.

23 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

24 MR. O'CONNOR: It's simply a matter of the  
25 council making a change. It's -- there's no state law

1 restrictions on making changes here. We take care of the  
2 personnel aspects and we find out we got an extra five  
3 grand, we could reprogram that money into something else.

4 MR. TILLERY: Absolutely. I just wanted to  
5 make sure that it would come back to the council and that  
6 money just simply wouldn't be somehow in the end.....

7 MS. HSIEH: Reappropriated.

8 MS. JAMES: It would just be carried for --  
9 it would just.....

10 MR. TILLERY: Yeah.

11 MS. JAMES: We would get that back at the  
12 end of the state fiscal year or.....

13 MR. O'CONNOR: You mean you want to be sure  
14 ADF&G doesn't keep it; is that what.....

15 MS. JAMES: No, no.

16 MR. O'CONNOR: .....you're saying?

17 MS. JAMES: No. It isn't going to happen.

18 MR. O'CONNOR: Denby's new boat. I'm  
19 sorry.

20 MS. JAMES: I thought it would be better to  
21 over-budget than under-budget that particular position  
22 because we don't really know how that's going to work out  
23 with her being in two PCNs.

24 MR. O'CONNOR: Uh-huh.

25 MS. JAMES: And again, we haven't even

1 reclassified it at this point. It was just what we were  
2 projecting would be the best approach.

3 MR. ZEMKE: I guess I have a little concern  
4 if we're dealing with both positions and figuring out  
5 there's actually another \$130,000 that's probably going to  
6 be returned and lapsed over till next year. Indeed we're  
7 at the kind of five percent limit by significantly over-  
8 budgeting and it seems like it may be a problem in that  
9 we're shorting some of the projects that potentially could  
10 get.....

11 MS. HSIEH: We could cut those down.

12 MS. JAMES: Uh-huh. I could get it.....

13 MS. HSIEH: And then if I work an hour over  
14 my schedule, we'll have to have a Trustee Council meeting.

15 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah.

16 MS. HSIEH: I'd prefer that almost. We  
17 could cut this.

18 MS. JAMES: Easily done. I just would have  
19 to run the scenarios and change the numbers.

20 MR. ZEMKE: You know, I don't know what you  
21 would consider being comfortable with, whether.....

22 MS. HSIEH: I'm.....

23 MR. ZEMKE: Six months probably isn't  
24 enough. Maybe six months to eight months or nine months.

25 MS. HSIEH: I'm comfortable with her

1 cutting them down. I think our positions here have always  
2 been sort of tenuous and the time spent, but of course if  
3 there's a change, then we can just come to the Trustee  
4 Council if there was a change in our schedules, a need, for  
5 example, for one of us to work more here, we could just do  
6 that formally.

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I think just a bit  
8 -- in case everybody doesn't have the background, that  
9 Elise is working half time and you're on, at this point, a  
10 Fish and Game PCN. She's half time. Jen is working full  
11 time, but half time here and half time at the Department of  
12 Law. And right now she's on a Department of Law PCN with  
13 half of that being paid, I think, through an RSA from Fish  
14 and Game. So that's the -- so basically you've got -- what  
15 you have is two half time people doing this job.

16                   MS. HSIEH: We could cut these positions  
17 down to three quarters, that way if for some reason one of  
18 us ends up working more, which hoping won't happen, but  
19 sometimes happens, and it would be more difficult for Jen,  
20 because she'd have to take it to the Department of Law, but  
21 it's possible that I would have to up my hours, then there  
22 would be that flex. Or take it to half. I'm comfortable  
23 either way.

24                   MR. BROOKOVER: I guess I think taking it  
25 down to something like three quarters would be reasonable.

1 I want to make sure that you have the flexibility needed to  
2 -- you and Jen, the flexibility.....

3 MS. HSIEH: Part of me doesn't want.....

4 MR. BROOKOVER: .....needed to.....

5 MS. HSIEH: .....that flexibility, so.....

6 MR. BROOKOVER: .....do the job without,  
7 you know, the need for budgeting two full positions.

8 MS. HSIEH: Yeah. No, I agree.

9 MS. JAMES: So, I'm going to put them both  
10 down to.....

11 MR. BROOKOVER: Nine months.

12 MS. HSIEH: Three quarters.

13 MS. JAMES: Three quarters. Nine months.

14 MR. BROOKOVER: Which would be three  
15 quarters.

16 MS. JAMES: Thank you.

17 MR. ELTON: Mr. Chair. Just to make sure  
18 that I understand. So, when Renee puts them down at three  
19 quarters, when it comes time for us to approve, we're  
20 approving the three quarters; is the the process?

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

22 MS. JAMES: Okay. Let's see, where did I  
23 leave off?

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think you were done  
25 with science management.

1 MS. JAMES: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Unless there was any  
3 other questions. I guess I had one question on the herring  
4 research and restoration and planning. Are these -- this  
5 assume the same level of activity as -- with no changes  
6 than what we're doing now?

7 MS. HSIEH: That's not entirely -- you mean  
8 from the past years?

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No, from this currently,  
10 I mean, what we're -- like say, you know, we decide a month  
11 from now, yeah, we want to do something else on herring in  
12 terms of a planning group or anything like that. Is there  
13 any other money built into this that allows any other  
14 additional activities or is.....

15 MS. HSIEH: No, this money is the \$22,000,  
16 which is pretty tightly budgeted to bring all the herring  
17 PI's here and you typically, in October, a very productive  
18 meeting for them to get together and talk about what  
19 they're doing. And then \$13,000, which actually pretty  
20 much relates to Doug Hay. Doug Woodby and Jeep Rice are  
21 both agency personnel, so we don't have separate contracts  
22 with them. But Doug Hay, we contract with him, both his  
23 time and to come up here. All three would be attending the  
24 herring PI meeting, and also guiding any revisions in the  
25 herring planning document. And that's what those two

1 figures represent.

2                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Because I guess  
3 I'm a little bit worried with the additional work that  
4 we're having -- I mean, it's a question of timing, but  
5 relating to the herring, you know, we may have more.....

6                   MS. HSIEH: There's.....

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....needs here.

8                   MS. HSIEH: You have another Trustee  
9 Council meeting scheduled in November, at which time there  
10 may be additional monies. Or you could put in some flex  
11 money here for any sort of herring planning efforts that  
12 may come up.

13                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: My guess is.....

14                  MS. HSIEH: Either way.

15                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....that it will  
16 increase at some point.....

17                  MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh.

18                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....but I just don't  
19 know when.

20                  MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh. I agree with you.

21                  MR. BROOKOVER: Mr. Chair. I had a  
22 question as well. Two actually. Renee, this is one  
23 component, the science management component that had a  
24 pretty substantial reduction over the last year; right?  
25 And we added the Deputy Executive Director position. So

1 what's responsible for -- which would, you know, even make  
2 the reduction more without that added in -- what's  
3 responsible for the reduction?

4 MS. JAMES: Let me find my last year's  
5 here.

6 MS. HSIEH: Catherine can answer that as  
7 well. Catherine, do you want to come up to the table? The  
8 microphone is under the paper.

9 MS. BOERNER: I have a big voice, everyone  
10 will hear. Okay. The major reduction for that was the  
11 herring planning team meetings that we had budgeted for  
12 last year, which was the two meetings in Cordova and the  
13 travel and getting everyone there. That was quite  
14 expensive. I think -- yeah, we had \$180,000 budgeted for  
15 that last year. We won't be doing that. We had also added  
16 in \$30,000 to do a strategies and technol -- yeah,  
17 strategies and technologies of supplemental production  
18 workshop, which we have elected not to do. So that was  
19 another 30,000 that came off the science budget for this  
20 year. Oh, let's see if there's anything else.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Let's see, do you have  
22 that microphone covered there?

23 MS. JAMES: Oh, I'm sorry.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, that should fine  
25 there.

1 MS. JAMES: That was probably the largest  
2 part of it.

3 MS. BOERNER: Peer review -- let's see, did  
4 the peer review contacts go down?

5 MS. JAMES: Yeah.

6 MS. BOERNER: Yes, those went down  
7 significantly. We were also paying 10 herring steering  
8 committee members last year, so that was \$75,000, where  
9 we're down to a group of three this year, with only one  
10 actually having a contract in place.

11 MR. BROOKOVER: Very good.

12 MS. HSIEH: Thank you, Catherine.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
14 questions on the science management section?

15 (No audible responses)

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So, I guess the only  
17 current change we're talking about is the Deputy Executive  
18 Director position being three quarters; right?

19 MS. JAMES: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

21 MR. O'CONNOR: The point on increasing the  
22 herring.....

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

24 MR. O'CONNOR: .....research, which I think  
25 would be good at about 50 grand. Give us the

1 flexibility.....

2                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do you think we need to  
3 make that change now or do you want to wait until November?

4                   MR. O'CONNOR: I don't.....

5                   MS. HSIEH: We have an administrative limit  
6 with regard to individuals. I believe we can contract with  
7 them up to \$5,000. Renee, correct me if I'm wrong. Beyond  
8 that, we have to get your approval in their name. So,  
9 while we would have, for example, if you set aside \$50,000  
10 for us to do some herring planning, we probably wouldn't be  
11 able to allot, if we had a certain number of people we were  
12 contracting with, until November when we had names and more  
13 of a schedule.

14                  MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.

15                  MS. HSIEH: So.....

16                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So we'll revisit that in  
17 November.

18                  MS. HSIEH: Yeah, you can -- if you want to  
19 put in \$5,000 just for elasticity, which I wouldn't -- you  
20 know, and then we would recount to you how that was spend,  
21 that's fine, but a large sum, we probably wouldn't be able  
22 to use without your approval anyway. Renee, do you agree  
23 with that?

24                  MS. JAMES: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

25                  MR. O'CONNOR: That's fine. As long as we

1 don't cut ourselves short on what we need to do when we  
2 need to do it.

3 MS. HSIEH: So you could add another \$5,000  
4 in the herring planning just to allow in case, you know,  
5 there was a little additional travel or some of this  
6 which.....

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Why don't we go  
8 ahead and do that? I suggest to just go ahead and put  
9 5,000 additional in the herring planning now and then we'll  
10 revisit it in November. So we're not getting cut short  
11 here.

12 MS. JAMES: Okay. Public information and  
13 outreach is budgeted at 82,350. That includes \$3,000 for  
14 travel.

15 MS. HSIEH: May I -- do you -- may I make  
16 one more note. The \$5,000, I would recommend putting it to  
17 be used for the IHRP review panel, for those three names.  
18 Thus if we go over \$5,000 with one of those persons, that  
19 will be authorized by you.....

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

21 MS. HSIEH: .....at this time.

22 MS. JAMES: Okay. Again, travel was at --  
23 budgeted at 3,000. And that we have listed in compliance  
24 with the IPA travel funds, are provided as part of that  
25 IPA, as well as professional development and training,

1 which leads us to the contractual 63,550. That's the IPA  
2 for Rebecca Talbott to work half-time with EV -- to  
3 continue working half-time with EVOS, and that includes her  
4 increased salary at three percent. Commodities were  
5 budgeted at 9,000. That's basically to help produce and  
6 purchase documents for public information. That one's  
7 actually pretty short. Does anyone have any questions on  
8 that one?

9                                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I guess I'm -- this is  
10 Larry. I'm glad to see this in here. I think that it's  
11 good that we continue the public information and outreach  
12 effort that we started with the 20th anniversary and I'm  
13 happy that Rebecca can stay with us and help on that.  
14 Because I worry a bit, you know, particularly with all the  
15 work that we have, I think we are reaching a critical  
16 juncture in terms of decision on fast-forward. And also it  
17 seems like there is more attention now on oceans in general  
18 with the task force that was meeting here a week or two ago  
19 and the national strategy, AOOS getting additional funding  
20 and up and running. And just more efforts out there that  
21 need to be coordinated with the council. So I see this as  
22 a key position for us over the next couple of years.

23                                   MS. HSIEH: I agree. We've had a lot of  
24 interest.

25                                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I think it's going

1 to grow. Any other comments? Questions? Okay. Thanks.

2 MS. JAMES: Okay. And then moving on to  
3 the Public Advisory Committee. We budgeted this year  
4 37,605. We have personnel, \$7,500 and those annual funds  
5 are provided for the designated federal officer, Doug  
6 Mutter, assigned to the PAC and as required by the Federal  
7 Advisory Committee Act. And I think everyone is familiar  
8 with what Doug does. Travel is budgeted at 24,000. That  
9 is -- that's showing the reduction of the 10,000 for their  
10 PAC field trip. And.....

11 MR. ELTON: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Kim.

13 MR. ELTON: Given the discussion that we  
14 had about meeting in January and if I remember correctly,  
15 Doug was talking about a potential -- with the addition of  
16 that, was talking about a potential three meetings. I  
17 mean, I'm wondering.....

18 MS. HSIEH: One of those will be  
19 telephonic.

20 MR. ELTON: One would be telephonic.

21 MS. HSIEH: We'd stick to the two in person  
22 meetings.

23 MR. ELTON: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you.

25 MS. JAMES: Okay. And then I think we had

1 3,000 budgeted for meetings. Public announcements, meeting  
2 materials and amenities. And that covers the PAC budget.  
3 Trustee Council member expenses were budgeted at 29,975.  
4 We really had no change there at all. And just getting  
5 some feedback from staff that did travel, it didn't sound  
6 like there was -- people stayed well within those costs.  
7 It didn't seem to be a big issue for travel.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Craig.

9 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman. I would be  
10 curious to know, I mean, how much we actually spend on  
11 that. I think from the perspective of the Department of  
12 Law, I'd be surprised if we spent a dime.

13 MS. JAMES: Yeah.

14 MR. TILLERY: So.....

15 MS. JAMES: Most -- a lot of people did not  
16 spend those dollars.

17 MR. TILLERY: Okay. And why then -- I  
18 mean, why do we need G&A to cover travel costs? Almost  
19 anybody that comes anywhere does it in conjunction with  
20 other business. I just don't understand why the council  
21 would be adding G&A.

22 MS. JAMES: And followed what has been done  
23 previously. I had the same questions. I would imagine the  
24 G&A is going toward staff making travel arrangements, that  
25 type of thing.

1                   MR. TILLERY: Does it just go there or does  
2 it go there as a percentage of what you actually spend? I  
3 mean, did the Department of Law get nine percent of 5,000,  
4 even though we didn't spend any of it?

5                   MS. JAMES: I believe so.

6                   MR. TILLERY: For -- so we get five percent  
7 for not -- I mean, we get nine percent for not doing  
8 anything? That doesn't sound right.

9                   MS. JAMES: Administrative costs.

10                  MR. ZEMKE: Well, you should return it all  
11 if you didn't spend any of it.

12                  MS. JAMES: Yeah, and if you're not  
13 spending it, then it should come back, yes.

14                  MS. HSIEH: But it doesn't, I don't  
15 believe.

16                  MS. JAMES: Yes, it's not.

17                  MS. HSIEH: This is -- Renee came in in  
18 November. She followed the format of what has gone before.  
19 In fact, we asked these questions a couple of years ago  
20 when we looked at the budget, when I looked at this budget  
21 for the first time as an attorney. And Renee is going to  
22 revamp the way this budget is done. This is the way it's  
23 been done in the past years, but both the formatting is a  
24 little confusing and with regard to the nine percent, we  
25 agree. And also the 5,500, I think typically DEC and DOL

1 don't tend to use it.

2 MS. JAMES: But if there was a meeting  
3 somewhere else, maybe not in their location.....

4 MS. HSIEH: Yes, if we ended up having a  
5 meeting somewhere else.

6 MR. TILLERY: Well, in Cordova, for  
7 example.

8 MS. JAMES: Right.

9 MR. TILLERY: The Cordova meeting.

10 MS. HSIEH: But at the same time we tend to  
11 -- I mean, we -- unless you planned another Trustee Council  
12 meeting, you can't authorization for the funds. The nine  
13 percent, I don't know where that originated. That's what's  
14 been done here for the Trustee Council all these years.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I think for  
16 both.....

17 MR. ELTON: What does G&A stand for?

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: G&A is just.....

19 MS. JAMES: Administra -- in my.....

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Somehow it's -- it's  
21 overhead.

22 MR. TILLERY: General administration, I  
23 think it is.

24 MS. JAMES: General administration.

25 MR. ZEMKE: But the Forest Service has

1 recognized that our Trustees are here in Anchorage and so  
2 don't have travel costs. So rather than lapse the funds  
3 back, we basically requested to not have any in this travel  
4 budget portion. Throw it over to somebody like NOAA where  
5 they're in Seattle or other places.....

6 MS. HSIEH: Right.

7 MR. ZEMKE: .....and they may have  
8 significant travel expenses.

9 MS. HSIEH: So if for example some of you  
10 would like to follow suite, I suppose we could do the same.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Why don't we check back  
12 with our individual departments and look at it from that  
13 end at the same time as Renee looks at it from her end and  
14 then try to get a consensus on both the travel costs and  
15 what's appropriate in the G&A expenses associated with  
16 that.

17 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, and can you tell me  
18 whether -- I don't even know if we bill like for example  
19 that Cordova meeting to this or not. So could you tell me  
20 how much we spent last year? Could you send -- just give  
21 me something later?

22 MS. JAMES: Right. I can do that. Okay.  
23 Should I just move on here then?

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, why don't we keep  
25 moving.

1 MS. HSIEH: Yeah, it's 11:00 o'clock.

2 MS. JAMES: Habitat protection program is  
3 budgeted at 109,000. Personnel costs are at 35,000. These  
4 funds are provided to support -- in support of agency  
5 efforts -- excuse me, I'm losing my voice -- to bring small  
6 parcel proposals to the council for consideration.

7 Expenses such as title review, hazmat review and survey  
8 review. Similar expenses are appropriate. Due diligent  
9 efforts, which may be undertaken by sponsoring agencies  
10 under this program. The budgeted due diligence  
11 expenditures on personnel are those to be accomplished  
12 through the use of in-house staff as most efficient and/or  
13 cost effective. The purchase of any interest in land  
14 requires additional Trustee Council review and approval.

15 Contractual is 65,000. Those funds are  
16 provided in support of agency efforts to bring -- this is  
17 duplicative. I didn't really understand why this was, and  
18 I think Carol.....

19 MS. HSIEH: Carol clarified the other day  
20 that it's because sometimes they contract with personnel to  
21 have these properties prepped and sometimes it is agency  
22 personnel that can do it. It just has to be flexible that  
23 way. So that's why those two paragraphs sound very  
24 similar. Carol can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe  
25 that was the.....

1 MS. FRIES: That's correct.

2 MS. HSIEH: Okay.

3 MS. JAMES: Any questions on habitat?

4 MR. ZEMKE: I guess for ourselves with the  
5 Forest Service, this last year we didn't actually even  
6 request the NRDA funds to come down, because we knew we  
7 weren't going to spend any on due diligence because we  
8 didn't have any -- nominate any parcels. And so  
9 essentially -- may be in the same situation again this year  
10 but we're not sure, so -- and we could go either way,  
11 whether we could kind of eliminate those funds from coming  
12 down, and then if we did have need, we'd have to come back  
13 to the Trustee Council to requests funds in that manner.  
14 So I could go either way. But I anticipate we're probably  
15 not going to request funds to bring down this year,  
16 but.....

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do you want to change  
18 that number, Steve, or.....

19 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, I guess I could -- in  
20 that regard, I could go down to zero. We do have.....

