EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT TRUSTEE COUNCIL

PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP

RESTORATION OFFICE 645 G Street Anchorage, Alaska

October 29, 1992 9:30 a.m.

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS:

State of Alaska MR. CHARLES COLE Attorney General

10 State of Alaska Department MR. JOHN SANDOR of Environmental Commissioner

11 Conservation

12 United States Department MR. CURTIS MCVEE of the Interior Special Assistant to the Secretary

14 * * * * * * *

15PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS:

16RUPERT ANDREWS PAMELA BRODIE JAMES CLOUD JAMES DIEHL DONNA FISHER 17RICHARD ELIASON JOHN FRENCH PAUL V. GAVORA 18JAMES KING RICHARD KNECHT GERALD McCUNE BRAD PHILLIPS CHARLES TOTEM VERN C. McCORKLE 19JOHN McMULLEN JOHN STURGEON CHARLES TOTEMOFF 20LLEWELLYN W. WILLIAMS, JR.

21EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS:

22CLIFF DAVIDSON, ALASKA STATE HOUSE JALMAR M. KERTULLA, ALASKA STATE SENATE 23

24

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

PROCEEDINGS

MR. COLE: Let us call this informal meeting together, the first meeting of the Public Advisory Group.

5

First, I'd like to introduce myself, I'm Charles Cole, one of the Trustee Council appointed by Governor Hickel. To my right is Commissioner John Sandor, Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation, another member of the Trustee Council appointed by Governor Hickel. And on his right lis Curt Mcvee, a member of the Trustee Council, the nominee of 2Secretary of the Interior Lujan. Not present today as members of the Trustee Council are Commissioner Carl Rosier, 4Commissioner of Fish and Game of the State of Alaska, appointed Spy Governor Hickel; Mike Barton, a federal appointee, nominee to the Secretary of the Interior.

Ms. Brodie, if you would be kind enough to join us?

18Pamela Brodie, ladies and gentlemen, nominee of the Sierra

19Club.

And lastly, Steve Pennoyer, who is another member of the Trustee Council, appointee of Dr. Knaust from NOAA.

I think it might be well now to go around the table and 23have each member of the Public Advisory Group introduce 4themselves so that we can have a sense of who people are and 25who they represent and -- on the Public Advisory Group.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Ms. Brodie, would you be good enough to start the personal introductions?

MS. BRODIE: Yes. Excuse me for being late.

I'm Pamela Brodie with the Sierra Club, here as an
environmental representative.

MR. CLOUD: I'm Jim Cloud, a resident of Anchorage, and a banker, and I represent the public at large.

MR. DIEHL: I'm Jim Diehl. I'm a board member of the Knik Canoes and Kayakers, representing recreational users.

MS. FISCHER: My name is Donna Fischer. I'm a 11member of the Valdez City Council, beautiful Valdez, and I'm 2representing local government.

DR. FRENCH: I'm John French. I'm the director 140f the Fishery Industrial Technology Center in Kodiak. I'm a 15faculty member with the University of Alaska Fairbanks, and out 16in that capacity. I reside in both Kodiak and Homer, depending 17on the conditions. I represent scientific/academic interests.

MR. GAVORA: I'm Paul Gavora. I'm representing public at large. I'm from Fairbanks, Alaska.

MR. KING: I'm Jim King. I'm a wildlife lbiologist and I was just chatting with Charlie Cole this legal career. I was a game warden in the 1950s in Fairbanks, when the last was starting his legal career. And it reminded me that legal game warden, people would you want to do something like like last, because nobody likes game warden, and I used to tell

R & R COURT REPORTERS

them, well, you know, everybody's trying to snare or trap or shoot those animals out there, and somebody had to speak for the animals, or there wouldn't be any, so I'm here as a conservationist I guess and I've been doing that for a good many years.

MR. COLE: Welcome.

13

25

MR. McCORKLE: Good morning. I'm Vern

McCorkle, coyotes or wolves. I have been in public policy and

municipal administration for a career's worth in Alaska. I

presently work in publishing. I represent the public at large.

MR. McCUNE: Jerry McCune, and I'm representing

the commercial fishing interests, and I'm the president of CDFU

and UFA.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Brad Phillips?

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm Brad Phillips, and I've been 15taking visitors into Prince William Sound since 1958, and we 16were the first people to take -- have a regular service out 17there. I was in Fairbanks when Charlie -- before Charlie Cole 18started his legal career. But we're very interested in -- in 19all of Prince William Sound. It's -- and I represent 20commercial tourism.