21 MS. HSIEH: Carol has comment. I believe  
22 it's not just US Forest Service; right?

23 MS. FRIES: You're involved in the Valdez  
24 duck flats parcel.....

25 MR. ZEMKE: Oh.

1 MS. FRIES: .....so you'll have legal  
2 involvement.....

3 MR. ZEMKE: Okay.

4 MS. FRIES: .....site inspections, reports.  
5

6 MR. ZEMKE: Okay.

7 MS. FRIES: And there's NEPA compliance as  
8 well, so.....

9 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, some of NEP -- some of  
10 that other work gets done under the program management  
11 portion, so there's kind of a blending of funds. But I had  
12 forgotten about the duck flats one, so I guess I probably  
13 misspoke, so maybe I should leave that one in.

14 MS. HSIEH: We appreciate the spirit in  
15 which you misspoke.

16 MR. ZEMKE: Yes.

17 MR. HARTIG: Okay. Anything else on  
18 habitat protection?

19 (No audible responses)

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We'll move on.

21 MS. JAMES: Program support and project  
22 management was budgeted at 284,148. That included  
23 personnel costs of 260,686. This section is going to  
24 change, as we know, as the project -- the project  
25 management is going to change. TC council support probably

1 won't change. This is really -- this was a really hard  
2 area for me to understand and I've had a lot of help from  
3 Dede Bohn and Carol and several other people in trying to  
4 make some sense out of this. So the project management is  
5 totally a guesstimate at this point. We know what the  
6 monthly salary is for each of these agencies, so once the  
7 projects have been approved, these will have to be  
8 adjusted.

9 MS. HSIEH: So as it's highlighted, there's  
10 one month's salary, up to a maximum of 12 months, that will  
11 be included in this approved budget for each project that  
12 you approve as it gets assigned to the different agency  
13 project managers. And on top of that, there's also the  
14 nine percent on top of that figure. This is -- this, I  
15 believe, this project management cost is what has been a  
16 hot potato back and forth in the history of EVOS Trustee  
17 Council and those funds, versus the Trustee Council  
18 support, which I think you addressed earlier quite  
19 succinctly with regard to liaisons. So I think you're  
20 seeing sort of the hot potato spot. But -- so those  
21 numbers are going to go up quite a bit after you approve  
22 projects, which hopefully is going to be soon.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Craig.

24 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman. I guess what  
25 baffles me is these are funds that we provide to people to

1 manage projects and then we got to pay nine percent  
2 overhead for overhead? There's overhead on our overhead.  
3 That doesn't make any sense to me.

4 MS. HSIEH: This has been -- when I looked  
5 back, in 2006 this was looked at as well as a cost savings  
6 to EVOS and if the Trustee Council is going to run these  
7 scientific projects into the future in some way, shape or  
8 form, this is the hot potato of potential savings. Whether  
9 it's more efficient to bring the project management in-  
10 house so that the scientific staff here is aware of what's  
11 going on with the projects and consolidate versus having  
12 this sort of automatic one month salary tacked on to all  
13 the agencies. It's the way it's always been. This is how  
14 this trustee council has been run, I believe.

15 MR. TILLERY: Okay. But just on the  
16 limited thing of why wouldn't -- why would you have G&A on  
17 this, overhead again on overhead?

18 MS. HSIEH: This is the way it was.....

19 MR. TILLERY: Why wouldn't you just  
20 eliminate that 23,000?

21 MS. HSIEH: I don't -- I'd have to.....

22 MS. JAMES: I'm not sure.

23 MS. HSIEH: .....the -- I'm not sure if our  
24 general operating procedures or if there's some other  
25 authorizing document that at this point in time at this

1 meeting you'd have to ship. I'm not sure. Or if you want  
2 to try and do away with it at this meeting and then I would  
3 have to -- the lawyers would have to go back and look at  
4 the authorizing documents to see if there's any holdup on  
5 that.

6 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

7 MS. HSIEH: You could, I suppose.....

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead. Yeah.

9 MR. TILLERY: Carol, you would get some of  
10 this money.

11 MS. FRIES: That's correct.

12 MR. TILLERY: Do you need the -- I mean,  
13 what's the G&A do?

14 MS. FRIES: The G&A -- the funds that are  
15 authorized for liaisons, project management, et cetera, are  
16 for personal.....

17 REPORTER: Can't hear you. Thank you.

18 MS. FRIES: Sure. Sorry. Carol Fries,  
19 Department of Natural Resources. The funds that are  
20 authorized are for personal services, but all personal  
21 services -- in other words, when you have an individual  
22 sitting in an agency, there are expenses associated with  
23 that. You have copiers, you have an administrative staff  
24 that handles procurement. I mean, I can -- for instance, I  
25 can contract for services, but I have to work with the

1 procurement officer. I have to work with the financial  
2 officer. And so the way this was set up -- and this is --  
3 this started out slightly different and I believe when  
4 Molly was Executive Director, this would have been like in  
5 2000, 2001, it shifted to this particular formula. It was  
6 at one point -- I think it was higher, but it was only on  
7 certain line items. The G&A provides funds to cover those  
8 expenses other than salary that are associated with these  
9 positions and this work.

10 MR. ZEMKE: There would be things like  
11 telephone.

12 MS. FRIES: Correct.

13 MR. ZEMKE: IT at the home base.

14 MS. HSIEH: Overhead.

15 MR. ZEMKE: Lease, other things.

16 MR. TILLERY: So these are legitimate  
17 costs.

18 MS. FRIES: Yeah. Yeah.

19 MR. TILLERY: and do you get the G&A  
20 whether you spend the money, the money upon which the  
21 percentage is.....

22 MS. FRIES: Correct.

23 MR. TILLERY: .....based or not?

24 MS. FRIES: Now at this point, the G&A  
25 comes through the system and it's in the system, yes.

1                   MR. TILLERY: Even if you never spend an  
2 actual dime and we don't -- we never incur any costs, the  
3 agency still gets the G&A money?

4                   MS. FRIES: That's -- technically, yes. A  
5 lot of times the G&A will -- I mean, we do lapse G&A, but  
6 technically it comes through and it's conveyed, it's paid.

7                   MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I guess I have  
8 a concern that this G&A seems to be money.....

9                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It seems like it needs to  
10 be looked at.

11                  MR. TILLERY: Looked at, yeah.

12                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I think all the G&A  
13 needs to be revisited, but it sounds like you're pretty  
14 much intending to do that. The question is whether we  
15 leave it in the budget then investigate it further, both  
16 from the agency perspectives, see what all is in there, how  
17 it gets billed, what it's actually used for, and whether we  
18 need to renegotiate something there with the agencies or  
19 change some other document where it appears.

20                  MS. FRIES: Could.....

21                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Carol.

22                  MS. FRIES: There is basically for all  
23 projects and all funds that are coming into the Department  
24 of Natural Resources, we have a DOI approved overhead rate,  
25 and it's -- at one point I know it was 15 percent. It may

1 be like 13.65 percent. And that is tacked on to -- for  
2 instance, if I have a contract with -- the one thing that I  
3 can think of off the top of my head is for the Selendang.  
4 There is an overhead, an administrative overhead rate of  
5 13.56 percent that is associated with all of those  
6 billings. And I know that for contracts with private  
7 entities, there is a similar percentage rate attached to  
8 those billings as well. Because I've been under pressure  
9 myself because this rate is significantly lower than the  
10 rate, for instance, that a large project group attaches to  
11 their billings with many of the parties that they do  
12 business with.

13 MR. TILLERY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess I  
14 don't have a problem fundamentally with the idea that there  
15 is overhead associated.....

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

17 MR. TILLERY: .....with the personnel  
18 expenses. My concern is that there is overhead apparently  
19 associated when there are no expenses, so that's the.....

20 MS. FRIES: But I think part of the problem  
21 too is that you're -- the agency budgets and the Trustee  
22 Council budgets as well, and so, I mean, it -- I think it's  
23 -- it's difficult to make everything sort of sync and come  
24 out balanced. And.....

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, why don't we --

1 we're not going to get to the bottom of it today. Why  
2 don't we have staff come back and give us the full picture,  
3 hopefully at the next meeting, as to what expenses are  
4 actually incurred by the agencies relating to G&A and  
5 what's being paid and how those line up and whether there's  
6 a better way to line it up. Thanks, Carol.

7 MR. O'CONNOR: I would have one comment  
8 from my point of view. I think this is obscenely low. The  
9 G&A rate is dramatically insignificant relative to the true  
10 cost in providing the support to the personnel. My agency  
11 has to provide Pete and company with an office, with a  
12 telephone, with a fax machine, with whatever resources he  
13 needs to perform the functions he's performing. And to  
14 attach simply a nine and a half override to the personnel  
15 costs I think is ridiculous. It should be far in excess of  
16 that. The question of whether or not the monies are being  
17 spent, whether or not there is an activity going on, the  
18 agency nonetheless has committed those resources to support  
19 whatever it is we deem appropriate as a trustee council for  
20 agency support. So I'm going to argue exactly the  
21 opposite. I think that nine and a half percent is  
22 phenomenally low. I know it's considerably more expensive  
23 and in some instances we impose what I would suggest here  
24 is probably an indirect charge rate, to use federal  
25 nomenclature, of multiples of the salary, rather than a

1 small percentage of the salary. So we have a significant  
2 discussion to engage here, because I think at least my  
3 agency is donating a lot of money to this process that they  
4 otherwise -- that I otherwise would not have allowed if  
5 this was a different construct. So just my two cents on  
6 those two cents.

7 MS. HSIEH: I think the cost savings that  
8 was deliberated on in the past was -- I don't think they  
9 discussed the G&A being charged when there had been no  
10 expenses, maybe because of the committed resources issue.  
11 But what was discussed was taking project management in-  
12 house so that you have -- you would have to add, you know,  
13 I don't remember what the numbers of the staff were here,  
14 two or three people here, and then you wouldn't have this  
15 sort of automatic one month's salary going to an agency  
16 with the G&A for every project regardless of shape, size or  
17 flavor. You'd just have the projects managed here. So  
18 that was the hot potato that was bounced around and numbers  
19 were brought out in 2006. It -- at that time they  
20 projected a \$500,000 savings. That's just off the top of  
21 my head from glancing at the paperwork. So that has come  
22 to my attention because this system with regard to project  
23 management does seem a little arbitrary with this sort of  
24 one month per project sort of thrown out with each project.  
25 It just seems a little one size fits all and maybe there

1 could be a more efficient way of doing it.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Let's see, Kim, did you  
3 have a question?

4 MR. ELTON: Well, just a comment. I mean,  
5 when Renee comes back to us with additional information, I  
6 mean, I hope we include the university because my  
7 understanding is the university overhead charge is  
8 considerable. So.....

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

10 MR. ELTON: .....it would be nice to have  
11 some kind of perspective to put the nine percent into.

12 MS. JAMES: My experience with grant  
13 funding, like federal grant funding, it's 18 percent. So  
14 -- and that may have gone up. So nine percent, you know,  
15 as bad as that sounds, 18 percent's probably closer to the  
16 norm.

17 MR. ELTON: Yeah, if you could just kind of  
18 poll different organizations and see what it is so that we  
19 can.....

20 MS. JAMES: And I don't know.....

21 MR. ELTON: .....put it in perspective.

22 MS. JAMES: .....what the university is. I  
23 think they give us 18 percent.

24 MS. HSIEH: I think.....

25 MS. FRIES: I think it's 24 percent.

1 MS. HSIEH: 24 percent.

2 MS. JAMES: 24 percent. Yeah, so.....

3 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, then we're -- when  
4 you're doing this, I would appreciate it if you would talk  
5 to people like Pete, people like Dede, Carol, what exactly  
6 are they doing? Because I will tell you when -- in  
7 response to the criticism of the PAC on the money that  
8 we're paying to liaisons, I asked them to give me a sense  
9 of what it is they're doing for the money that they're  
10 getting paid, and the list is pretty significant. And I'm  
11 not sure that the council staff as it's currently  
12 constructed certainly would be capable of performing all of  
13 those functions, particularly given the fact that many of  
14 them are unique to the federal or state governments. We  
15 would have to have people who are qualified in the business  
16 of federal procurement, qualified in the business of NEPA  
17 compliance, able to respond to FOIA requests or, you know,  
18 public -- whatever the hell they're called under the  
19 state's construct. The list is pretty significant on  
20 what's actually being done. I don't mind exercising an  
21 evaluation here but let's make it a full blown evaluation  
22 of what it is we're actually doing with each and every  
23 project and how much time and energy is being dedicated and  
24 how much expertise is required to manage the projects,  
25 because I think it is far beyond that, which is appreciated

1 by folks. So.....

2                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, as I understand and  
3 probably what they'll come back to us, Craig, is the  
4 viewpoint of the agencies too that are involved working  
5 from both sides, if you will. From administration, from  
6 EVOS's perspective and from the agency perspective, what  
7 each is contributing and whether that's the right mix and  
8 the right allocations. And as part of that, I would say  
9 look at internal management projects too. All or partial  
10 or however you want to do it, so we have a complete  
11 picture. That's all we want is a complete picture.

12                   MR. O'CONNOR: I think it's an appropriate  
13 undertaking to occasionally revisit the constructs that we  
14 have in play and see if there's better ways to do it. We  
15 also need to look at whether or not certain functions could  
16 actually be delegated to non-federal -- in our world, non-  
17 federal employees to be performed, so.....

18                   MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

19                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Craig.

20                   MR. TILLERY: Just to throw yet -- in terms  
21 of what you're thinking about, please keep in mind that  
22 since inception in 1991, the Department of Law has never  
23 taken a dime for any of the work that it does on this  
24 council.

25                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: You're not sending us a

1 bill though.

2                   MR. TILLERY: We're not sending you a bill,  
3 but I'm just suggesting our view is that -- and this was, I  
4 guess Charlie Cole made this pronouncement, that this is  
5 part of what we do as government and the money should go  
6 straight to restoration.

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

8                   MS. JAMES: One change I didn't get around  
9 to pointing out was that last year Fish and Game actually  
10 got 17,000 -- well, it was earmarked for Fish and Game,  
11 17,898, and in reality that work, that project work was  
12 done by JoEllen and in my mind should never have gone under  
13 project management because her salary was already paid and  
14 in my checking, I did see that it -- salary charges were --  
15 did reduce that 17,000 in-house. So that did change. That  
16 was significant in lowering our costs under project  
17 management, in just kind of reviewing through that.

18                   I think our last one is ARLIS and we have  
19 budgeted 166,372. Personal costs of 124,885. Let's see  
20 here. And again, we budgeted 1,500 in travel.  
21 Contractual, we have 26,250 budgeted. And the contractual  
22 cost is a cash contribution to ARLIS, ARLIS's operating  
23 budget. The contribution is monitored through a  
24 reimbursable service agreement with EVOS. It pays for  
25 commodities at the research library and that helps to

1 maintain the EVOS records as well. And then a research  
2 assistant, assistance by library staff. So the total  
3 amount there is a 166,372. From -- and last year that  
4 changed, I think, the -- I recalculated that salary a  
5 little differently. I'm not sure how they came to their --  
6 the 136,404. When I ran that scenario in ABS, I came up  
7 with a different figure.

8 MS. HSIEH: Renee has had an interesting  
9 few months here.

10 MS. JAMES: Yes, I have.

11 MS. HSIEH: Coming up with different  
12 numbers.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

14 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, it was all magical.

15 MS. HSIEH: Apparently.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any question on ARLIS  
17 portion of the budget?

18 (No audible responses)

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Now, do we need a  
20 motion?

21 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yes, Craig.

23 MR. TILLERY: I'm not sure if I have this  
24 right, but I might. That -- would it be appropriate to  
25 move that we approve the 100 [sic] budget as proposed with

1 the exceptions of reducing the Executive Director's salary  
2 to -- or monies to three quarters, the Deputy Executive  
3 Director to three quarters, adding 5,000 to the herring  
4 planning component, and then with the notation that we may  
5 revisit the G&A at a later date. Does that capture all of  
6 it?

7 MS. HSIEH: Yes, the herring planning for  
8 the services of Doug Hay, Jeep Rice and Doug Woodby.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, the review panel.

10 MS. HSIEH: The review panel. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: That's what I had on my  
12 list.

13 MR. TILLERY: I would move that.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. A second?

15 MR. O'CONNOR: I would second that.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thanks, Craig. Any other  
17 discussion?

18 (No audible responses)

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any opposition to  
20 the motion?

21 (No audible responses)

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Seeing none, it  
23 passes. Thanks, Renee.

24 MS. JAMES: You're welcome.

25 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, thank you. I actually

1 understood that one.

2                               CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We get better and better.  
3 Okay. We're into -- onto Agenda Item 10, the Fiscal Year  
4 2010 Work Plan. Catherine, do you want to go ahead and  
5 join us up here? I guess we should perhaps start as I  
6 suggested earlier by, you know, what approach do we want to  
7 use on this. We have Catherine here as a resource to talk  
8 to all or any of the 40 proposals. We have them broken  
9 down already into the herring projects and then that's  
10 broken down further by the survey -- the 10 survey  
11 projects, the 132 projects. And then the remaining herring  
12 projects and I'm not sure whether it's eight, ten or  
13 eighteen, exactly what of those is herring. And then we  
14 also have the science panel's breakdown into the high,  
15 medium and low or do not fund category.

16                               MS. BOERNER: It's.....

17                               MS. HSIEH: No, that was.....

18                               MS. BOERNER: .....Executive Director.

19                               MS. HSIEH: The Executive Director.

20                               CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Or Executive  
21 Director.....

22                               MS. BOERNER: Yes.

23                               CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....with input from the  
24 science panel. Excuse me.

25                               MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

1                                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:  And then we have the --  
2  of course, the input from Prince William Sound Science  
3  Center and from ADF&G, looking at it from a long term  
4  management perspective.  I guess my suggestion, and it's  
5  certainly open to debate, is to take the herring separately  
6  and start maybe with the herring survey projects, the dash  
7  132, then quickly follow that -- or I don't know how  
8  quickly -- with the other herring projects -- or they may  
9  just get wrapped into it -- and then consider all the rest,  
10 using perhaps the Executive Director summary as a guide  
11 there.  Are there any other suggestions on how we should  
12 approach this?

13                                  MR. O'CONNOR:  Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a  
14 -- sort of a sense of an issue that's going to bubble up  
15 during the course of our conversation and that is a cap and  
16 how much are we going to consider ourselves constrained by  
17 the cap.  I think a lot of the motivation for some of the  
18 recommendations by the Executive Director may have been  
19 reflective of the fact that we do have a limitation we have  
20 arbitrarily imposed upon ourselves.  I would like to know  
21 if we're going to consider breaking through that cap, which  
22 I firmly believe we should if it's appropriate to get the  
23 studies in the field.  But if we're going to constrain  
24 ourselves by that cap, then I think we should have that in  
25 the back of our minds as we go through this exercise.  But

1 I want to know if that's what we're going to do.

2                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So why don't we get a  
3 compar -- Catherine, you can help with that. You know, if  
4 we stay at the five percent cap, what does that mean in  
5 total number and then how does that relate to herring  
6 projects or -- maybe you're not the right one, I'm sorry.  
7 But how does that.....

8                   MS. BOERNER: The science, not the numbers.

9                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think I have a sense  
10 for it.

11                   MS. BOERNER: Right.

12                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But yeah, certainly if we  
13 did all of them, we'd greatly break the five percent cap,  
14 but.....

15                   MS. BOERNER: Absolutely.

16                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....you can kind of give  
17 us the relative order of magnitude?