MS. BENTON: My name is Kim Benton, and I work 22as a consultant to Alaska's timber industry. I'm sitting in 23for John Sturgeon today who unfortunately had to be on Afognak 24Island.

MR. TOTEMOFF: My name is Chuck Totemoff, the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

president of the Chenega Corporation, representing the native landowners.

MR. COLE: Well, let me introduce the Honorable Cliff Davidson from Kodiak. It's always a pleasure to have you join us, Mr. Davidson.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVIDSON: Thank you,

Mr. Attorney General. I just wanted to add that I was

appointed by the Speaker Grusendorf to represent the Alaska

House of Representatives, and I didn't know Charlie Cole before

10his friend.

MR. COLE: And indeed he is. But let me tell 12you it's tough to be summoned down before the Chairman of the 13House Resource Committee and grilled and racked over the coals, 14but somehow the last two sessions I have managed to survive it.

he came down as Attorney General, and I'm still trying to be

Before we go further with this meeting of the Public 17Advisory Group, I see that we're honored to have Alaska's 18Congressman with us today, Don Young, and I offer you the 19floor, Mr. Young, if you'd like to make some comments about the 20Exxon Valdez settlement, the future of the Advisory Group and 21the Trustee Council, and any other political views you might 22like to present today.

CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24First, I want to congratulate all of you for the public service

25you're putting forth here. This is a very fine group of

Alaskans, and I know there will be a lot of opinions and a lot of diversified ideas, but together I think we're trying to solve a challenge facing Alaskans.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that you're well aware that I have written a letter concerning the -- some of my ideas and suggestions. And I hope the -- that all the members will have it.

But I think we have to remember one thing in your decisions, and you will not find me bothering you a great deal, because I think this group can make up its -- its minds in its 100wn way, but I think we ought to remember the people that were 11involved in this Spill, not just very frankly a lot of studies.

12 There are some serious environmental problems in Prince 13William Sound and the areas that were affected that existed, 14were -- did not occur because of the Oil Spill. We have areas 15that have tanks, we have polluted areas that this is an 16opportunity for once to clean up those areas, and to make sure 17that the Spill (sic) is safely, environmentally protected even 18beyond the Oil Spill. We have areas -- Cordova, of course, and 19Chenega Bay and Tatitlek and Kodiak and other areas that can be 20fixed, and I'm hoping that you will consider that as you go 21through these deliberations.

You will be in fact hit from all sides and different 23groups of people, and we know that, and I want to commend you 24again for you efforts and your dedication to the State of 25Alaska and the Prince William Sound area. This is a yeoman's

task and you have tremendous responsibility, and I'm confident that we will bel able to solve the problem.

And in closing, again, let's not forget the people directly involved. I know that there will be a tendency and demands in Congress, and I -- the reason I'm here, we've already had numerous suggestions from Congressional leaders on how you should perform you task, outside the State of Alaska, and I'm just suggesting that before you act, and I'd hope you will act on the positive side to recognize the Alaska needs or the needs of the people of Alaska and -- and you'll go down in ohistory as one of the finest groups of people that ever served the State.

And I thank you for allowing me to be here, and there's 13no press, the press just came in. This was not for press 14purposes, that's why I got here early. Thank you. I'm very 15proud of you.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

16

MR. COLE: Thank you, Congressman Young.

I think probably it's best now to sketch briefly the 19history of the Exxon Valdez settlement. I know you are all 20likely familiar with it, but let me just sketch it.

I had in mind to prepare this morning my remarks, but 22unfortunately the Southeastern weather caused a change in 23plans, and so I have not thought out carefully my remarks 24today, but let's see if I can summarize for you the essence of 25where we are.

You will recall that on October 7th of 1991 the State of Alaska and the United States entered into a settlement agreement, which on that day was approved by Judge Holland, settling the claims of the United States of America and the State of Alaska against Exxon for natural resource damages.

I won't try to summarize for you that agreement in detail, but I simply want to say that under the terms of the agreement, Exxon was to pay \$900 million. Some of those monies were used to reimburse the State of Alaska and the United States for -- for its work in assessing the natural resource lodamages and cleanup. Those reimbursements total -- somebody lil'm sure will correct me -- approximately \$150 million.

Now, why was that provision included, you may ask, and 13what is its status? Well, those provisions were included at 14the instance of the State and the United States and it's 15provided for in the regulations.

There has been in the past urgings by some members of 17the public that the Federal Government and the State relinquish 18those claims for reimbursement. We on the State scene have 19presented those claims or demands or requests to the 20legislative leaders and were promptly rebuffed. The feeling 11was that the State has expended those monies from the State 12 Treasury, and the State should be reimbursed.

In order, however, for there to be adequate funds to 24get the work of the Trustee Council under way, and restor- -- 25begin restoration in the Sound, the State and Federal

Governments agreed to take those reimbursements over a fiveyear period. The -- the State has been reimbursed approximately \$29 million, and the Federal Government has been reimbursed approximately \$24.5 million. That's up to this current date. Roughly I think a like amount will be reimbursed out of the next payment, and perhaps as I recall, a similar amount in year three and -- and in years four and five the payments will be substantially reduced. And like I say, the purpose of that is to enable the Trustee Council to have funds so that the restoration activities can get under way. Now, at this juncture I see that Senator Murkowski has 10 $1 \mid 1$ joined us, and it's my pleasure to introduce Senator Murkowski 12to members of the public at large and ask if he would like to nake some remarks to the group today. Senator, you may come up 14here if you wish, and SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Thank you. 15 MR. COLE: make whatever remarks you wish 16 17to make today. SENATOR MURKOWSKI: You have quite a group 18 ¶ghere. Good morning, gentlemen and ladies. Let me thank you, 20Mr. Cole for an opportunity to just make brief comments. First of all, I'd like to congratulate those that have 2 volunteered for what is obviously a very difficult and I assume

R & R COURT REPORTERS

3ultimately a controversial effort to make some recommendations

140n this settlement, and I guess it would be appropriate to

√simply thank you for agreeing to serve on -- on this Public

Advisory Group.

I think bringing the responsibility down to the level of the people for their input is probably the best type of -- of government process that could be envisioned. You know, we had this accident and tragedy as a consequence probably of complacency if you were going to generate one single word, depending on oversight from a government located in Washington, D.C., and one in Juneau, Alaska, with various agencies, but there was no involvement from the people.

As a consequence of that, why, we learned a couple of 10things. The best oversight are the people in the area, and as 11a consequence, you're all familiar with the citizens as council 2that were established as a consequence of the Spill, both in 13Cook Inlet and Prince William Sound. I think those of you who 14have had some familiarity with those groups know that they're 15active, they have funding, they're capable of reviewing new 16technology, and as a consequence are made up of a balance of 17people in the area, whether it be the fishermen, the 18environmentalists, the -- the tour operator, the people in the 19logging industry or what have you, they now review the 20contingency plans associated with the oil activity and the 21movement in both Prince William Sound and Cook Inlet, and I 22think the establishment of that was most significant.

Now, this advisory group, of course, is a consequence 24 of the 1990 Oil Pollution Act, and I believe it simply cannot 25 work without public oversight, so again I commend you for your

R & R COURT REPORTERS

willingness to make this effort on behalf of -- of the public.

It would see to me that the general obligation would be to encourage that the money be expended to enhance those areas and those resources that were specifically damaged.

Now, I understand that there's some question about the process as it relates to the Energy Bill, which the President signed, and there was very little in it for Alaska as a consequence of the inability to resolve differences in the conference, and I'm here to briefly give you an explanation of that conference and respond to any questions that you may have.

But the problem, of course, with the buy-back was how 18you were going to identify the source of funds, because the 19legislation as introduced called for a scoring, which means the 20ffice of Management and Budget basically said, "All right. If 21you're going to buy-back this package of leases, you're going 22to have to find a billion and a half dollars." Well, I 23suggested that we had an alternative for that, and that was to 24allow a lease sale for ANWR. Unfortunately the Chairman of the 25House Conference would not accept that, and -- of course, I

wasn't surprised, but we had that alternative. Then we proceeded through a series of exploratory avenues such as saying, "Well, let's take the one-year moratorium and see if we could find the money in one year, and if not, it'll move over to the second or third year." Well, they wouldn't accept that, because they said that scored as well. So as a consequence, Miller pulled down the Bristol Bay lease buy-back, because it would not be accepted by either he or the other chairman, Bennett Johnson, because Bennett wanted the Energy Bill to pass and if he couldn't find the billion and a half dollars, he knew othat it couldn't pass, and there was simply no way to find the libilion and a half dollars unless we did something like open up 12ANWR.

Then we proceeded into other issues that were in the 14Alaska package, and we basically broke down on -- on two 15specific issues. One was a \$50 million federal dictate of an 16expenditure of the -- of the federal portion of the -- of the 17settlement. There was 50 million from -- from civil -- or 18criminal penalties for both -- for both the State and federal.