18                   MS. HSIEH: I believe.....

19                   MS. BOERNER: Do we know what the cap is?

20                   MS. HSIEH: I believe -- my notes say that  
21 five percent, but it's about 4.1. Your last tab in your  
22 notebook saw the current state of the investment period  
23 ending July 31st. That's the most recent data that you can  
24 get. So I think my rough -- so if the research is 91.4, I  
25 believe my rough estimate was about 4.1. And we can have

1 Renee and JoEllen check it.

2 MS. BOERNER: No, I meant the EVOS  
3 administrative budget is about.....

4 MS. HSIEH: Correct.

5 MS. BOERNER: .....2.1.

6 MS. HSIEH: Correct.

7 MR. O'CONNOR: So we have two million.

8 MS. BOERNER: And that's with the 10 Prince  
9 William Sound herring survey projects, just in fiscal year  
10 10, approaching about 1.3 million in their request. So  
11 it's not -- depending on how you elect to move forward, it  
12 may not leave much left if we stay with the cap.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So that's just the survey  
14 products. The 10 is the 1.3 million.

15 MS. BOERNER: Yes. For fiscal year 10.

16 MR. O'CONNOR: That would not include the  
17 ones that had been recommended by Nancy or suggested by  
18 Nancy Bird earlier?

19 MS. BOERNER: That would be all 10. If you  
20 elected.....

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But that's just the.....

22 MS. BOERNER: .....to fund all 10 projects.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....survey projects.

24 Not.....

25 MS. BOERNER: Just the survey.....

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   .....the additional.....

2                   MS. BOERNER:   .....projects.

3                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   .....herring project.

4                   MS. BOERNER:   So, right.  That would leave

5 you not a lot of money to fund any additional non-herring

6 work or additional herring work.

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   How about if we -- on the

8 high priority and medium priority from the Executive

9 Director's list, what was the total there; do you remember?

10                  MS. BOERNER:   Uh-huh.  Herring or in

11 general?  Okay.  I'm looking -- if you just take -- if you

12 look at the chart, the recommended by -- for funding by

13 Executive Director with the correct budget number that

14 Elise had alerted you to earlier, we'd be looking, with the

15 -- with that, it would be 2.9 million.  So that would

16 include the EVOS administration and the five high funding

17 priority projects that Elise recommended.

18                  MS. HSIEH:   So you're just looking at the

19 five?

20                  MS. BOERNER:   Uh-huh.  The five plus the

21 EVOS administration budget would take us to 2.9.

22                  MS. HSIEH:   For just FY-10.

23                  MS. BOERNER:   Yes, for just FY-10.

24                  MS. HSIEH:   Versus the total requested.

25 Many of these projects are multi-year.....

1 MS. BOERNER: Right.

2 MS. HSIEH: .....so that's why you have the  
3 two numbers.

4 MS. BOERNER: Well, if we're sticking to  
5 the cap, it would be just this year.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But if we -- I guess  
7 that's another question on all these, if we break the five  
8 percent cap this year, these are multi-year projects, a  
9 number of these survey projects, that.....

10 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....we're breaking it  
12 for a number of years.

13 MS. BOERNER: Exactly. Right. And if you  
14 looked.....

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And.....

16 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. I mean, just those 10  
17 herring survey projects, we're looking at about 5.4 million  
18 between fiscal year 10 and fiscal year 13.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So either it would really  
20 constrain us on other work that we would do.....

21 MS. BOERNER: Absolutely.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....or we would be  
23 eating into the principal.

24 MS. BOERNER: Yes. Yeah, if you just look  
25 at the administrative budget and if you looked at Elise's

1 high funding priorities and her fund priorities, that would  
2 take us to 4. -- almost 4.8 million. So that would leave  
3 several projects out that were potentially considered for  
4 funding, including -- yeah.

5 MR. BROOKOVER: Catherine, can you say that  
6 one more time? The 4.8 million you just mentioned included  
7 what?

8 MS. BOERNER: That would be on Elise's list  
9 if we took the high funding priority, which would include  
10 the administrative budget, and then the ones that she had  
11 recommended just for fund, which does exclude two of the  
12 herring survey projects.

13 MR. BROOKOVER: Right.

14 MS. HSIEH: So the first two tiers.

15 MS. BOERNER: It would take us to 4.8  
16 million.

17 MR. BROOKOVER: Right. For FY-10.

18 MS. BOERNER: For fiscal year 10, yes. And  
19 then if you added those two additional projects in that she  
20 had not recommended for funding this year, let's see,  
21 you're looking at about another \$300,000 added to that  
22 total.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And what would be the --  
24 looking at the further years out, would it be -- we could  
25 just take the total requested column here and just divide

1 that by four?

2 MS. BOERNER: Yes. Some of these projects  
3 are one year, two year -- they can be anywhere between one  
4 and four year.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

6 MS. BOERNER: So not all of them are four  
7 year.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I'm just wondering, a  
9 sense of if we.....

10 MS. BOERNER: For each year.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....go beyond the five  
12 percent this year on some of these projects, what that  
13 means for future years.

14 MS. HSIEH: Well, I don't think we have  
15 them broken down by the next.....

16 MS. BOERNER: No.

17 MS. HSIEH: .....four years; do we?

18 MS. BOERNER: Unh-unh. I'm trying to think  
19 if I remember seeing that information. I imagine you'd  
20 probably start each year, I don't know, somewhere between  
21 one and a half and two million dollars.....

22 MS. HSIEH: Already spent.

23 MS. BOERNER: .....in multi-year projects.

24 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

25 MS. BOERNER: And that's just a -- that's

1 just a guess, based on.....

2 MS. HSIEH: So you'd be at.....

3 MS. BOERNER: .....what I've seen coming  
4 in.

5 MS. HSIEH: So you'd be at your cap for at  
6 least the first couple of years.

7 MS. BOERNER: Right. For at least probably  
8 the first two years.

9 MS. HSIEH: With -- in combined with the  
10 admin budget every year.....

11 MS. BOERNER: With admin budget.

12 MS. HSIEH: .....on the annual cycle.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And that's just on the  
14 herring? The herring survey or.....

15 MS. BOERNER: No, that would be.....

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: The high priority and the  
17 fund?

18 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, that would be if you  
19 were just looking at perhaps the high priority and the fund  
20 projects.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

22 MS. BOERNER: And if you elected to fund  
23 those for multi-year.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: And so if we funded the  
25 high priority and the fund, we would -- including the EVOS

1 administration cost of roughly two million a year, we would  
2 be at the cap for the next three or four years?

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We'd be over it this  
4 year.

5 MS. HSIEH: Over it this year.

6 MS. BOERNER: Right.

7 MR. BROOKOVER: Over it this year and  
8 roughly.....

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And right at it the  
10 next.....

11 MS. HSIEH: That's a rough estimate.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....two or three years.

13 MR. ZEMKE: Looking at those totals, it's  
14 about 12 million for three -- if they say that's an average  
15 of three years, that would be about four million a year,  
16 those two categories that are in the top of the  
17 spreadsheet.

18 MR. HARTIG: Including the EVOS  
19 administration, yeah. Yeah.

20 MS. HSIEH: Which we're trying to cut down  
21 the budget, but I don't know if we'll cut it down that  
22 much.

23 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, you're looking -- I  
24 think if we look at Elise's high funding priorities plus  
25 the funds, just those two things over the next -- between

1 fiscal year 10 and fiscal year 13, including the  
2 administrative budget for each year, we're looking at about  
3 10.4 million dollars total for this -- I'll say this  
4 package. That's what you're kind of looking at over the  
5 next four years worth of funding.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Let's see, Craig, did you  
7 have a comment or a question?

8 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, with -- recognizing  
9 I'll probably offend somebody if not Mr. Tillery for sure  
10 here, I think the five percent cap is really arbitrary  
11 silliness. The decisions that should be made by the  
12 Trustee Council, given the needs that we have, the  
13 restoration goals that we are trying to accomplish and the  
14 responsibilities that we have, we should not be  
15 artificially constraining ourselves in these decisions.  
16 Right now I couldn't tell you what we are going to  
17 accomplish, not by way of science but by way of the over-  
18 arching policy of the council if we constrain ourselves to  
19 five percent each year. What is it we're doing with that  
20 and what does my future look like? You know, what does --  
21 as far as I'm concerned, we got a job to do, we need to get  
22 the job done, we need to get it done as promptly as we  
23 possibly can with the greatest amount of intellect brought  
24 to bear on the solution to those problems, not sit here and  
25 manage a fund in perpetuity. That's not the way this

1 process in my mind should be running. So I believe that we  
2 should ignore the cap and do what needs to be done. And  
3 we're going to have a lot more that needs to be done, not  
4 just these projects, but we're going to have other things  
5 coming down the pike very likely with regard to lingering  
6 oil and perhaps other undertakings that we need to engage  
7 in. And if we're going to start to manage ourselves  
8 unnecessarily with a cap, if I was given a budget of a  
9 hundred bucks and said I had to live with it, that's one  
10 thing. But to simply say you can only spend a certain  
11 amount of your money because we think that's all you ought  
12 to spend is a whole different way to go about this. If I  
13 got a good reason to stick with the cap, then I'd like to  
14 hear it; and if we don't, I'd like to get the job done  
15 that's our responsibility. And if it takes more money than  
16 the five percent, so be it. And I'd like to go into this  
17 process with that philosophy in mind.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Craig Tillery.

19 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. The five  
20 percent cap idea came in back in '97, I think, when we went  
21 to the idea of a GEM project. The idea was that we didn't  
22 have that much more clear projects out there. We were  
23 going to go to this multi-year, I mean long term study  
24 program. The idea was that we would have -- we would  
25 manage this, so it was in essence in perpetuity. That

1 program got derailed for a number of reasons and it is no  
2 functioning. The cap really doesn't make any sense in that  
3 context anymore. It seem to me that having that number  
4 provides a useful guideline, but not something that should  
5 constrain us. And if there are reasons to go beyond that,  
6 as we have done for example in the last few years, and  
7 having to -- because lingering oil came up and so forth --  
8 then we should go past it. So I think it's a nice number  
9 to keep in mind but it's not something that should  
10 constrain us because sort of the paradigm on which it was  
11 based has disappeared.

12                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you. Any  
13 other comments from the Trustees relating to the cap? And  
14 it's not a true cap. It's not a legal cap. It's a guide.

15                   MR. TILLERY: Right.

16                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Well, I think  
17 we're done with that discussion. Why don't we go back to  
18 how we want to approach these. Do we want to hit the  
19 herring survey ones first and then the additional herring  
20 and then the rest of the fund, the high prior -- high  
21 funding priorities and the fund priorities and the fund  
22 priorities?

23                   MS. BOERNER: Sure thing.

24                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

25                   MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It looks like we got a  
2 consensus. Okay. Do you want to lead us through the  
3 herring survey ones, Catherine?

4                   MS. BOERNER: Sure. We're going to jump  
5 around a bit, so I'll give you the work plan page numbers,  
6 that way we can kind of follow along as we're going. The  
7 10 projects that were submitted in response to our request  
8 for a comprehensive survey all have the same project  
9 number, which is 10100132, and then there will be a dash  
10 with a letter. And all of them being with the same title,  
11 which is PWS Herring Survey. And the first project in that  
12 suite comes in from Scott Pegau, and that's on Page 68 of  
13 your work plan. And this is the over-arching synthesis of  
14 all of the 10 projects that would be completed. Scott  
15 would be responsible for helping with the logistics. He'd  
16 be responsible for coordinating public outreach on these 10  
17 projects. He would also be responsible for the final  
18 synthesis report of these projects, which was something we  
19 explicitly asked for. We did not want to receive 10  
20 individual final reports and then try to figure out how  
21 they all fit together. We did ask for one comprehensive  
22 report, and that will be the responsibility of this team.

23                   In fiscal year 10 they were asking for  
24 343,100, with a total requested of 1.1 million, and that  
25 would be going through fiscal year 10 to fiscal year 13.

1 That 343,100 also includes contracts with the Cordova  
2 Fishermen United to help provide sampling and vessel  
3 charters with the remainder of the team. So other team  
4 members do not have vessel or sampling time in because it's  
5 contained within this project. This project was  
6 recommended for funding by the science panel, myself and  
7 the Executive Director who recommended it as a -- just a  
8 fund, and the PAC, as again, as we had discussed earlier  
9 with the 10 percent reduction across the board for all 10  
10 of these projects. Are there questions regarding that  
11 specific project or would you like me to go down kind of  
12 all 10 and then we'll -- you can ask questions at the end.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Why don't we.....

14 MS. HSIEH: Or -- do they questions?

15 MS. BOERNER: That's what I said.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Why don't we.....

17 MS. BOERNER: Or if you have questions on  
18 the specific.....

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....stop questions on  
20 each individual one but we.....

21 MS. BOERNER: Sure.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....will of course not  
23 vote until we get further down. We won't ask for a motion  
24 on each one. Okay. Any other questions on this proposed  
25 project? Steve.

1                   MR. ZEMKE: I guess as far as Scott is  
2 responsible for the final report, will he also be doing the  
3 interim or annual reports also?

4                   MS. BOERNER: He'll be assisting with that,  
5 yes. And we'll also be coordinating at team meetings with  
6 the 10 to get that information synthesized.

7                   MR. ZEMKE: Okay. And hopefully we'll be  
8 kind of getting an update on how well this process is  
9 working and.....

10                  MS. BOERNER: Exactly.

11                  MR. ZEMKE: .....what needs to be done, if  
12 anything, to correct problems or enhance opportunities.

13                  MS. BOERNER: Yes, uh-huh. Definitely.

14                  MS. HSIEH: Did you guys really want her to  
15 read through all the proposals or have you reviewed them  
16 and do you have particular proposals that you have  
17 questions on?

18                  MS. BOERNER: I can read the list of 10  
19 off, just if -- and if there's a specific problem -- as  
20 opposed to me summarizing each of them. Whatever is more  
21 -- whatever is easier for you.

22                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I think it was good to  
23 summarize that one but.....

24                  MS. HSIEH: That one, yeah.

25                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....why don't we just go

1 through them and see if there's any questions on each one  
2 of them.

3 MS. BOERNER: Sure.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Or if you think there's  
5 something specific that we need to know.....

6 MS. BOERNER: We need to discuss.

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, that's important  
8 from.....

9 MS. BOERNER: That sounds like a good idea.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....your perspective,  
11 yeah, feel free to raise it.

12 MS. BOERNER: Okay. So I'll just kind of  
13 read down the rest just so that you can keep in line what  
14 else we're discussing. The second project in that package  
15 is on Page 21 of the work plan and the lead PI on that is  
16 Campbell. And that's Plankton and Oceanographic  
17 Observations. This was recommended for funding by all  
18 parties with again the 10 percent fund reduced from the  
19 PAC.

20 The next project on there is on Page 83,  
21 it's.....

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, why don't you  
23 stop.....

24 MS. BOERNER: I'm sorry.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....and make sure

1 there's no questions.....

2 MS. BOERNER: Oh, I'm sorry.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....on the Campbell  
4 proposal.....

5 MS. BOERNER: Campbell proposal. Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: 132-A. It is good to  
7 know the level of consensus, both from the science panel  
8 and the Prince William Science Center and.....

9 MS. BOERNER: Because we have other ones  
10 that aren't.....

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....the Executive  
12 Director. Yeah.

13 MS. BOERNER: .....quite so clean.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: When we get to those,  
15 whether there's a difference. You might highlight those  
16 for us.

17 MS. BOERNER: Absolutely.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Because there's just so  
19 many. I read through them several times, but to try to  
20 keep them all in my head and move through them quickly, I  
21 don't know.....

22 MS. BOERNER: I know.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....if I can handle  
24 that. Okay.

25 MS. BOERNER: Okay. Campbell. Okay, the

1 next one. The group again is on Page 83 in your work plan,  
2 and that's Thorne. And that's Assessment of Juvenile  
3 Herring Abundance. And again, this was recommended for  
4 funding by all parties with the 10 percent fund reduction  
5 by the PAC. Questions?

6 (No audible responses)

7 MS. BOERNER: Okay. The next one will be  
8 on Page 46, and that PI is Kline and it's Pacific Herring  
9 Energetic Recruitment. And again, this is recommended for  
10 funding by all parties with the 10 percent reduction by the  
11 PAC. Okay. And we hit one of the ones that was a little  
12 bit more split. The next one in your pack will be on Page  
13 36 and the PI is Heintz. It's Predictors of Winter  
14 Performance. This project was not recommended for funding  
15 by the science panel, the science coordinator or the  
16 Executive Director but was recommended for funding by the  
17 PAC with a 10 percent reduction.

18 MR. O'CONNOR: Which page did you say?

19 MS. BOERNER: Heintz.

20 MS. HSIEH: 36.

21 MS. BOERNER: 36.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Kim.

23 MS. HSIEH: The work plan page numbers are  
24 on my cheat sheet too.

25 MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, oh. I was reading them

1 wrong. Okay. I was looking at the.....

2 MR. ELTON: I mean, here it shows you  
3 recommending funding.

4 MS. BOERNER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, you're  
5 right.

6 MR. ELTON: On the breakout that you've  
7 approved. The summary sheet, it shows you not  
8 recommending.

9 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, that's actually not  
10 correct. I did recommend it for funding. I apologize for  
11 that.

12 MR. ELTON: Okay.

13 MS. BOERNER: That is a mistake. I did  
14 recommend this funding with the PAC.

15 MR. ZEMKE: I guess originally there was  
16 concerns about the sample size and the randomness of the  
17 survey and from my understanding some of those or all those  
18 concerns have been addressed by the.....

19 MS. BOERNER: That was addressed. There  
20 was also concern about two seriously delinquent final  
21 reports from the PI, which have since been brought -- have  
22 since been given to us, those two pro -- those two final  
23 reports. But that was a concern for the science panel.

24 MR. ZEMKE: So has the science panel gone  
25 back and reviewed that.....

1 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

2 MR. ZEMKE: .....but they still  
3 recommend.....

4 MS. BOERNER: They still recommended a do  
5 not fund, yes. They felt almost as Elise did, that if  
6 instead of maybe an arbitrary 10 percent to kind of cull  
7 out what they determined were projects that would not have  
8 a tremendous impact if they were not part of those 10. And  
9 Heintz was one of those projects.

10 MR. BROOKOVER: So was the cost of the  
11 total program issue relative to the benefits of the.....

12 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

13 MR. BROOKOVER: .....projects in the  
14 science panel eyes?

15 MS. BOERNER: And I just think they just  
16 were not happy with this project. After reading the DPD,  
17 they just really didn't feel that it brought anything to  
18 the table or was adding anything to the team.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions on  
20 Heintz, 132-D?

21 MS. HSIEH: The peer reviews as well I  
22 think were somewhat mixed.

23 MS. BOERNER: They were lukewarm.

24 MS. HSIEH: Yeah, they were.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead, Kim.

1                   MR. ELTON: I need to understand this, this  
2 process. Maybe I get to ask a question because I'm the  
3 newest person here. I mean, one of the things that kind of  
4 concerned me in the discussion leading up to this meeting  
5 was that it seemed there were two different approaches that  
6 were taken. The proposers were looking at a suite of  
7 studies. That suite of studies being one component  
8 supporting another component, supporting another component,  
9 with the idea that you -- that nobody would be able to come  
10 back at some point in the future and say what about this.  
11 And if I understand correctly -- and if I don't, please  
12 somebody correct me -- what we got into was instead of  
13 looking at a suite, we started looking at fiscal  
14 ramifications of doing the entire point. The PAC seemed to  
15 recommend saying we want them all, but if you're concerned  
16 about financial resources, then do a 10 percent across the  
17 board reduction, allowing the proposers to come up with  
18 where they're going to take that reduction. And this is  
19 perhaps the most important part for me and the part that I  
20 need to understand is that when the proposals were reviewed  
21 by the science panel, it seemed to me that they were  
22 bifurcated so that they would look at one and then they'd  
23 look at the other, then they'd look at the other, which is  
24 dramatically different than the process that was done by  
25 the proposers where they looked at them as a suite. And so

1 I guess what I'm getting to here is I need to know whether  
2 the science panel recommendations were made -- if when  
3 everything came back, when it came back with Scott's  
4 additional information, whether or not they were still  
5 reviewed on a project by project basis or whether they were  
6 reviewed on as the suite, as it seems the proposers wanted  
7 it done.

8 MS. BOERNER: If I can.....

9 MS. HSIEH: The science.....

10 MS. BOERNER: I'll -- I -- yeah. The  
11 science panel, I will say, when they originally got in  
12 these 10 proposals and looked at them, there was tremendous  
13 frustration in the group because it was very hard to  
14 understand how these projects sat together and how -- where  
15 the overlaps were, where the cost savings were. There was  
16 not kind of our over-arching understanding of how these  
17 projects -- so it was hard not to review them as individual  
18 projects because we couldn't figure out where these  
19 projects came together. I know at one point the group even  
20 said I don't think we should fund any of them at this point  
21 because if they can't explain how these projects fit  
22 together, then we should be funding any. We did go back to  
23 Scott Pegau, the team leader, and we asked for that  
24 clarification. You really need to explain how these come  
25 together because otherwise we have to review them as

1 individual projects. And that was -- you do have the  
2 response in your packets. It was the diagram to try to  
3 help explain where the overlap is. We did then send that  
4 back to the science panel when then tried to look at the  
5 projects again, both as individuals and as part of a team.  
6 And that's how the -- that's where the recommendations came  
7 from. They still felt that even looking at it as a team  
8 concept that two projects just didn't -- either didn't fit  
9 in or not offering the information -- you know, the  
10 response that was put in was not sufficient.

11 MR. ELTON: I don't want to get too deep in  
12 the weeds on process.....

13 MS. BOERNER: Sure.

14 MR. ELTON: .....but, I mean, when -- so  
15 there were two meetings of the science panel. The first  
16 meeting they just said, wait, you know, we don't  
17 understand. So responses came back in. The science panel  
18 got together as a group and discussed the response as a  
19 group or where there team leaders for the science panel  
20 that reviewed it and then reported to the group?

21 MS. BOERNER: We actually polled individual  
22 at that point. We had the one in-face meeting where each  
23 project was reviewed just on its individual scientific  
24 merits. And then when we actually got the response back  
25 from Scott, that was done simply by email just due to

1 schedules. It was impossible to get another meeting  
2 together.

3 MR. ELTON: Well.....

4 MS. BOERNER: So each person sent the  
5 entire group their feelings on what was -- what the  
6 response was and what was left, and then we came up with a  
7 group consensus.

8 MR. ELTON: Okay. So everybody shared  
9 their thoughts.....

10 MS. BOERNER: Absolutely.

11 MR. ELTON: .....about the response and  
12 then the group got back together one more time or.....

13 MS. HSIEH: Via email.

14 MS. BOERNER: Via email.

15 MR. ELTON: .....participated in a  
16 telecon.....

17 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. We did not have a  
18 teleconference, no.

19 MR. ELTON: I mean, I would just suggest  
20 that as a matter of process trying to do something  
21 complicated like that via emails is difficult.

22 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

23 MS. HSIEH: I don't believe we got any  
24 response from the science panel that they misunderstood or  
25 couldn't comprehend Scott's response, or that it was earth

1 shattering to them and that they were having difficulty  
2 with the process. Having sat in on their meeting, they  
3 discussed the proposals, if they could fit together, how  
4 they would fit together. They were kind of lost there a  
5 little bit. But they spent a large part of their meeting  
6 discussing these proposals together as far as they could  
7 and then later on with Scott's document. I don't -- I did  
8 not get the feeling that process dictated an error here in  
9 their recommendations.

10 MR. ELTON: I'm -- I guess -- Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. Go ahead, Kim.

12 MR. ELTON: I guess I'm less concerned  
13 about errors than I am about kind of human dynamics. I  
14 mean it just seems to me that -- and I'll use an example,  
15 this group. And again, I acknowledge I'm kind of the  
16 rookie. I would hate to make a decision on the  
17 administrative budget or a decision on the work plan with  
18 people exchanging emails. That to me seems to leave out a  
19 very important group dynamic, and I guess I'm stumbling a  
20 little bit here.

21 MS. HSIEH: Except these are scientific  
22 proposals that are contract for services and I don't -- I  
23 think scientific proposals have a certain -- you know, they  
24 are stand alone as well as fitting together. But the PI's  
25 are not going to be going out, you know, five of them in a

1 boat together and processing results. These are individual  
2 projects which overlap, share boats, share data.

3 MR. ELTON: Well, and this may be me and a  
4 learning process for me, but it seems to me that I'm being  
5 asked to make kind of the same decisions the science panel  
6 has been asked to make, but I get to do it in a group here  
7 with everybody.....

8 MS. HSIEH: Well.....

9 MR. ELTON: .....kind of being involved.

10 MS. HSIEH: The science panel considers the  
11 scientific merits of the proposals. The peer review is  
12 also very helpful for that input as well. And so I think  
13 that their perspective on the proposals is narrowed to  
14 that. You're asking to make a more complicated decision,  
15 which is considering the policies, the direction, the  
16 finances of the Trustee Council, where would you like to  
17 spend those. The science panel is looking at scientific,  
18 you know, rigorousness of the proposals. So these weren't  
19 -- they were not one proposal. It is 10 separate PI's  
20 coming together and trying to overlap and share.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Craig.

22 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, I -- I mean, I echo  
23 Kim's concerns about the dynamics, but what -- how we  
24 manage this exercise. But I think I have a question that  
25 is more fundamental in my mind at this point, given the

1 reaction of the science panel to the spaghetti chart, the  
2 who does all this come together. Is the science panel  
3 suggesting that what we're doing does not make sense? What  
4 our plan is and what our approach is to herring does not  
5 make sense? Or are they simply say, well, that's nice, and  
6 we're just going to go over here and tell you what we think  
7 the technical merit is of a particular project? Because I  
8 -- and I must confess, I sat through a lot of this science  
9 panel meeting for my own edification and I came out very  
10 confused on what was going on because of the dynamics of  
11 scientists and how they interact. But what I'm hearing is  
12 that the science panel doesn't really think we got a clue  
13 as to how to go about conducting the affairs of determining  
14 what's going on with herring. Is that what they're saying?

15 MS. HSIEH: It was my impression that the  
16 science panel would rec -- I mean, I'm speaking and they  
17 maybe want to correct me, but they -- I think they would  
18 like to see more sort of leadership in the herring arena.  
19 I think they were -- they respected very much the work that  
20 has gone into these 10 projects, but I don't believe even  
21 after getting more information, I don't believe they  
22 thought it was a make it or break it -- I don't think they  
23 felt comfortable recommending to fund projects that didn't  
24 stand up to their scientific sort of looking at the vig --  
25 just the vigor of the project. I don't think they felt

1 that it was a tragic flaw that would make all 10 fold in.  
2 With regard to -- they definitely were frustrated with the  
3 Trustee Council and I think they definitely feel like there  
4 could be some -- I mean, of course, I've heard this as long  
5 as I've -- the short period of time I've been involved,  
6 that everyone wants sort of more leadership. And so I  
7 think there's definitely that frustration. I don't think  
8 it's as extreme as, well, this doesn't do anything or they  
9 -- or the Trustee Council doesn't know what it's doing. I  
10 think they appreciate the work that went into these 10  
11 projects and feel that many of the projects, as you can see  
12 from their comments, will yield data and information that  
13 will be helpful. Will it be a silver bullet and will we  
14 have the answer at the end? I don't -- I'm not sure who  
15 can promise or suggest that.

16 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, I'm -- I guess I'm  
17 concerned. We went out with a request for proposal which  
18 we felt was appropriate, defined by those advisors that we  
19 have and you guys. And we solicited a number of proposals  
20 that admittedly were not put together as a package, but  
21 there is a coherent package there as defined by the person  
22 who we in some form have ordained to be the guy who is  
23 overseeing this undertaking, in collaboration with our  
24 advisory group, at least one member which sits on the  
25 science panel. What did we do wrong? What is wrong with

1 our approach? I mean, Nancy thinks it's great. We think  
2 it's great. You guys think it's great. But your science  
3 advisors, Madam Executive Director, don't seem.....

4 MS. HSIEH: I wouldn't say that we.....

5 MR. O'CONNOR: .....to be.....

6 MS. HSIEH: .....think it's great. I think  
7 that -- I think Doug Hay does sit on the group. I wouldn't  
8 say that means he leads it or directs it. I think that  
9 there is a need for a smaller group. I know in the past  
10 there was a discussion of a herring czar or whatever, but I  
11 do think a smaller expert group to look at the Trustee  
12 Council's herring efforts would be helpful. And I think  
13 with regard to the small group that we've put together, the  
14 panel to review the IHRP, I guess that was the direction in  
15 which I was heading at this point in time.

16 MS. BOERNER: The group is also frustrated  
17 with the IHRP. I think they were hoping at this point we  
18 would have something that would be very black and white.  
19 These are the projects we're funding this year, these are  
20 the problems and then they could just look at that and say,  
21 okay, these projects fit into that year one, these projects  
22 fit in year two. Because we're not quite there yet and we  
23 didn't have that, I think there's still a lot of  
24 frustration within the group, because they feel that a lot  
25 of onus then lies on them to make those decisions.

1                   MR. BROOKOVER: I guess I'm trying to  
2 pinpoint the source of Mr. O'Connor's concern because my  
3 sense is that the science panel's concern centered on the  
4 degree of integration of the proposals and hence the  
5 request for additional information by the PI's -- which is  
6 the science panel -- then had -- although, you know, by --  
7 possibly by email.....

8                   MS. BOERNER: Right.

9                   MR. BROOKOVER: .....as opposed to another  
10 process.

11                  MS. BOERNER: Sure.

12                  MR. BROOKOVER: But is -- but at the same  
13 time the science panel recommended fund for eight of the 10  
14 proposals, and so they apparently -- I mean, I assuming  
15 they had a comfort level with those proposals.....

16                  MS. BOERNER: Yes.

17                  MR. BROOKOVER: .....from a scientific  
18 standpoint.....

19                  MS. BOERNER: Yes.

20                  MR. BROOKOVER: .....that merited that fund  
21 recommendation. And so is the concern the degree of  
22 integration of these proposals that we're discussing that  
23 the science panel had? Am I correct with that?

24                  MS. HSIEH: I think.....

25                  MR. BROOKOVER: Is that the concern?

1 MS. HSIEH: I think they recommended those  
2 proposals for fund even if they weren't integrated and I  
3 think they thought it was important and good that they were  
4 integrated and shared data, but those proposals will  
5 probably yield helpful and good information and look to be  
6 well structured. So I think that -- but they were  
7 concerned because there was all this discussion about  
8 integration from Scott's proposal, but then when you looked  
9 at the other nine, you couldn't really tell.....

10 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

11 MS. HSIEH: .....where that was. And  
12 that's what Scott's later communication made more explicit.  
13

14 MS. BOERNER: Right. And I think they were  
15 comfortable pulling out some projects that they just felt  
16 scientifically they could not endorse, regardless of the  
17 level of integration. You know, when you've got peer  
18 reviews like this project proposal is too much money and  
19 time spent to address a list of objectives well enough  
20 studied and answered elsewhere, you have to look at that  
21 and say, well, it's great that it's part of an integrated  
22 team, but what about the scientific validity of the  
23 project.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Kim.

25 MR. ELTON: Catherine, I want to make sure

1 that I understand. I mean, you're saying that's the  
2 conclusion they came to but obviously on the Heintz one,  
3 you came to a different conclusion.

4 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

5 MR. ELTON: And so.....

6 MS. BOERNER: Right.

7 MR. ELTON: .....why?

8 MS. BOERNER: I don't.....

9 MR. ELTON: You did a good job articulating  
10 the science panel's.....

11 MS. BOERNER: Right.

12 MR. ELTON: .....objection to it. I want  
13 to know why you came to a different conclusion.

14 MS. BOERNER: Based on my conversations  
15 with the team and because I'm -- I come at it from a  
16 different plan. I did spend all last summer in Cordova  
17 with these folks. I understand what they're trying to get  
18 at, I understand the answers that they're trying to  
19 achieve. I don't think that the project is not  
20 scientifically valid. I do think they do feel that it is  
21 going to add something significant to the team.  
22 Essentially I'm willing to take that leap of faith that --  
23 I mean, this is a well-established PI, somebody we're  
24 worked with a lot in the past and is certainly well-  
25 respected in the field. I'm happy to say -- you know, I

1 feel comfortable saying that that could be part of those 10  
2 projects.

3 MR. ELTON: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Thanks,  
4 Catherine.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other discussion on  
6 any broad topic or on the Heintz proposal or should we move  
7 on to E?

8 (No audible responses)

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I guess we'll move on to  
10 E.

11 MS. BOERNER: Okay. E will be on Page 31  
12 and the PI is Gay. And it's Nursery Habitats of Juvenile  
13 Pacific Herring. And I'm happy to say this was recommended  
14 by all parties with the exception of the 10 percent  
15 reduction by the PAC. Good? Okay. The next one will be  
16 on Page 15 and the PI is Brown. And the project is  
17 Herring, Predator, and Competitor Density. And this again  
18 was recommended for funding by all parties with the  
19 exception of the 10 percent of the PAC and the science  
20 panel did feel that perhaps just funding the first year of  
21 the project would be wise to determine actual project cost.  
22 Because this is an expensive project, but there's also a  
23 lot of aerial survey work being done here. So they felt  
24 maybe to do it, after the first year see what it costs, see  
25 what results come back, and then perhaps fund out-years of

1 the project. From the past I did not recommend we follow  
2 that because I know in the past administratively that's  
3 incredibly difficult to do. And by the time we got  
4 results, we'll be far into the next field season. Evelyn  
5 has been a PI with us almost since the beginning and is  
6 every well respected. I'm very comfortable in the proposal  
7 that she submitted and that she'll get the results she is  
8 hoping for. And it looks like Elise agreed with me. We  
9 were not fund reduced. Questions? No. Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Did they have  
11 problems.....

12 MS. BOERNER: Oops.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....with the aerial  
14 survey itself and whether that needed to be ground-truths  
15 or what's the.....

16 MS. BOERNER: Ground-truths, yes.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: That's what they wanted,  
18 some ground-truth element to it.

19 MS. BOERNER: Exactly. And if you actually  
20 look at the other proposals, there is a degree of ground-  
21 truthing being done by other members of the team. It was  
22 just hard to understand it unless you really go in-depth in  
23 all 10 of these proposals to understand that that overlap  
24 was in fact happening.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I was just wondering if

1 from the PI you would get a sense of that, you know,  
2 through the season, you know, where they could tell us  
3 their degree of confidence in it.

4 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Yeah, I.....

5 MS. HSIEH: You mean could we ask for an  
6 update?

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I don't know how  
8 you -- not being a technical person. I mean, I understand  
9 the issue, but I don't understand how you would resolve it  
10 absent adding some ground-truth element to the.....

11 MS. BOERNER: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....to the proposal.  
13 And obviously the PI is competent enough that they don't  
14 need to do that.

15 MS. BOERNER: Well, they will be ground-  
16 truthing. That's what I said, I don't think the science  
17 panel quite understood that that ground-truthing is  
18 happening in the other 10 -- in the other nine proposals.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I saw it in there.

20 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, so it's there. And  
21 then these aerial surveys are going to be done in  
22 conjunction with ADF&G and their surveys. So I'm -- I  
23 think there's a pretty high comfort level of what's going  
24 to be there.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

1 MS. BOERNER: And for them to be able to  
2 react quickly if there is perhaps a swanning event, that  
3 they can get there right away.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. On to G.

5 MS. BOERNER: Okay. I'll be on Page 7, and  
6 the PI is Bishop. And that was Top-Down Regulation by  
7 Predatory Fish. And this was a fund by all parties with  
8 the 10 percent reduction from the PAC. Okay. Good. The  
9 next one will be on Page 52 and the PI is Kuletz. This is  
10 trends in seabird predation. This was not recommended for  
11 funding by the science panel or the Executive Director. It  
12 was recommended for funding by myself and PAC, less the 10  
13 percent from the PAC. I know there were a lot of concerns  
14 about this project. We have been funding it since fiscal  
15 year 07, and the science panel felt that with those years  
16 of data that should be sufficient at least to make a first  
17 order estimate. The overall cost of the project was  
18 concern. And another concern that was vocalized several  
19 times was that this seemed to be more of a seabird project  
20 than a herring project. I don't know that I agree with  
21 that, and actually I didn't, because I still recommended it  
22 for funding. But for me, they are adding nighttime surveys  
23 of predation, which to me is going to be very important  
24 information as juveniles come to the surface to feed at  
25 night. That's going to be a very critical time to get

1 information and it will the first time we have that  
2 opportunity, so I was comfortable with funding it for all  
3 years of the project.

4 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, it seems to me added  
5 benefit by being able to go to -- taking a look at the  
6 conservation concerns of other injured species that are  
7 dependent on herring. I think that's been a question that  
8 -- some of the questions it can answer not only what's the  
9 impact of reduction in herring with the Prince William  
10 Sound on the commercial fishing fleet, but also on other  
11 trophic levels, particularly kind of top-end predators that  
12 are.....

13 MS. BOERNER: Right.

14 MR. ZEMKE: .....using that. And this by  
15 -- in conjunction with other information. It seems like  
16 it's an enhancement rather than a negative.

17 MS. BOERNER: Right. Than a detraction.  
18 Any questions on that one?

19 (No audible responses)

20 MS. BOERNER: Okay. I'll take you to the  
21 final project of the 10, and that's on Page 38 and the  
22 investigator is Hershberger and that's to Herring Disease  
23 Program. That was recommended for funding by all parties  
24 with a priority fund by the Executive Director and the 10  
25 percent reduction by the PAC. This work -- we have been

1 funding this work since fiscal year 07, and this will be a  
2 continuation of that work.

3 MR. ZEMKE: Do you know -- it shows fiscal  
4 year 13 as \$300,000. Is that a cont -- would that continue  
5 beyond that also or is.....

6 MS. BOERNER: I don't believe so.

7 MR. ZEMKE: Do you think that.....

8 MS. BOERNER: I think Paul is hoping to  
9 have kind of his final conclusions at that point. Yeah,  
10 this project -- the -- has produ -- has been heavily  
11 published, has been well used by other entities. It's  
12 really kind of exciting, innovative work.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So we're through  
14 the.....

15 MS. BOERNER: There's your 10.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....10 survey.....

17 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....herring survey  
19 projects. Do we want to go on to the other herring related  
20 projects or do we want to cull through this list first and  
21 decide whether to add that initially to the motion as we  
22 build a motion here?

23 MR. O'CONNOR: I move the 10, Mr. Chairman.

24 MR. ELTON: Second.

25 MR. O'CONNOR: Herring projects.

1 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: That we accept all  
2 10.....