19 The \$50 million for the federal was proposed to -- to purchase 20certain land acquisitions in legislation by Miller. There were 21no hearings on that, and there was, you know, no question of 22the -- the alternative authority of the Trustees to recommend 23that if they so see fit, so that's an area that you folks might 24care to address with regard to a recommendation.

But nevertheless, the issues broke down as a

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

consequence of the inability to get assurances in the package that those damaged, in other words, the fishermen that were damaged by the Spill could pursue in court their damages. And Bennett Johnson, who's from Louisiana, again the Chairman of the -- of the Senate Energy Committee and the co-conference chairman, refused to accept that. I said, "I'm not going to sell out one interest group for another. I'm not going to sell out Alaskans who were damaged from their right to pursue litigation in their case in the courts."

And the other issue was the Alaska OCS subsistence 10 review study, and I maintained that we simply could not accept 11 a prohibition which would prevent the -- the affected areas to 12 have the assurance that they would have a subsistence review on 13 any OCS activity.

Now, those are the facts. We could have accepted 15 something out of that, but to accept something would have meant 16 that we would have had to give up on what they call the TAPS 17 remedy non-exclusive, which is the basic right of Alaskans to 18 pursue their damages in court. And I make no apologies. That 19 would have been a poor deal to have accepted. To have accepted 20 it, we would have been criticized for basically selling out 21 Alaskans who were damaged in their right to pursue the matter 22 in court. As a consequence, we intend to pursue this 23 legislation when we go back in January, re-introduce it.