3 MR. O'CONNOR: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....for purp.....

5 MR. O'CONNOR: But I'd like a list of what  
6 those 10 were.

7 MS. BOERNER: Sure.

8 MR. O'CONNOR: I'm trying to go  
9 through.....

10 MS. BOERNER: I can read that off for you.

11 MR. O'CONNOR: .....all of this. So I  
12 can.....

13 MS. HSIEH: Catherine can read them  
14 off.....

15 MS. BOERNER: I can read them off for you.

16 MS. HSIEH: .....for the purposes of the  
17 motion.

18 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah.

19 MS. BOERNER: Are you ready? Okay.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah.

21 MS. BOERNER: It will be -- make sure I've  
22 got everybody in line. Project 10100132, investigator  
23 Scott Pegau, Communication, Involvement, Outreach, and  
24 Logistics. Project 10100131-A, Campbell, Plankton and  
25 Oceanographic Observations. Project 10100132-B, Thorne,

1 Assessment of Juvenile Herring Abundance. Project  
2 10100132-C, Kline, Pacific Herring Energetic Recruitment.  
3 I lost D. Oh. Project 10100132-D, Heintz, Predictors of  
4 Winter Performance. Project 10100132-E, Gay, Nursery  
5 Habitats of Juvenile Pacific Herring. Project 10100132-F,  
6 Brown, Herring Predator and Competitor Density. Project  
7 10100132-G, Bishop, Top-Down Regulation by Predatory Fish.  
8 Project 10100132-H, Kuletz, Trends in Seabird Predation.  
9 And Project 10100132-I, Hershberger, Herring Disease  
10 Program.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Do we want to do  
12 separate motions or just one? That's what I was thinking.  
13 I guess one way is to add these -- put these in the pot and  
14 then revisit all -- the whole pot all at once. It's just  
15 the way to put it. Is there any other discussion on these  
16 10 right now? Otherwise we'll assume they're temporarily  
17 in the pot, that they'll be part of the motion when it's  
18 made.

19 MR. ELTON: Does that mean Craig has to  
20 withdraw his motion then or how did you want to do this,  
21 Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: My preference would be to  
23 look at -- make sure -- take these in one piece at a time.  
24 We're taken now the herring survey piece and it sounds like  
25 we could take maybe a tentative vote to say that these all

1 go in, you know, to the final motion. And then we'll  
2 revisit it, you know, when we make the final motion with  
3 all the different -- the three pieces in it. So I'd kind  
4 of like to build it, if that's okay with people. I mean, I  
5 don't want to shortcut anything here, but I....

6 MR. BROOKOVER: Do we need a motion.....

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: That way we can look at  
8 the total cost at the same time, we can go back to any  
9 questions on integration or overlap or cost efficiency, the  
10 10 percent, look at the broader issue all at once. Is that  
11 okay with everybody? Okay. So the motion.....

12 MR. O'CONNOR: Whatever gets us to lunch,  
13 Mr. Chairman. Just wanting to.....

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, we'll of timing  
15 here once we get done with this. So the motion as I  
16 understand it is that to consider these 10, the 132 and  
17 132-A through I, and -- for funding. And that we're going  
18 to temporarily approve the funding of these and we're going  
19 to revisit again as part of an over-arching motion with all  
20 the different projects in it. Okay. So all those that are  
21 in favor of the current motion -- I guess first I should  
22 ask is there any other discussion on it.

23 MR. BROOKOVER: Will.....

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Tom.

25 MR. BROOKOVER: Will we have discussion

1 after we make this motion?

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We'll have  
3 discussion.....

4 MR. BROOKOVER: Regarding the 10 projects.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, we can have  
6 discussion right now on these 10.

7 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any further discussion on  
9 these 10. And then we'll look at them again, you can  
10 discuss them again if you'd like in the context of the  
11 final motion.

12 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay. But once we make the  
13 motion on these 10, we will be approving the 10; is that  
14 correct?

15 MR. ELTON: Tentatively.

16 MR. BROOKOVER: Tentatively pending  
17 the.....

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

19 MR. BROOKOVER: .....this follow-up  
20 discussion for the whole package.

21 MR. ELTON: Right.

22 MR. TILLERY: This -- to me this -- the  
23 vote doesn't make any sense. I mean, it's either we're  
24 voting or whatever, kind of we're not.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I'm just trying to pass

1 this stage.

2 MR. TILLERY: I kind of agree with your --  
3 I think what we should do is just.....

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Table the motion  
5 for now.

6 MR. TILLERY: The -- we're done with these  
7 10. We've discussed them. We'll get back to all of them  
8 at the end, bring them all back at the end.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So you're willing to  
10 table your motion for now, pending the.....

11 MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, absolutely.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So let's move on.  
13 Okay. Let's talk about timing. We've been at it almost  
14 two hours now. Do people want to take a break? Do we want  
15 to take a lunch break and come back? What do you want to  
16 do?

17 MR. O'CONNOR: I don't want to -- I think  
18 we should take a break as needed but keep plowing through  
19 this.

20 MR. BROOKOVER: I concur.

21 MR. O'CONNOR: I mean, I feel like I'm on a  
22 roll. I'm not quite sure what I'm doing.....

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I agree.

24 MR. O'CONNOR: .....but man am I rolling  
25 here, so.....

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Here's the problem I  
2 have, is that we had scheduled a lunch meeting and I've got  
3 an attorney general that's probably there right now.

4                   MS. BOERNER: Oops.

5                   MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, well, that changes  
6 things.

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So I need to let him know  
8 what we're going to do and I guess we need to let the place  
9 know what we're going to do.

10                  MS. HSIEH: We had called, I believe.

11                  MS. WOMAC: I've called Glacier Brewhouse  
12 and told them we may not be there until 12:30 and they are  
13 aware that. They are good with it. You have the room the  
14 whole day.

15                  MR. ELTON: I don't mind offending a new  
16 attorney general.....

17                  MS. BOERNER: With one AG sitting there.

18                  MR. ELTON: .....but, Craig, you might.

19                  MR. TILLERY: Oh, what the heck.

20                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do you want to call him?

21                  MR. TILLERY: I think I'd better.

22                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Let's take a five minute  
23 break.

24                  (Off record - 12:10 p.m.)

25                  (On record - 12:22 p.m.)

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We're going to get  
2 started again. I'm going to un-mute the phone.

3                   MS. BOERNER: It is.

4                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, we already --  
5 somebody was ahead of me.

6                   MS. BOERNER: I just did it.

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you. Okay. So we  
8 got through our discussion on the 10 herring survey  
9 projects and we're going to go now to the remainder of the  
10 herring related projects to the extent that Catherine can  
11 identify those for us.

12                  MS. BOERNER: Right. There's five  
13 additional herring projects that were recommended for  
14 funding, so I'll take you through those quickly. The first  
15 one will be on Page 17, the PI is Bychkov. It's Measuring  
16 Interannual Variability in the Herring's Forage Base. This  
17 is the continuous plankton recorder work that has been  
18 going on in the Gulf of Alaska for quite a long time, and  
19 this helps us understand how food is getting invected [sic]  
20 into Prince William Sound for herring. This project was  
21 recommended for funding by all parties. Questions? Are  
22 you still finding the page?

23                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It should be a familiar  
24 one.....

25                  MS. BOERNER: 17.

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   .....to people.

2                   MS. BOERNER:   Uh-huh.

3                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG:   Okay.  I don't see any  
4 questions on that one.

5                   MS. BOERNER:   Okay.  The next one will be  
6 on Page 72 and the PI is Rice, Significance of Whale  
7 Predation on Natural Mortality Rate of Pacific Herring.  
8 This the final year of a project that we've been funding  
9 since fiscal year 07.  So this will be their final year of  
10 analysis and write-up.  And this was recommended for  
11 funding by all parties.  Questions?

12                                   (No audible responses)

13                   MS. BOERNER:   Good.  The next one will be  
14 on Page 85, Vollenweider, Are Herring Energetics Limiting  
15 Part III.  This is the third and final part again of a  
16 project that's been funded since '07, so this will be the  
17 final year of analysis and write-up and it was recommended  
18 for funding by all parties.  Okay.  The next one will be on  
19 Page 19 and the PI is Campbell.  And it's Carrying Capacity  
20 Supplementation for Herring Restoration.  This is a desk  
21 exercise to look at one of the potential herring  
22 restoration options that were identified as part of our  
23 meetings last summer.  This was recommended for funding by  
24 all parties but was a low funding priority by the Executive  
25 Director.

1 MR. O'CONNOR: Question.

2 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

3 MR. O'CONNOR: Question. This is -- 119  
4 you said? 1-1-9?

5 MS. BOERNER: Page 19.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It's also 1-1-9.

7 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, it's Project 119, yes.

8 MR. O'CONNOR: 119. I guess a question I  
9 would have is should we be spending some time on this  
10 waiting for the data from the herring package that the  
11 information is going to be collected from the herring --  
12 the other herring projects to do this?

13 MS. BOERNER: Not necessarily. This is  
14 just a one-year project. It's strictly a desk exercise.  
15 There's not data collection being done as part of it. It's  
16 really trying to understand one of the potential options  
17 and whether permitting would be required. Essentially what  
18 would it take to actually get this project completed if  
19 it's something we wanted to investigate further.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.

21 MS. BOERNER: And it's just one fiscal  
22 year.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And what was the concerns  
24 about it again from the Executive Director?

25 MS. HSIEH: I think I felt that -- and this

1 is of course -- my tiers were trying to be, you know, going  
2 from one level of -- I'll steer to the next. So this is a  
3 fund recommendation but I could wait. Because it seems  
4 like this desk exercise, if you wait a year, it's not going  
5 to really shift what will come out of it. And in fact,  
6 maybe if you even know, if supplementation is even on the  
7 table in a year, it might not even become relevant.

8 MR. TILLERY: So this is only money to  
9 figure out whether we can or how you would go about putting  
10 together a project for like adding herring chow to the  
11 Sound?

12 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

13 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

14 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, this would be to  
15 determine the possibility of feeding over-wintering herring  
16 in the Sound.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But is it just.....

18 MS. BOERNER: Which was one of the options  
19 identified in the IHRP.....

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But.....

21 MS. BOERNER: .....for restoration.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But it's not looking at  
23 the science questions, it's.....

24 MS. BOERNER: No.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....looking at the

1 permitting and the maybe logistic questions.

2 MS. BOERNER: Logistics and so I guess it  
3 would be -- you can almost determine whether or not it's a  
4 viable option.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But is it.....

6 MS. BOERNER: It would have to be done for  
7 any of the options.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But it's not looking at  
9 whether it might cause harm by dumping a bunch of nutrients  
10 or something or anything like that?

11 MS. HSIEH: I don't think it gets to that.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I mean, is somebody else  
13 looking.....

14 MS. BOERNER: Not really.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....at those kind of  
16 science questions separate.....

17 MS. BOERNER: They will. I think before we  
18 even get into the really complex scientific questions, you  
19 have to know if it's even something that you can do.

20 (Off record conversation regarding  
21 telephonic feedback)

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I mean, what benefit  
23 would this have to us right now?

24 (Off record conversation regarding  
25 telephonic feedback)

1 MS. BOERNER: As we're updating the IHRP  
2 with the group of three that you looked at as part of the  
3 budget package, it will be helpful to know if some of these  
4 options simply aren't viable. I mean, we can remove them,  
5 we can stop looking at them, they can come out or be added  
6 in.

7 (Off record conversation regarding  
8 telephonic feedback)

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So I guess the question  
10 is, is why would we even be looking at this? What value  
11 would it have for us right now. I mean, I don't think it's  
12 a very hard question to answer, you know, in terms of the  
13 legal side. I don't know on the logistical side.

14 MS. BOERNER: I think a lot of the options  
15 have been -- that we came up with as part of the herring  
16 plan have been heavily questioned and I know that some  
17 options to many people seemed more viable than others. So  
18 I almost think this is a way of saying this is a viable  
19 option, we need to proceed forward with it.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I guess I'm wondering in  
21 my mind though whether this is a significant limiting  
22 factor to herring recruitment. You know, is that there's  
23 any more nutrients at some particular stage in some  
24 particular area. I haven't heard that yet.

25 MS. BOERNER: I think that's still

1 something that they're debating and it will be part of  
2 those 10 projects. A number of them are looking at food  
3 availability.

4 MR. BROOKOVER: That was my question, I  
5 guess just for confirmation, I believe that will be  
6 addressed through the herring survey projects.

7 MS. BOERNER: Right.

8 MR. BROOKOVER: As to whether that is a  
9 limiting factor.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, see, but once we  
11 know it's a limiting factor, then it would make sense to  
12 look at this further. I just question the timing of it  
13 too.

14 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, it would seem to me  
15 like you would figure out do we need this, then you would  
16 have a study where you would have year one, which would be,  
17 you know, can we do it, is it -- can we get permits, can we  
18 get -- can we dump the stuff in there, is it going to cause  
19 harm, that sort of thing. And then you'd have the next or  
20 phase two or whatever would -- could be you'll do it would  
21 be a more logical way to approach this rather than spending  
22 this money and then determining, well, actually it wouldn't  
23 help anyway, it's not an issue.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah.

25 MS. BOERNER: But you do have to eliminate

1 some of the potential restoration options as from -- in  
2 some way as we're moving along.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I just think  
4 it's.....

5 MS. BOERNER: And some of them can be.....

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....premature though to  
7 look at the legal and the logistics issue, it would be hard  
8 to do unless you had a feel for where you need to do it,  
9 how much you need to do and, you know, it would a be fact  
10 driven inquiry, even on the legal side.

11 MR. ZEMKE: I'd be a little worried that we  
12 may not be asking the right questions to be able to move  
13 forward on this if indeed it is a viable option. So if we  
14 defer for another three or four years then we may be, oh,  
15 actually we need this information to be able to proceed and  
16 now we're got to wait another four or five years to get the  
17 information and though I'm not sure whether this is form  
18 related, like you'd be able to get down to are there other,  
19 in say permitting, individual studies that need to be done  
20 to -- or information collected to be able to proceed.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
22 discussion on 119?

23 MR. O'CONNOR: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm  
24 confused by some of the words in the abstract. If what  
25 we're doing is a tabletop exercise to determine what the

1 administrative context would be for doing some  
2 supplementation here, feeding, permits and that sort of  
3 thing, that's one thing. And it's probably going to be  
4 something that will be useful information sooner rather  
5 than later, but the other part of this talks about an  
6 evaluation of the potential impacts and benefits to both  
7 the herring population and the Prince William Sound  
8 ecosystem by the impact of adding nutrients, which seems to  
9 be a whole different focus and one that doesn't seem to be,  
10 you know, fleshed out in the scientific way. So if what  
11 we're talking about is regulatory context, administrative  
12 context, then I don't -- then I can understand it being a  
13 \$36,000 project and let's get on with it. Otherwise, I  
14 think it's more complex. So I'm assuming what you're  
15 telling us is that cut off that last phrase. You're not  
16 going to go out and see what the ecological impact is of  
17 adding a bag of fish food type thing.

18 MS. BOERNER: That would be -- yeah, that  
19 would be the -- you know, if you looked at it and said,  
20 okay, it's feasible, we can get the permits, we can do all  
21 that, then the next year's would be pilot studies.....

22 MR. O'CONNOR: Got it.

23 MS. BOERNER: .....to determine exactly  
24 what would happen when you dumped that bag of food in.

25 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.

1                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

2                   MS. BOERNER: Okay.

3                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Let's move on to the next  
4 one then.

5                   MS. BOERNER: Oh, boy. Okay. The last one  
6 in the group will be on Page 78 and the PI is Seeb. This  
7 is a pilot project for high density DNA sequencing. The PI  
8 originally submitted a very large, very costly project to  
9 do a multi-year study. Based on the comments that were  
10 received back from the science panel, the -- Dr. Seeb  
11 offered a pilot project up that would essentially provide  
12 proof of concept at a much lower cost. So this project  
13 would just take one herring and would begin doing the high  
14 density DNA sequencing. We would have results in January,  
15 which would allow us to inform a February invitation to see  
16 if this was a technology that we'd like to continue moving  
17 forward with. The pilot project was not reviewed by the  
18 science panel. Unfortunately we got it far too late for  
19 them to have the opportunity to review it. They did  
20 recommend it for funding actually as part of the larger  
21 project that was originally submitted. They did recommend  
22 that for funding but to reduce some of the cost, because it  
23 was quite costly. It was almost a million dollars.  
24 (Telephonic feedback) Yeah, we're doing this again. In  
25 terms of myself an Elise, we both felt that while the

1 project is interesting, it's something I'd to see proceed  
2 forward, if necessary, this could wait an additional year  
3 or further. But it was not reviewed -- the pilot project  
4 was not reviewed by the PAC and it was not reviewed by the  
5 science panel.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other questions for  
7 Catherine on this one?

8 (No audible responses)

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So refresh my memory on  
10 this why it would be one herring for the whole Sound, just  
11 to see whether.....

12 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....you could do the DNA  
14 sequencing?

15 MS. BOERNER: This will be the first time  
16 this kind of technology is being used on herring. So we'd  
17 be a bit of a pioneer in the technology. It has been used  
18 for other fish types, including salmon and it has been used  
19 successfully. I know there's a lot of controversy about  
20 certain different ways of genetic analysis for fish, but  
21 this along with the microsatellite work that's already been  
22 completed and funded by us I think will provide a really  
23 clear picture of the genetics in the Sound, whether we're  
24 managing multiple populations, a single population. I know  
25 from ADF&G's perspective, that will be very useful

1 information.

2                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I was wondering why  
3 they would take one fish because -- wasn't there a proposal  
4 to take one on the east side and one on the west side? Or  
5 was.....

6                   MS. BOERNER: Right now it's just a matter  
7 of can they actually get the alleles to determine if this  
8 technology is appropriate. It's essentially to run the  
9 fish and make sure that we actually get appropriate  
10 information out of it, not necessarily looking at.....

11                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And the idea then  
12 there.....

13                   MS. BOERNER: .....hypothesis driven  
14 result.

15                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....would be a phase two  
16 after this at some point then that would get representative  
17 populations from around the Sound and.....

18                   MS. BOERNER: Absolutely.

19                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....see whether we got  
20 distinct populations or not that we're having to manage.

21                   MS. BOERNER: Exactly. So as part of our  
22 next invitation, which would go out in February, that would  
23 be something that we could ask for, with that information  
24 that we've received from this pilot project, saying okay,  
25 we know that SNPs works, you know, all right, what are --

1 you know, are we going to proceed forward or not? And now  
2 having kind of an idea of what it would cost to proceed  
3 forward.

4 MS. HSIEH: This is technology not.....

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Either.....

6 MS. HSIEH: .....is not -- this technology  
7 is not being used on herring on the Atlantic side at all?  
8 I thought it was.

9 MS. BOERNER: It's not being used at all --  
10 used on the Pacific. They just started a project. It  
11 would be running almost concurrent with us on the Atlantic  
12 side, looking at Atlantic herring, but they have not yet  
13 begun that project. It's just starting.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It seems like this would  
15 have value elsewhere in the state.

16 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. Absolutely.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. I don't see any  
18 other questions on that one, so -- did it come or.....

19 MS. BOERNER: That brings us to an end.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: Sounds like we got CSI  
21 herring going.

22 MS. BOERNER: That brings us to the end of  
23 the additional herring projects.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

25 MR. TILLERY: Did we -- we went through

1 129?

2 MS. HSIEH: Which one?

3 MS. BOERNER: Which one?

4 MR. TILLERY: 129.

5 MS. BOERNER: It was the.....

6 MS. HSIEH: Seitz.

7 MS. BOERNER: Seitz. Yeah, that was on the  
8 do not fund list by the Executive Director, which is why I  
9 kind of -- because there are a number of herring projects  
10 in the do not funds. If you'd like, we can proceed down  
11 through those, but there's quite a number. And that would  
12 be this -- yeah, the Seitz project.

13 MR. TILLERY: I don't know, maybe we don't  
14 want to do that. Let's just.....

15 MS. BOERNER: It's on Page 79 or your work  
16 plan.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, why don't we take  
18 those as a batch and see if there's people that want  
19 to.....

20 MR. TILLERY: So, you know, just kind of  
21 looking at that one, because it had a science panel  
22 recommendation to fund and a science coordinator  
23 recommendation to fund, but then a PAC and executive of do  
24 not fund, so it seemed to be less unanimous.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

1 MS. BOERNER: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I saw that too. Well, do  
3 you want to -- we can certainly take that up right now if  
4 you want, Craig.

5 MR. TILLERY: I think that's the only one  
6 in that situation.....

7 MS. BOERNER: No, no.

8 MR. TILLERY: .....with mixed.....

9 MS. BOERNER: There's one other.

10 MR. TILLERY: Well, there's one that has a  
11 modify and then a bunch of.....

12 MS. BOERNER: There's Konar, 854.

13 MR. BROOKOVER: I'm sorry, Catherine, which  
14 one was that?

15 MS. BOERNER: Konar, project 854. It's on  
16 Page 50 of your work plan.

17 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

18 MS. BOERNER: That was a fund by the  
19 science panel but a do not fund for everyone else.

20 MR. BROOKOVER: And is that herring?

21 MS. BOERNER: No.

22 MR. BROOKOVER: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So at this point  
24 we've covered all of the herring projects where there was a  
25 recommendation to fund by the Executive Director.

1 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And now there's, what, a  
3 few.....

4 MS. BOERNER: One.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: One.

6 MR. TILLERY: Basically one.

7 MS. BOERNER: There's one herring project  
8 that was recommended for funding by the science panel.....

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And by the science.....

10 MS. BOERNER: .....and by myself.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....coordinator but not  
12 the Executive Director. Okay. Why don't we take that one  
13 up, number 129, Seitz.

14 MS. BOERNER: Sure. And again, that's on  
15 project -- Page 79 of your work plan. Seitz, Ecology and  
16 Migratory Movements of Pacific Herring. This would be an  
17 acoustic tagging project. We'd be using an existing array  
18 over -- is it Port Gra -- JoEllen, was it Port Graham?

19 MS. LOTTSFELDT: Port Gravina.

20 MS. BOERNER: Gravina. Thank you. Port  
21 Gravina and we'll be tagging herring, physically tagging  
22 herring and then measuring their movements using acoustic  
23 technologies. Again, this is pretty new technology. The  
24 array has been put in and is being co-funded by other  
25 institutions. I think the science panel's interest in this

1 is it is new technology and the comment was this is the  
2 type of project where it's interesting to learn what you  
3 didn't think you were going to learn, that these types of  
4 projects often give unexpected results that are far more  
5 interesting than what you thought you were going to get. I  
6 think we were -- both myself and the science panel, we're  
7 intrigued from a scientific perspective if we can really  
8 use this type of technology to in fact track herring.  
9 Where you can put these tiny little tags into a herring, it  
10 keeps swimming over a receiving line and you can understand  
11 how they're coming and going, where they're spawning. So I  
12 think from a scientific perspective, it's interesting;  
13 however, I know from Elise and from the PAC, the cost is  
14 significant, especially in the first year is a majority of  
15 it, because you have to buy the tags to put into the  
16 herring.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So it's not.....

18 MS. BOERNER: And have somebody actually  
19 going out there and doing it.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So if I hear it right,  
21 we're not really testing a hypothesis here, what we're  
22 doing is we're -- this method development.

23 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Right. And we're  
24 looking at seven -- over the life of the project, \$752,300;  
25 444,000 in the first year.

1                   MR. TILLERY: Is -- Mr. Chairman. Is there  
2 any group out there that might be willing to partner with  
3 us on something like this? Developing technology.

4                   MS. BOERNER: In some ways they already  
5 are. They're the ones that are -- you know, this is AOS,   
6 which is being worked on at Prince William Sound Science  
7 Center, so they'll be assisting with the project and  
8 they're putting the array in, so this type of work is being  
9 co-funded by multiple people. We would just be looking at  
10 the herring. Other groups are looking at other fish and  
11 sea mammals -- and other mammals. So -- but I think we're  
12 the ones with the highest interest in the herring itself.

13                  MR. ZEMKE: So is this a conceptual design  
14 or what would it take to actually understand the movements  
15 of the herring beyond -- so this \$750,000, is it another  
16 several million dollars then to be able to get a fully  
17 function understanding of where herring go?

18                  MS. BOERNER: As anything, as the  
19 technology develops, the price will continually come down.  
20 Once the arrays are in place, you'll lose -- that's a  
21 significant amount of cost that does not have to be  
22 continually re-upped. And the cost of the tags will  
23 continue to come down as the technology is more adopted.

24                  MR. BROOKOVER: Catherine, in this  
25 proposal, how of the design relies on the array that's in

1 place versus the mobile tagging. And what I'm getting at  
2 is one of the last sentences under the science panel  
3 comments talks about tagging of salmon smolts, providing  
4 new information about their distribution and interactions  
5 with herring in natal bays, which to me the post array  
6 won't get it.

7 MS. BOERNER: Right.

8 MR. BROOKOVER: So I'm curious about the  
9 mobile sampling and how much of the project that entails.

10 MS. BOERNER: Right. Let me refresh  
11 myself.

12 MS. HSIEH: Larry, there are two people on  
13 line with out-of-state prefixes, perhaps cell phones. So  
14 if need be, with the echo, we could ask them to call back  
15 in. I don't know if they have us on mute or something with  
16 their cell phones, creating some sort of echo.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, why we do that. I  
18 kind of hate cutting people off as we're going through  
19 something important to them, so.....

20 MS. WOMAC: So ask them to call back.

21 MS. HSIEH: Ask them to call back in and  
22 we'll -- is that what you recommend, Cherri?

23 MS. WOMAC: Ask them to hang up and call  
24 back.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So I need to do

1 that. Take it off.

2 MS. WOMAC: I took it off.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. This is Larry  
4 Hartig again, the chair here for the meeting, and we're  
5 getting a pretty severe echo, which makes it difficult to  
6 communicate in the room, so what we're asking I guess is  
7 the two people that are participating on their cell phone,  
8 if they could hang up and call back in, the same number,  
9 the same code, and rejoin us. Okay. Although we're not  
10 getting the echo now, so.....

11 MS. HSIEH: Yeah, so my.....

12 MS. BOERNER: So we'll just keep moving  
13 forward.

14 MS. HSIEH: Keep moving forward till  
15 it.....

16 MS. BOERNER: Like you said.....

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

18 MS. BOERNER: .....it must be a cell phone  
19 or something.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So we'll keep moving  
21 forward. So you got Tom's question.

22 MS. BOERNER: Yes, if you actually could  
23 repeat that. I apologize. It was distracting.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: So there's a benefit  
25 mentioned.....

1 MS. BOERNER: Right.

2 MR. BROOKOVER: .....in the project.....

3 MS. BOERNER: Right.

4 MR. BROOKOVER: .....in terms of  
5 distribution in natal bays.....

6 MS. BOERNER: Right.

7 MR. BROOKOVER: .....or nursery bays with  
8 herring and salmon.

9 MS. BOERNER: Right.

10 MR. BROOKOVER: And there are two parts  
11 that I'm aware of, the array system and mobile hydro-  
12 acoustic sampling. And I.....

13 MS. BOERNER: Right.

14 MR. BROOKOVER: I'm wondering how much  
15 emphasis is place on the two relatively in the projects.  
16 In other words.....

17 MS. BOERNER: Right.

18 MR. BROOKOVER: .....is 90 percent of the  
19 funding going into the post array system with a little bit  
20 of acoustic sampling, or is it.....

21 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

22 MR. BROOKOVER: .....how's -- where's the  
23 balance and how much information are we going to get with  
24 respect to specific nursery bays versus larger scale  
25 movements in and out of the Sound?

1 MS. BOERNER: Right. I mean, really this  
2 -- I'll almost call it a pilot project. I mean, this is  
3 going to be a very small area. It's going to give us some  
4 ideas. It's, again, going to test the technology. It  
5 relies heavily on the post array, and that's what its goal  
6 was -- that's what it was designed for. I think that again  
7 we're in that situation where we're testing the technology  
8 for herring. We know we can tag them. The post array is  
9 new, is relatively new and I think what the goal is, that  
10 they're going to understand better where these fish are  
11 coming in and out but I will say there were members of the  
12 science panel that felt we needed to understand more about  
13 are these fish going out to the shelf, where are they  
14 going. So I think there was a lot of dispute about whether  
15 or not this was a project that we would need to fund at  
16 this point in time. I know I'm not being very articulate.  
17 I'm trying to recall the conversation, which was quite a  
18 while now.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Would there be a problem  
20 if we didn't fund it this year in terms of the other people  
21 that are working on this project maybe with other species?

22 MS. BOERNER: Right. I do know.....

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: You know, we.....

24 MS. BOERNER: Well, they're out there. I  
25 think everyone is going to be out there this year working

1 with this array as it goes in. So I do think if we were  
2 going to receive maximum benefit, we'd probably want to be  
3 out there this year along with everybody else. But of  
4 course there's nothing to say it could not be done next  
5 year or the following year. We're just trying to look at  
6 kind of maximum scientific benefit.

7 MR. TILLERY: I'm confused I guess why that  
8 would be of a benefit. If we're just tracking herring we  
9 could -- is there -- why would it be a benefit to do it  
10 this year versus next year?

11 MS. BOERNER: Well, I think it's always  
12 good when you're out there doing -- using these techniques  
13 with other groups because these groups are sharing  
14 information, so you learn where things aren't working, do  
15 this, change the technique. So I said it certainly can  
16 wait, but from a scientific perspective, if I were them, I  
17 would want to be out this year alongside with the other  
18 people that are developing the technology to be a part of  
19 it and be -- to help develop the appropriate protocols  
20 instead of waiting next year, then we're going to have to  
21 say, okay, well this year we did this, but next year we  
22 have to change it because that didn't work and next year we  
23 have to change it because that didn't work.

24 MR. TILLERY: I guess -- my vision of what  
25 I understood this would be, would be we would go out and

1 get some herring, 200 of them.....

2 MS. BOERNER: Right.

3 MR. TILLERY: .....tag them.....

4 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

5 MR. TILLERY: .....release them.

6 MS. BOERNER: Release them.

7 MR. TILLERY: And then this information

8 would flow to some office in Anchorage or something.

9 MS. BOERNER: No, we would then -- no, we

10 actually have to physically go out and gather the informa

11 -- gather the data. The data isn't transmitted

12 electronically, you actually have to go pull up the array,

13 get the information, sync the array and.....

14 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

15 MS. BOERNER: .....or pull up the receiver,

16 I should say. There's two different kinds of boats that

17 can do this technology and unfortunately the second one is

18 so expensive, which is, like you said, the kind of

19 electronic transmitter. That wouldn't be part of this

20 project. This is a manual -- we still manually go out.

21 MR. TILLERY: Are they going to do this

22 another year or is this a one year only?

23 MS. BOERNER: This project was not one

24 year.

25 MR. TILLERY: No, I mean the array. Is it

1 going to be out there for.....

2 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. It's going to be out  
3 there for good. Or I should say for at least a significant  
4 amount of time.

5 MR. TILLERY: And pulled up every year?

6 MS. BOERNER: Well, you have to pull it up,  
7 get your information, then you put it back down again. So  
8 you're essentially just gathering the data from it. But we  
9 don't have to keep buying the devices every year, just the  
10 tags. That's why the price goes down dramatically in the  
11 out years of the project. Such as, in fiscal year 10,  
12 they're asking for 441,000. Fiscal year 11, they're asking  
13 for 164,000, which would just cover the tags.

14 MR. ZEMKE: Would the array be more fully  
15 developed in another year or two? Since they're  
16 instituting it right now, it might be a benefit to wait  
17 another year or two so that we get better data with the  
18 more -- you know, lesser cost.

19 MS. BOERNER: I honestly can't answer that  
20 question. I can find out for you, but I can't answer it  
21 right now.

22 MR. TILLERY: So if we wait another year,  
23 do we -- are we going to end up having to pay the 444,000  
24 buy-in or are they going -- we going to get to start  
25 off.....

1 MS. BOERNER: I think they'll still be  
2 coming back with the 444,000 buy-in.

3 MS. HSIEH: Well, depending on the cost of  
4 acoustical tags.....

5 MS. BOERNER: Of course.

6 MS. HSIEH: .....if it's shifted at all.

7 MR. ZEMKE: This isn't purchase for any  
8 array equipment, it's basically just for the tags.

9 MS. BOERNER: This was for the tags and the  
10 CTD glider, which is what you actually put over -- to get  
11 the information.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I guess the question that  
13 I'm struggling with, the one I asked originally, you know,  
14 whether it's answering some hypotheses, you know, that are  
15 out there, that, you know, why -- if we develop this  
16 methodology, then so what? What's it going to tell us  
17 that's valuable in terms of herring recovery and is it a  
18 critical component there of answering that question. And I  
19 can understand you wanting to know where the herring are  
20 coming from, where they're going and -- coming in and out  
21 of the Sound. I understand that, but I'm not sure whether  
22 this is what we need to answer those questions in the  
23 context of recovery.

24 MS. BOERNER: I think the main question  
25 it's really trying to answer is do herring have natal

1 homing like salmon do. Most assume they don't. And that  
2 could have implications for restoration if they're spawning  
3 in different areas or moving from year to year where  
4 they're not going -- you know, they don't have that site  
5 fidelity that say salmon would. So being able to  
6 understand whether -- you know, what areas they're moving  
7 through will help us better understand where these events  
8 may happen.

9                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But this doesn't tell me  
10 that. In the proposal, it doesn't tell me how that fits  
11 together.

12                   MS. BOERNER: It's not going to this year,  
13 yeah. And in this initial type of proposal, it -- we're  
14 just testing one area and, no, I mean, it's not going to  
15 give us a Sound-wide perspective, which is why I think  
16 there was -- why the PAC and Elise were a little more  
17 cautious with a do not fund for this year.

18                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Do we want any  
19 other discussion on that one? Anybody else want to weigh  
20 in on it or ask a question?

21                   (No audible responses)

22                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Are there any  
23 other herring specific ones that people want to take up  
24 right now? Otherwise, what I'll do is go back up to the  
25 high funding and fund and see if there's any others that we

1 haven't covered yet and then what -- and lower funding, I  
2 guess. And then what I would do is on the do not fund is  
3 to ask finally if there's anybody that wants to ask on any  
4 of those and then look for a motion. Okay.

5 MR. O'CONNOR: I have a question on one.

6 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Go ahead, Craig.

7 MR. O'CONNOR: Why we haven't talked about  
8 it in the herring context, is the Quinn humpback whale,  
9 because at least as I read it, it's looking at humpback  
10 whales and their abundance relative to herring.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: This is 128?

12 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Quinn.

14 MS. BOERNER: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: 128.

16 MS. BOERNER: Quinn. That project -- do we  
17 have the page number?

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: 78.

19 MS. BOERNER: Thank you. 70.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Oh, se.....

21 MS. BOERNER: 70.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Oh, okay.

23 MS. BOERNER: The Quinn project is they're  
24 looking at historical humpback whale data. They're going  
25 to go through and be able to actually provide us

1 information using photo identification. So this is not  
2 active work. This isn't somebody that's going to be out in  
3 the Sound getting information but hoping to help us model  
4 and hoping to get an understanding of both the herring  
5 abundance in the Sound and the proportionate humpback whale  
6 populations in the Sound. So this is going back and  
7 looking at old data and being able to actually look at that  
8 and determine population counts. So, yeah, there's not  
9 field work associated with this project.

10 MR. BROOKOVER: And Catherine, correct me  
11 if I'm wrong, but my understanding is it would tie in with  
12 Jeep Rice's project that does estimate for better.....

13 MS. BOERNER: Right.

14 MR. BROOKOVER: .....for -- you know, I'm  
15 saying it's simply herring predation.....

16 MS. BOERNER: Right.

17 MR. BROOKOVER: .....by humpback whales,  
18 and so this study would allow some hindcasting estimates  
19 of.....

20 MS. BOERNER: Exactly.

21 MR. BROOKOVER: .....herring predation by  
22 humpback.....

23 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: .....whales over time.

25 MS. BOERNER: Yeah. And that way -- so

1 Jeep did the field work, this will be the historical, and  
2 then that can all be used for the modeling.

3 MR. ZEMKE: But, yeah, since there's no new  
4 data collection, we're not losing anything by not doing it  
5 next year, so.....

6 MS. BOERNER: No, the only.....

7 MR. ZEMKE: .....I would assume that's  
8 going to be some of your recommendation, is that it could  
9 wait a year possibly to get Jeep Rice's full report out and  
10 then we could use these to be able to hindcast the -- take  
11 a look at overall.....

12 MS. HSIEH: There has been.....

13 MR. ZEMKE: .....humpback predation.

14 MS. HSIEH: The data is held by private  
15 individuals and there has been some discussion as to  
16 whether that data would be available in future years or if  
17 this is an opportunity and a window that would close.

18 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, there's a master  
19 student that they have prepared to do this work and that  
20 would only be for this fiscal year that she could do that.

21 MS. HSIEH: So there's some discussion of  
22 opportunity. My only -- when I made this -- these tiers,  
23 again, I was really trying to really cut things into how  
24 much are you going to spend and what really -- you know,  
25 what could wait. And it's not that I don't think this

1 should be funded, it's just when I had to draw lines,  
2 that's what -- that was a potential could wait. There was  
3 some risk but I think grad students will be available.  
4 That to me is not a concern. But I don't know if this  
5 private individual would all of a sudden take on a  
6 different attitude and not allow their data to be used. I  
7 don't know.

8 MR. O'CONNOR: This was an issue, as I  
9 recall, during the science panel's discussion about this;  
10 right?

11 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

12 MR. O'CONNOR: They were concerned about  
13 the availability. I don't know who this private person is.

14 MS. BOERNER: Right.

15 MS. HSIEH: I heard about it more after. I  
16 think the science panel thought it was very interesting and  
17 it was a fund. I don't remember a large amount of.....

18 MR. O'CONNOR: I don't know. Maybe I.....

19 MS. HSIEH: .....worry about it.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: .....heard it someplace.

21 MS. HSIEH: It was later, because I didn't  
22 come out with a could wait until much later, and then I got  
23 the response, well, if you wait, you may lose the  
24 opportunity, so.....

25 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.

1                   MR. ZEMKE: Student's master thesis. Is it  
2 -- this on Prince William Sound or does that -- does it  
3 include a lot of other areas? It seems like they're  
4 already.....

5                   MS. BOERNER: Right.

6                   MR. ZEMKE: .....determined that there's a  
7 masters thesis coming out of it.....

8                   MS. BOERNER: Right.

9                   MR. ZEMKE: .....and three journal articles  
10 that they must have.

11                  MS. BOERNER: Right. That they're -- yeah,  
12 that they wan to have. I understood this would just be for  
13 Prince William Sound.

14                  MR. O'CONNOR: We've talked about predator  
15 pits and humpback whales would be a predator in those pits;  
16 right?

17                  MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Sure.

18                  MR. O'CONNOR: So this would be something  
19 significant to know relatively soon, I guess. If this is a  
20 prevailing concept, let's find out if we've got an  
21 abundance of predators that might be causing this problem  
22 to which we'll then of course shoot the humpback whales and  
23 all go to jail, so.....

24                  MS. BOERNER: In any kind of restoration  
25 effort, you'd have to be able to swamp the predators,

1 essentially, to bring the numbers up, so, you know,  
2 understanding that predator interaction is key.

3                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: This is to correlate the  
4 humpback whale population with the herring population and  
5 maybe look at its.....

6                   MS. BOERNER: Right. See how they track.

7                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

8                   MS. BOERNER: And then matching that up  
9 with Jeep's field work which has been done over the past  
10 three years now before. So.....

11                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Are there any  
12 other herring related projects people would want to cover  
13 before we pick up everything else that's left on the  
14 funding list? Executive Director's funding list.

15                   (No audible responses)

16                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So why don't we go  
17 to that.

18                   MS. BOERNER: Okay. So I'll take you  
19 through the remainder of the high priority funding  
20 recommendations that were made by Elise. The first one  
21 will be on Page 11, PI Bodkin. It's project 808,  
22 Evaluation of Recovery of -- and Restoration of Injured  
23 Nearshore. This was recommended for funding by all parties  
24 and a priority fund from Elise. And this is again is  
25 continuing work that has been funded for quite a number of

1 years now. And it's been very vital in working with our  
2 lingering oil information and understanding how the  
3 nearshore is recovering from the oiling. Questions? No.

4 MR. O'CONNOR: What you said -- I was  
5 reading my copious notes here that were put together by my  
6 liaison, at no cheap price I might add. They are  
7 integrating, they are getting the information out of  
8 Michel's -- Jacqui Michel's work on where.....

9 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

10 MR. O'CONNOR: .....the oil is and the  
11 probabilistic modeling and all of that sort of thing that's  
12 going on. So you feel comfortable that they're going to  
13 know where to go.....

14 MS. BOERNER: Yes.

15 MR. O'CONNOR: .....basically.

16 MS. BOERNER: Yeah.

17 MR. O'CONNOR: We recused the PI that's on  
18 the science panel. We did; right?

19 MS. BOERNER: We did.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: I can't remember who that  
21 was.

22 MS. BOERNER: Tom Dee.

23 MR. O'CONNOR: That's right. Okay.

24 MS. BOERNER: We did.

25 MR. O'CONNOR: All right.

1 MS. BOERNER: We forced him out of the  
2 room. Uh-huh.

3 MR. O'CONNOR: That's right. I remember  
4 that. He was the lucky guy that got to leave.

5 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, agency personnel have  
6 to recuse themselves if they're on the science panel and  
7 were talking about that agency or if they're a PI or  
8 affiliated with a PI they recuse themselves.

9 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Thanks.

10 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh. Next. The next one  
11 will be on Page 40. It's Project 839, the PI is Hollmen.  
12 Evaluating Injury to Harlequin Ducks. This will be the  
13 final year of a project that was funded under the priority  
14 lingering oil work that was funded, I believe, in fiscal  
15 year 08.

16 MR. O'CONNOR: Have we got any reports on  
17 this?

18 MS. HSIEH: No, this is sort of -- this is  
19 really more of an administrative issue. For some reason at  
20 that time things were being funded sort of spurt by spurt,  
21 year by year. This really is -- this was a project that --  
22 a proposal that was funded and somehow the last year was  
23 not because you guys chose to fund it one year at a time in  
24 a couple -- a couple years ago. So this is really -- we're  
25 paying now for the their final year and their report. It's

1 really administrative that it wasn't authorized and  
2 approved earlier at another time.

3 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, it was always intended  
4 to be a three year project but for some odd administrative  
5 reason, because it was funding out of the cycle, we just  
6 funded a year at a time and this will be the third and  
7 final year of this project.

8 MS. HSIEH: That's why it was not reviewed.

9 MS. BOERNER: Right.

10 MS. HSIEH: It's already been reviewed and  
11 approved by you guys. It's just.....

12 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.

13 MS. HSIEH: .....the last year fell off.

14 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Craig.

16 MR. TILLERY: I have a disconnect in my  
17 mind on these numbers. On the sheet it's got a total of  
18 250 with 218 and then 32,000 in a following year. And on  
19 the spreadsheet it seems to suggest it's simply a one-year  
20 funding for 213.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Uh-huh.

22 MR. TILLERY: Unless I got it.....

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. No, you're right.

24 MS. HSIEH: Uh-huh. Why is there an FY-11?

25 MS. BOERNER: FY-11.....

1 MS. HSIEH: Page 40 of the work plan.

2 MS. BOERNER: .....is the closeout year of  
3 the project, yes.

4 MR. TILLERY: But even the 213 is not the  
5 same.....

6 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, that's not even  
7 correct.

8 MR. TILLERY: .....as the 218.

9 MS. BOERNER: I don't know where the 213  
10 came from.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It sounds like the 32,000  
12 must be for the report writing end or.....

13 MS. BOERNER: No. Yeah, this on the sheet,  
14 on the Executive Director's sheet is an error. The funding  
15 in the work plan is correct. So they're asking for fiscal  
16 year 10, it would be \$218,000 -- \$218,300. And then fiscal  
17 year 11 would be their final report writing year and they  
18 were asking for \$32,400.

19 MS. HSIEH: So 250,700.

20 MS. BOERNER: So 250,700 is the correct  
21 total amount. So you'd be funding this for two years.

22 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah. On the alphabetical  
23 spreadsheet it's correct.

24 MS. BOERNER: Okay. Right.

25 MR. O'CONNOR: Can we get something out of

1 this sooner than FY-11? It would be interesting to know.

2 This is of critical importance to us.

3 MS. HSIEH: We know what the schedule is.

4 We could ask.

5 MR. O'CONNOR: Let's see if we can't

6 accelerate this a little bit.

7 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, we can ask for perhaps

8 a more detailed annual report that will give us more

9 understanding of where they are.

10 MR. O'CONNOR: That would be helpful.

11 MS. BOERNER: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

13 MS. BOERNER: Sorry about that. Okay. The

14 number is correct. Okay. The next project will be on Page

15 56. It's project 742 and this is Craig Matkin. Killer

16 Whales in Prince William Sound and the Kenai Fjords. This

17 was recommended for funding by all parties and a

18 continuation of a 17 -- 18 year data set. Question? Okay.

19 The next one down will be Page 87, Weingartner, project

20 340. Long term monitoring of the Alaska Coastal Current.

21 This is the funding for the GAK 1 line, and this was

22 recommended for funding by all parties. And it was a

23 priority fund for Elise.

24 MR. ZEMKE: Do you know what the total

25 funding for the GAK1 line.....

1 MS. BOERNER: The GAK1.....

2 MR. ZEMKE: .....monitoring rate is?

3 It's.....

4 MS. BOERNER: I'm honestly not sure. I'd  
5 have to check. I don't want to give you the wrong number.

6

7 MR. ZEMKE: But this is just a portion of  
8 it.

9 MS. BOERNER: It's a portion, yes. Okay.  
10 Okay. Let's see, we did Bychkov. Okay. I'll take you  
11 down to Page 23, project 290, Carls. This is the Exxon  
12 Valdez Trustee Hydrocarbon Database. This was recommended  
13 for funding and this is the repository of all of our oil  
14 information that's collected. Okay. Page 42, project 751,  
15 Irons. Prince William Sound Bird Survey Synthesis and  
16 Restoration. Again, this was recommended for funding by  
17 all. I will take you to -- the next one will be Page 54,  
18 project 574, Lees. Reassessment of Bivalve Recovery. This  
19 was funded -- recommended for funding by myself and the  
20 science panel. It was recommended as part of a fund  
21 contingent by the PAC. This project -- there was another  
22 project that came in from a PI named Shigenaka that had  
23 very similar objectives. The PAC was hoping that these two  
24 researchers would be able to work together in order to get  
25 more information and have it be more cost effective. And

1 then Elise had a potentially could wait on this type of  
2 work. I will say after speaking with Lees and Shigenaka,  
3 the amount of overlap that came back on their projects was  
4 not really sufficient, which is why the science panel  
5 remained with a fund for the Lees project, which they felt  
6 was more comprehensive and would offer us more information  
7 than the Shigenaka proposal. So they felt of the two, this  
8 would be the more likely one to be funded. Okay. Okay, we  
9 discussed the Quinn project. And the last one would be the  
10 Alutiiq Museum, which luckily is outside my purview. And  
11 that's all I have for you. And I'm happy to answer  
12 questions about the ones we've discussed or anything that's  
13 on the do not fund list.

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
15 discussion on the ones that we've covered so far?

16 (No audible responses)

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Are there any other  
18 questions on the Alutiiq Museum? Craig.

19 MR. TILLERY: Well, I guess, yeah, I.....

20 MS. HSIEH: That's not being.....

21 MS. BOERNER: Yeah, that's pending.

22 MS. HSIEH: I have it as pending because I  
23 believe it -- I think we discussed at -- this at the last  
24 Trustee Council meeting. Department of Natural Resources,  
25 we wanted more information about the history of the Trustee

1 Council funds that have gone to the building that houses  
2 the Alutiiq Museum currently. And that brought on some  
3 other questions about sort of a larger perspective on  
4 Trustee Council funds have been spent on archeological  
5 resources which are listed as recovered. Because there has  
6 been some money that was spent, I believe, on the building  
7 that now houses the Alutiiq Museum and now -- anyway, so  
8 there's some history there that needed to be clarified and  
9 hasn't been, so.....

10 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I guess my  
11 question would be why hasn't it been and when will it be?

12 MS. HSIEH: We're dependent on Department  
13 of Natural Resources to look into that and I am hopeful  
14 that in the November meeting it would be -- we'd have that  
15 information.

16 MR. TILLERY: And at that time might it  
17 then be appropriate to take up this.....

18 MS. HSIEH: (Nods affirmatively)

19 MR. TILLERY: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: So we'll take up this  
21 \$500,000 proposal at the November meeting.

22 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other ones  
24 that have come up so far that people want to discuss?  
25 Otherwise what I'll you, are there any of them in the do

1 not fund list that people would like to bring up now for  
2 further discussion or a discussion?

3 MR. O'CONNOR: Other than the ones  
4 that.....

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, other than the ones  
6 that we've already discussed. Are there any that you would  
7 like to call to our attention, Catherine, particularly or  
8 that there was questions or.....

9 MS. BOERNER: No, I don't think so. No.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any.....

11 MR. BROOKOVER: I don't have anything that  
12 I want to bring up in the do not fund category. We've  
13 already discussed the two of the ten herring surveys  
14 projects that are there as well as Seitz.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: I don't want anything to  
16 fall through the cracks if there's any that trustee members  
17 want to discuss. It doesn't look like it. So is there any  
18 other just background information before we put a motion in  
19 and formally discuss the motion? Any more background?

20 MS. BOERNER: (Nods negatively)

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So if I could get  
22 a motion at this point and I guess there's two pieces to  
23 this motion; correct? An A and a B list?

24 MS. HSIEH: The resolution that will be  
25 drafted and sent to you for your signature will have an

1 attachment A which has the budget. And then an attachment  
2 B, which will relate -- which will list the scientific  
3 projects under the work plan.

4 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So I'm looking at  
5 how this.....

6 MS. HSIEH: So you're look -- you're --  
7 right now in this motion you're talking about the  
8 composition of that attachment B.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: B.

10 MS. HSIEH: Which so far you have a  
11 tentative agreement on the 10 herring -- Prince William  
12 Sound herring survey projects, which have been listed on  
13 the record.....

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: No, we never voted on  
15 that.

16 MS. HSIEH: .....by Catherine.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: We.....

18 MS. HSIEH: That's correct.

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....tabled that.

20 MS. HSIEH: You have tentatively in your  
21 pot.

22 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Talked about putting it  
24 in the pot. Okay.

25 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I have a

1 question. Are we voting on this year or are we voting on  
2 all years when there's more than one year?

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Good question.

4 MS. HSIEH: It's my recommend -- my strong  
5 recommendation that if you're going to fund a project that  
6 you fund all of its years. Each year we receive a report  
7 and at any time we're allowed to withdraw funding if  
8 something is seriously going awry with a report or not  
9 getting something that we expected from it. However, in  
10 the past when the Trustee Council has funded things year by  
11 year it doesn't really make sense because what you're  
12 ending up is you're paying for someone's part of their  
13 equipment, part of their data. Really, we would only  
14 withdraw funding if there was an issue or a problem. So it  
15 would be my strong recommendation, as we've learned in the  
16 past, funding year by year is a difficult way to do it.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Kim.

18 MR. ELTON: Well, I would assume that it  
19 makes economic sense also because then the research project  
20 can be predicate -- for example, if they go out for  
21 contracts on vessels, they can do it for an extended period  
22 of time, which could create an economic benefit down the  
23 road. And I'm also assuming that there is nothing that  
24 prohibits us from withdrawing funding at any point in time  
25 if in fact staff or somebody.....

1                   MS. HSIEH: I believe -- I mean, it's up to  
2 the -- it's a grant -- it's a grant, so, you know, if there  
3 was something seriously awry with the project, then we  
4 would recommend the funding be withdrawn.

5                   MS. BOERNER: Right.

6                   MS. HSIEH: But in absence of that, these  
7 should be approved for however many years the project is,  
8 unless you have a particular project -- for example, there  
9 was one we discussed today where the science panel  
10 suggested a one-year funding to see what data would bring  
11 in. If you have a particular interest in a project like  
12 that, then you may want to accommodate that. But in  
13 absence of that, it would be our recommendation to fund the  
14 project as written. Scientific projects tend to often go  
15 over several years, and it would difficult to do one year.

16                  MR. ELTON: And then a follow-up question,  
17 maybe of Craig. I mean, do we incur any kind of a legal  
18 obligation if, you know.....

19                  MR. TILLERY: Well, no, I think -- I was  
20 going to act -- there is -- but there is a procedural  
21 difference that this makes. If you -- if the council votes  
22 to fund all of the projects, we would not incur the legal  
23 obligation, we would write up the contract so that wasn't a  
24 problem. But that would mean that in order to not fund it  
25 in the next year, all six council members would have to

1 agree, so that if there was five members said, oh yeah,  
2 this is a disaster, let's don't do it, but one member said,  
3 no, we should do it, it would continue to be funded because  
4 you would need unanimity to un-fund it, just as you need  
5 unanimity to fund it. So that's kind of the biggest  
6 difference, I think.

7 MR. ELTON: And I'm somewhat reflecting on  
8 the comments that I made earlier about the economic  
9 advantage in contracting for three years, for example. But  
10 if that happened to -- we've incurred a contractual  
11 obligation to pay for that even if we decide unanimously to  
12 pull funding. I mean, the.....

13 MS. HSIEH: You're suggesting the PI would  
14 have a claim of estoppel against of estoppel against the  
15 Trustee Council.....

16 MR. TILLERY: Well.....

17 MS. HSIEH: .....for having relied upon the  
18 granting.....

19 MR. TILLERY: If they had contracted with a  
20 vessel for a three year period, then yes, we may very well  
21 be liable for that but they would have some duty then to  
22 try ameliorate their losses by sub-leasing the vessel or  
23 having the other person -- you know, so there's -- yeah,  
24 you're something of a risk, but I mean, you also run the  
25 risk that you have a three year project and somebody aces

1 you out for the exact vessel that you need in the second  
2 and third years because you weren't willing to commit. I  
3 don't know. It's.....

4 MS. HSIEH: Catherine may have more. I  
5 think the chances of us having to withdraw funding, it  
6 hasn't happened, I don't believe, almost ever or very  
7 often. And so I think that the chance of having to deal  
8 with those complications are a risk we'd be willing to take  
9 rather than having to come back every year and PI's not  
10 knowing if the next year of funding and if we're going to  
11 get out data, I think it's unbalanced.

12 MR. ELTON: And I've heard the Department  
13 of Law is not charging us for their services, so Craig can  
14 handle it if that came up.

15 MR. TILLERY: Actually, it depends on the  
16 agency that has the project.

17 MS. BOERNER: And keep in mind you do have  
18 one project that's continuing from FY-09 that's continuing  
19 into FY-10. So when you approve the work plan, you're  
20 approving continuing funding for that project as well.  
21 There's one sitting on there, it's one Page 1 of your work  
22 plan. It's the Hershberger project.

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Well, I still  
24 don't have a motion, but that was a good question in trying  
25 to frame is whether it's a commitment for all years of

1 these proposed projects or just for this fiscal year 2010.

2 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, I have an idea  
3 on how to proceed. Would it be appropriate to make a  
4 motion for a group of them and then to leave a few of them  
5 then for an individual vote on that are -- and I'm thinking  
6 more the ones in the lower funding priority. Or do you  
7 want just a motion on every one that -- one individual  
8 thinks should be funding? Of course, I think there's a  
9 consensus on a number of them.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It doesn't matter to me,  
11 but I'll ask the Executive Director whether if we could  
12 vote on those that probably don't need any more discussion  
13 and then get those out of the way, then focus on some  
14 individual projects and discuss those in a little more  
15 detail.

16 MS. HSIEH: Vote on ones that you already  
17 know you would like to fund?

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, make a motion --  
19 someone make a motion.

20 MS. HSIEH: Sure. Our resolution will  
21 reflect -- we'll just have one resolution, but you're  
22 welcome to make the individual motions. I believe that  
23 should be all right.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So do you want to  
25 make an initial motion?

1                   MR. TILLERY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I would  
2 move that we approve all of those projects in the high  
3 funding priority in the Executive Director's list and all  
4 those projects in the fund category. And in addition, the  
5 132-D and 132-H in the pending -- or the do not fund  
6 category. In other words, all 10 herring projects and then  
7 all high funding and high priority and moderate priority  
8 projects.

9                   MR. ELTON: I'd second.

10                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So all the high  
11 funding, all the fund.

12                  MR. TILLERY: Right.

13                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And then it would be 132-  
14 D and 132-H, those which would accomplish all the herring  
15 projects.

16                  MR. TILLERY: Right.

17                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: And on the -- okay,  
18 that's fully fund for all the proposed years of the  
19 project.

20                  MR. TILLERY: That is -- that would be --  
21 that's the intent.

22                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay.

23                  MR. O'CONNOR: I'm not quite sure what  
24 we're doing then.

25                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Shall we.....

1 MS. HSIEH: Oh. Here. It's working off of  
2 this.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, I can -- we can go  
4 through the project numbers, if you want, and just confirm  
5 that, Craig.

6 MS. HSIEH: He just -- all of these, all of  
7 these, all of these, plus the two. So all these encompass  
8 the herring projects. Those would all be funding.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: In the -- in your motion,  
10 Craig, are you including the lower funding priority  
11 projects.....

12 MR. TILLERY: No, I was.....

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: .....Campbell, Lees,  
14 Quinn and Seeb. Those are not.....

15 MR. TILLERY: Those I was leaving for  
16 individual discussion.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So would it be all  
18 the high funding projects, which are Bodkin through  
19 Weingartner; the fund which is Bishop through Vollenweider;  
20 then it's adding 132-D, Heitz -- Heintz, and 132-H, Kulitz.

21 MR. TILLERY: Correct.

22 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, Kim.

23 MR. ELTON: And I'm assuming the motion is  
24 at full funding for the herring suite or is it at the 10  
25 percent across?

1 MR. TILLERY: It's -- my motion was for  
2 full funding for the herring suite with no reduction.

3 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
4 discussion on the motion?

5 MR. O'CONNOR: Repeat that. Full funding  
6 for -- the rest of those words.

7 MR. TILLERY: It's full funding on the  
8 herring suite, not the 10 percent across the board  
9 reduction for the 10 herring. It's full funding for all of  
10 the years that are listed.

11 MR. O'CONNOR: All of the years was the  
12 part I guess. Okay.

13 MR. TILLERY: That are listed.

14 MR. O'CONNOR: All right. Got it.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
16 discussion on the motion?

17 MS. HSIEH: Just to clarify, these are  
18 projects as listed in the chart that we're looking at.  
19 There have been two different numbers which have been --  
20 which were typos and those have been changed, so we're take  
21 -- we'll -- we're -- we will construct your attachment to  
22 the resolution from the projects as named, as listed by  
23 Craig.

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, my understanding is  
25 about a hundred thousand left -- less on EVOS

1 administration 10100100 and that Hollmen, 839 has changed,  
2 so the total request is 250,700, and the fiscal year 10 is  
3 218,300.

4 MR. TILLERY: Yeah, the -- actually the  
5 motion doesn't include the 100 because we've already voted  
6 on that. Project 100.

7 MR. ELTON: Yeah.

8 MR. TILLERY: We voted on that.....

9 MS. BOERNER: The budget.

10 MR. TILLERY: .....earlier.

11 MS. HSIEH: Right. That's right.

12 MR. TILLERY: We approved that with certain  
13 modifications.

14 MS. HSIEH: That's right. That's right.

15 MR. TILLERY: So that's been voted on.  
16 It's everything.....

17 MS. HSIEH: Yeah.

18 MR. TILLERY: .....in that high funding  
19 except for that.

20 MS. HSIEH: That's right.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Thank you. Any other  
22 questions? Okay. Well, let's vote then.

23 MR. ZEMKE: Has there been a second?

24 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, there was a second.  
25 Kim seconded it. Okay. All those in favor say aye.

1                   IN UNISON: Aye.

2                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposed?

3                   (No audible responses)

4                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So the motion

5 passes. So those will be put on the B list for the motion

6 and we'll go to that motion here in a minute. Is there any

7 other motions?

8                   MR. O'CONNOR: So this is where we get down

9 to the individual projects.

10                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

11                  MR. O'CONNOR: All right. I would the

12 Quinn project, 1128, Historical Humpback Whale Abundance.

13                  MR. TILLERY: I would second.

14                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any discussion

15 then to add to the approved list project 128, Quinn, and

16 this would be, I take it, full funding for how many years

17 the project -- that is again, but full funding.

18                  MR. BROOKOVER: I think it was two, wasn't

19 it?

20                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, two years.

21                  MS. BOERNER: Two.

22                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any discussion on

23 Quinn?

24                  MR. BROOKOVER: I think it would, you know,

25 generally be a valuable project. I think it could

1 potentially wait, but I think the people are in place to  
2 proceed forward with it and it would add a lot of value to  
3 the information currently at hand. I'm looking at other  
4 projects, I think it's a reasonable cost to do that.

5 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other discussion?

6 (No audible responses)

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. All those in favor  
8 say aye.

9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposed?

11 (No audible responses)

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. The motion passes.

13

14 MR. BROOKOVER: Well, I'd move that we  
15 entertain 165-A, the pilot project for DNA sequencing.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Do I have a second?

17 MR. O'CONNOR: I'll second that.

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. There's a motion  
19 to approve 165-A, Seeb, on the DNA sampling of the one  
20 herring.

21 MR. BROOKOVER: Well, the reason I put it  
22 forward, I guess, is I saw the science panel comments  
23 initially on the full blown proposal of this nature having  
24 a lot of value but the concerns were cost and it was very  
25 costly. It was also, you know, venturing into a new field

1 and there was risk -- there is risk in undertaking a new  
2 methodology. Its initial successes in salmon have been  
3 good. It hasn't been tried on herring. I think the  
4 revised proposal is relatively low cost and it will go a  
5 long way with a little bit of effort towards addressing  
6 that risk. If this is successful, the science panel will  
7 have, I think, pretty critical information if we were to  
8 pursue a full blown proposal in the future.

9 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Kim.

10 MR. ELTON: Well, just a question and maybe  
11 of Catherine. I -- can I assume -- I mean, I -- Catherine,  
12 I think it was you that mentioned that there was a project  
13 that was going forward with Atlantic herring.

14 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

15 MR. ELTON: Can I assume that if it works  
16 for -- if they're spending money to determine if it's  
17 working for Atlantic herring, can we assume that it would  
18 also work for Pacific herring?

19 MS. BOERNER: I'm going to say no because  
20 it is a different type of fish, the size is different, the  
21 area is different, the water temperatures are different. I  
22 think it would be more interesting to have them from two  
23 ends and then we'll see if they do end up being similar.

24 MR. ELTON: That's all. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, and Craig.

1 MR. TILLERY: Mr. Chairman, this one is one  
2 that I'm torn about. So if we get this sequencing for just  
3 one fish, all that does is tell us it's feasible.

4 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

5 MR. TILLERY: Then we -- if it's feasible,  
6 we go out and they sequence different fish from different  
7 areas. Now does this then -- is the sort of the first step  
8 in getting to genetic stock identification? I mean, this  
9 -- in other words, this could almost replace to some extent  
10 the hydroacoustic stuff. I mean, it would -- in a sense  
11 that it would tell you whether they're -- the same fish  
12 were spawning in the same area down the line. When  
13 somebody catches a herring somewhere, we would know where  
14 that herring was headed for.....

15 MS. HSIEH: Well.....

16 MR. TILLERY: .....or what group it is  
17 or.....

18 MS. HSIEH: .....if herring -- I don't  
19 think we even....

20 MR. TILLERY: Know.

21 MS. HSIEH: .....Catherine can correct me  
22 if I'm wrong, but I don't even think we know that herring  
23 are going to have separate stock and certain stock have  
24 certain patterns. So really the risk is not only in can  
25 you sequence these genes, but then the other risk, and

1 maybe the larger question is, does it matter?

2                   MR. TILLERY: Well, right, and -- but this  
3 is the first step in determining does it matter and can  
4 this be a tool in the same way that salmon genetic  
5 identification has become incredibly valuable as I  
6 understand it.

7                   MR. BROOKOVER: That's how I see it. This  
8 is probably the first step. Now there are different  
9 methodologies and there are different potential  
10 observations that may be gained by genetics, like our  
11 Executive Director said, step two may not lead to a  
12 conclusion, but this would, in my eyes anyway,  
13 understanding the stock structure of herring is a pretty  
14 fundamental question with respect to both restoration and  
15 from Fish and Game's standpoint, management. And it's an  
16 area that hasn't been undertaken really or -- you know,  
17 with much headway or success yet. This would be a first.

18                   MS. HSIEH: So, yes, you'll see a million  
19 project come on its heels. That was your.....

20                   MR. BROOKOVER: And that's not to say that  
21 there aren't other methods that can be used to a core  
22 genetic stock structure as well. This is -- this would be  
23 one method.

24                   MR. TILLERY: But this would be a building  
25 block for almost any genetic -- just knowing that you can

1 sequence the genes; right?

2 MS. BOERNER: For this type. I mean, right  
3 now we're using a certain way of doing gene identification.  
4 This is kind of the next -- I won't say next tier, it's the  
5 next generation of it. It will give us finer --  
6 theoretically anyway, it will give us finer scale. I mean,  
7 it's important to know where the fish are coming from if  
8 all the herring in the -- along the whole Alaska coast are  
9 one big genetic population then the problem for our herring  
10 could be anywhere in that -- in that realm. Whereas if  
11 ours -- our little Prince William Sound stock is just one  
12 stock, it's important to know that because then we know we  
13 can isolate the issues to just Prince William Sound. So  
14 it's going to be critical to understand that just kind of  
15 baseline information and where to look for these limiting  
16 factors.

17 MR. ZEMKE: I guess I was a little hesitant  
18 too just because of the -- particularly the cost of going  
19 down the line, million dollars to start with and probably  
20 more beyond that. Though looking at it, it may be kind of  
21 essential to have that information coming down the line if  
22 we do indeed get into a supplementation or other types of  
23 restoration activities where we're trying to bump start  
24 various herring -- not -- I'm not sure if I want to tall  
25 them stocks but herring.....

1 MS. BOERNER: Populations.

2 MR. ZEMKE: .....herring numbers in  
3 specific areas of the Sound, if we don't know whether  
4 they're genetically unique, then I think we'd have a hard  
5 time trying to be able to do any kind of large scale  
6 supplementation or restoration in this particular area in  
7 the Sound. So there's probably -- in my mind probably is  
8 needed information that we need to have before we get into  
9 any kind of program, if indeed we ever get there.

10 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other discussion?

11 (No audible responses)

12 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. The motion is to  
13 approve project 165-A, Seeb, Pilot Project - High Density  
14 DNA Sequencing. All those in favor say aye.

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposed?

17 (No audible responses)

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. It passes. Any  
19 other motions?

20 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, I guess I'm going to  
21 bring up the Lees. We had a couple projects put in on the  
22 clams. Seemed to be general support for the idea of taking  
23 a look at bivalve recovery, particularly little neck clam  
24 given their sudden drop, what's going on there. They are a  
25 critical component of the food stock for sea otters, which

1 are adversely affected by lingering oil. I guess I would  
2 encourage our consideration of that and move its approval.  
3 I realize that we could wait. I guess my question is why  
4 wait? We go out and learn as much as we possibly can as  
5 soon as we can. If there's no complications associated  
6 with moving forward with that project, I would move that we  
7 do so.

8 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Do I have a second  
9 for the Lees project?

10 MR. BROOKOVER: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Any other  
12 discussion?

13 (No audible responses)

14 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Doesn't look like it.  
15 All those in favor, please say aye.

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposition?

18 (No audible responses)

19 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. That passes too.

20 Let's see. Okay. The lower funding, that just leaves  
21 Campbell, which is the tabletop exercise on the nutrients,  
22 if I remember right. Are there any other motions? Okay.  
23 Going once, going twice.

24 (No audible responses)

25 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. That was good. So

1 those I guess still on the B list of the restoration. We  
2 already covered the A list; is that right? So you have  
3 everything you need for the resolution?

4 MS. HSIEH: You'll just want to make sure  
5 you also authorize the appropriate G&A and project  
6 management fees for each of the projects which.....

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Right.

8 MS. HSIEH: .....you have approved in the  
9 aforementioned motions.

10 MR. O'CONNOR: Ever so popular.

11 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. So does somebody  
12 want to make a motion to that effect?

13 MR. O'CONNOR: I so move.

14 MR. TILLERY: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Second. Okay. Any  
16 discussion on the G&A component for the other projects that  
17 we just approved?

18 MR. ELTON: Can I ask a question? Just --  
19 I know it, I'm hungry. I mean, is -- are the university  
20 projects, are they getting nine percent or are the building  
21 in G&A in their bids?

22 MS. HSIEH: Go ahead, Catherine.

23 MS. BOERNER: The -- they build in their  
24 own indirect rate, which we've already negotiated, which is  
25 the 24 percent, and then we add nine percent on that.

1                   MR. ELTON: Okay. I'm just going on record  
2 here of saying and somebody else can make a motion if they  
3 want. I think the -- is there anybody from the university  
4 here? If so, you can go back to the chancellors. I think  
5 the university's overhead is extremely high, you know, I'm  
6 going to go further. I'm going to move to amend the motion  
7 that we do G&A for everybody but the university, which has  
8 already built in their cost, and I think we should check on  
9 the University of Washington also. Because we end up  
10 paying G&A that is built into their project cost already  
11 and then we're adding another nine percent.

12                   MS. BOERNER: Well, the.....

13                   MR. ELTON: To me, that just bothers me.

14                   MS. BOERNER: That nine percent comes to  
15 the project manager and to whoever.....

16                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Not the university.

17                   MS. BOERNER: .....is managing and not to  
18 the university.

19                   MR. ELTON: Not to the university?

20                   MS. HSIEH: To the agencies.

21                   MS. BOERNER: It goes to the agency, not to  
22 the university. They get their 24 percent.....

23                   MS. HSIEH: Already built in.....

24                   MS. BOERNER: .....and we get the nine  
25 percent.

1 MS. HSIEH: .....to their proposal. So the  
2 nine percent would be cutting from the agency.

3 MR. ELTON: I withdraw my motion.....

4 MS. HSIEH: There you go.

5 MR. ELTON: .....because it doesn't make  
6 sense at all. Go ahead.

7 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: But we're looking at the  
8 nine percent and they're going to report back on that,  
9 probably at the November meeting. And it sounds like on  
10 the university, that's an agreement that comes up  
11 periodically for renegotiation and we can look at it.

12 MR. ELTON: I've withdrawn the motion.

13 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Thank you. So we  
14 have a pending motion for -- to approve the G&A component  
15 that goes with the projects that we've just approved. So  
16 is there any other discussion?

17 (No audible responses)

18 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. All those in  
19 favor, say aye.

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposed?

22 (No audible responses)

23 CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Motion passes. So then  
24 we get back to my agenda here, see if we have anything  
25 left.

1                   MR. BROOKOVER: Mr. Chair. Before we leave  
2 the work plan, I just have one.....

3                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. Tom.

4                   MR. BROOKOVER: Are we there? Still in the  
5 work plan?

6                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, certainly.

7                   MR. BROOKOVER: I -- my sense is -- we had  
8 the discussion earlier about, you know, the five percent  
9 figure and whether to consider going over that and so forth  
10 and I think we did the right thing there. I think we heard  
11 some concerns with the herring survey projects and I think  
12 we have an opportunity here too that I'm seeing based on  
13 the discussion today and the -- and what I remember from  
14 the FY-10 call for proposals, which is an integrated  
15 herring program. And within that integrated herring  
16 program were herring surveys. There were other components  
17 of that integrated herring program. And I guess the  
18 concerns that I heard regarding the herring surveys piece  
19 of the program predominately were centered on -- you know,  
20 it would be nice to have some additional integration, and  
21 there was some uncertainties into how much the projects  
22 were integrated from a logistical standpoint but also an  
23 analytical standpoint. And we did spend a lot of money or  
24 approve a lot of money to be spent on herring projects in  
25 general. So I guess what I'm thinking, especially in light

1 of the earlier discussion we had with the Integrated  
2 Herring Restoration Plan review team, is to employ a small  
3 group of folks with scientific backgrounds, modeling  
4 expertise, to I guess ensure some -- ensure the  
5 continuation -- or ensure that the projects are integrated  
6 for the herring surveys. But also for the program as a  
7 whole. We approved herring projects outside of the herring  
8 surveys that are part of the integrated herring program  
9 that we included in the invitation, but they're outside of  
10 the herring surveys themselves and they can bear on the  
11 over-arching question of limiting factors. And I think  
12 they will contribute to knowledge on limiting factors and I  
13 think the herring survey program, in terms of their  
14 response we got to the call was a good one. I think the  
15 objectives were right in line with the call, including  
16 understand where nursery bays are and gaining information  
17 on those limiting factors. I think that we got a good  
18 response in the proposals that we just approved. But it  
19 falls short in a sense, or maybe it's just the next step  
20 that I see needing to be taken in terms of what do we do  
21 with those limiting factors and what do they mean. The  
22 Integrated Herring Restoration Plan listed potential  
23 limiting factors. We have an idea what they are. We'll  
24 have more information I think three years down the road  
25 when these projects conclude. But how resilient is that

1 information? Will we have really more knowledge of how  
2 those limiting factors limit herring? And I think that's  
3 the opportunity we have here, rather than wait three years  
4 or four years down the road, get this information, and then  
5 say, okay, well, what do we do now. I guess I'd suggest  
6 that this small group be used not only to ensure  
7 integration of the analysis of the projects, but also start  
8 thinking about and identifying a model to use to test  
9 hypothesis to figure out which factors are limiting and how  
10 they're limiting and how they relate to each other. So, I  
11 don't know that this is a motion that I'm making, but maybe  
12 a request to staff to kind of think about and develop this  
13 small group, whether it's a subset of the science panel or  
14 a similar group to the group that's employed, which I guess  
15 is sort of a subset of the science panel, but something  
16 along those lines with modeling expertise, herring biology  
17 expertise, that can not only help and work with the PI's  
18 and provide maybe the leadership that I've heard is needed,  
19 but also to help them integrate their analysis, ensure  
20 that's integrated, and explore a model to be developed to  
21 test hypotheses related to limiting factors. So if that's  
22 something the staff can do, I.....

23 MS. BOERNER: Uh-huh.

24 MR. BROOKOVER: .....I don't know if it  
25 will take an increase in budget, but if it does between now

1 and November, maybe we can determine that and then at the  
2 November meeting take it up if that's appropriate and if  
3 the other council members see that as a good thing.

4                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: It sounds like a very  
5 good idea to me.

6                   MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. I think so. We need  
7 to keep this ball moving.

8                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah, one of the concerns  
9 I have I guess from the Trustee Council standpoint is we  
10 got a lot of other issues; we can't just focus on herring.  
11 You know, so it would be good to kind of put this on a good  
12 path and then make sure we have somebody that's looking at  
13 it, you know, more holistically and reporting back to us in  
14 terms of the ongoing results and potential gaps, how  
15 they're working with other entities out there that are  
16 doing similar work and not, you know, duplicating things,  
17 you know, looking beyond just our own efforts. And then  
18 also, you know, what money we're spending kind of over the  
19 long term, what are we committing to. Because it's hard to  
20 keep that big picture and the details in your mind at the  
21 same time you're trying to pick up other issues. So good.  
22 Anything else on the work plan? It doesn't look like it.  
23 Do we need an executive session? I don't -- does anybody  
24 want to make the motion to go into executive session? It  
25 doesn't look like it. Can I get a motion.....

1                   MR. O'CONNOR: Not -- my fun meter is paid  
2 to be honest with you.

3                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Are there any.....

4                   MR. O'CONNOR: I would like to thank the  
5 staff however because this was no mean task that they  
6 engaged in here. This was quite an undertaking. I  
7 appreciate the efforts that went in on doing -- putting  
8 this together.

9                   CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Yeah. And not just for  
10 this meeting but through the last year or two.

11                  MS. BOERNER: 43 proposals.

12                  MR. O'CONNOR: I mean, I read all these of  
13 course myself.....

14                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Well, I know you did.

15                  MR. O'CONNOR: .....but I didn't bill for  
16 it.

17                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any other counsel members  
18 have anything else they'd like to bring up?

19                  (No audible responses)

20                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Can I get a motion to  
21 adjourn then?

22                  MR. O'CONNOR: So moved.

23                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Any opposition?

24                  (No audible responses)

25                  CHAIRMAN HARTIG: Okay. We're adjourned.

1 (Meeting adjourned - 1:42 p.m.)

2 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 4 through 212 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council's Meeting recorded electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 31st day of August 2009, commencing at the hour of 9:06 a.m. and thereafter transcribed under my direction and reduced to print:

THAT the Transcript has been prepared at the request of:

EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL, 441 W. 5th Avenue, Suite 500, Anchorage, Alaska 99501;

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 8th day of September 2009.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph P. Kolasinski  
Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 03/12/12