And the -- the interesting thing that I'd like people asto recognize is by not accepting it, we are not excluded from

```
pursuing it. Had we accepted this, or some kind of an
 alternative trade-off, which I was prepared to -- to pursue the
 50 million purchase for the land, if I could have gotten both
 of the other provisions, the OCS subsistence review and the
 right of the damaged people to initiate litigation.
                                                       I could
 not get that, so I simply said, you know, there's no point in
 Alaskans taking a deal that's not in the best interest of
 Alaskans, and particularly those people who have the right to
 pursue litigation through the courts as a consequence of their
 damages.
          I think I've gone on long enough, but if anyone has any
10
1 questions, I'd be happy to expand. Yes, ma'am?
                  MS. BRODIE: Yes, Senator, I was at the
13conference committee, .....
                  SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Uh-huh.
14
                  MS. BRODIE: ..... and you have repeatedly
1 5
16blamed Congressman George Miller .....
                  SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Yes.
17
                  MS. BRODIE: ..... since then .....
18
                  SENATOR MURKOWSKI: That's correct.
19
                  MS. BRODIE: ..... for not getting any progress
20
_{1}on the .....
                  SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Uh-huh.
22
                  MS. BRODIE: ..... Bristol Bay buy-backs, .....
23
                  SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Uh-huh.
24
                  MS. BRODIE: ..... but in fact
25
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Congressman Miller was trying very hard to protect Bristol Bay from oil drilling, including proposing compromises, and the problem was with the Bush Administration. The Bush Administration was refusing to go along with a five-year drilling ban and a one-year drilling ban. It was not Congressman Miller.

SENATOR MURKOWSKI: I beg to differ with you,
and this isn't, obviously the place to interpret feelings, but
as you know, in the House bill there was a five-year provision,
in the Senate bill there was a one-year moratorium provision.

Owe still have a one-year moratorium provision. You're going to
see some news relatively soon with regard to that matter, which
Insulative and the sure you'll be very
spleased.

But make no mistake about it, Miller accepted no 15responsibility for finding out where the funding would come 16from, and that's very, very easy to do in the legislative 17process, particularly in a conference late at night by simply 18throwing it out and saying it's, one, the Administration's 19responsibility. Chairman Miller had as much responsibility as 20any member of that conference to say where that money was 21coming from. He simply washed his hands of that obligation, 22and I don't think that's responsible -- an appropriate 23responsibility for him to take. He has as much responsibility 24to come up with where the money's coming from as certainly 25anyone else, and he just divorced himself and just threw it off

and said, "It's a political problem, it belongs to the Bush Administration." He should have said where the money's coming from. Why didn't he accept the ANWR? We had an identification of where the money would come from.

MR. COLE: Does anyone else have a question for Senator Murkowski? Yes, sir, Mr. McCune?

MR. McCUNE: Senator?

SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Uh-huh.

MR. McCUNE: I'd just like to get one little
point straight, is that you're going to go back and try to
loestablish the legislation on the TAPS fund, because where it
listands now, looking at it know, it looks like most likely the
l2TAPS finding by the -- the Committee is going to stand as is,
which Judge Holland has already said that the court date is
l4canceled now, so in essence, and I don't want to get into a
l5bunch of legal stuff, but looks like maybe we might have lost
l6our ability to go to court on the economic side, so -- I think
maybe we still have a chance if -- if we can preserve that way.
I I'm not quite sure, but maybe you have a better handle on

SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Well, to respond to your 1question, what we intend to do is what should have been done 2previously, and that's to hold hearings, which Miller -- you 2know, those hearings were not held on our side. It was simply 4introduced on one side. Hold hearings, and I intend as I said 25to introduce legislation which will allow the damaged parties

proposal, a process that had I accepted Miller's proposal, you would have been excluded from law. You're not excluded from that right now if -- if the law is -- if the legislation is accepted. But to have accepted that package, we'd have sold you people that were damaged right down the river, and there's no question about that.

MR. McCUNE: I understand that. Thank you. I was just wanted to see the point about putting it back in there.

- SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Yep, it's going to be put 11back in.
- MR. McCUNE: Thank you.
- SENATOR MURKOWSKI: We're going to hold 14hearings, and proceed in a -- in a manner that I think will 15address the concerns of all, and everybody will understand.
- MR. COLE: Any other questions for 17Senator Murkowski? Thank you, Senator, for appearing here.
- SENATOR MURKOWSKI: Mr. Cole. I wish you all a 19good day, and again my -- my congratulations on your 20willingness to undertake this -- this effort which is 1extraordinarily worthwhile, but is going to be tough. Good

22luck.

MR. COLE: Thank you. Before proceeding, I

24want to introduce Chuck Meacham -- Meacham, who is here as a

25representative of Commissioner Rosier from the Alaska

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Department of Fish and Game.

Well, let me sort of move along quickly. As a result of the settlement, the -- and the agreement between the State of Alaska and the United States, there was a requirement that a public advisory group be appointed to act essentially in -- in the capacity which the name implies, to advise the Trustee Council in connection with the decisions required to be made by the Trustee Council.

And we got the Trustee Council underway really last

December and held the first meeting here in Anchorage, and at

10that time, early on in connection with the work on the Trustee

11Council, we were faced with coming up with a restoration plan

12for the 1992 summer season. We -- we had to make decisions as

13to a lot of on-going studies in those early meetings. Those

14on-going studies were focused really on the development of

15damage assessments and damage claims for use in connection with

16litigation against Exxon. And so one of the first decisions we

17had to make was what studies should we terminate, what studies

18should we allow to run their course, and what studies we should

19endeavor to delimit and endeavor to draw to a conclusion early

20on.

That was not an easy process for the Trustee Council, 2because one of the principal problems which we faced in that 23regard was we did not want to lose the benefit of a lot of on-24going studies and just chop them off and say, "well, too bad. 25They're ended, you can't finish them up. You can't write you

R & R COURT REPORTERS

conclusions," and therefore what we did is we allowed a number of these studies, projects to continue so they could be wound up in an orderly fashion and thus preserve the -- the information which was being developed from the studies.

In addition, with respect to the 1992 plan, we had to make decisions in connection with that plan as early as March 1, and certainly by April 1, and the reason we had to do that, we had to do it, because of budget problems with the State and Federal agencies, we had to do it for personnel reasons, we had to do it for contract reasons, and we simply had to have some 10 time available for these projects to get underway, so that they 11 could be started as -- as soon as possible. Some in fact had 12 to be started as early as April, others obviously could not be 13 started until the weather got better out there in the Sound. 14 But at any rate, we -- we approved a number of projects for 151992. They're largely completed.

In connection with those projects, and in connection 17with the current projects we have for the 1992 -- or 1993 18season, they're largely formulated by what we call the 19Restoration Team. Let me tell you a little bit about the 20Restoration Team. We decided early on that we had to have a 21framework of people who work almost on a daily basis in 22connection with the development of these projects, to review 23proposed projects, and to make recommendations to the Trustee 24Council.

And so what we did is we agreed that each member of the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

Trustee Council would have one appointment to make in connection with the formulation of the Restoration Team. And that has been done. Primarily the appointments have been made by the member of the Trustee Council to a member of the agency. For example, Carl Rosier has appointed a representative from the Department of Fish and Game; John Sandor has done likewise. I as the Department of Law appointed Marty Rutherford. She is really now a member of the Department of Natural Resources.

In addition to that, in order to have an independent 12voice looking at these restoration projects, we have retained 13the services of Dr. Spies from the San Francisco Bay area, a 14scientist, to furnish us along with members of his peer review 15team his independent comments on these proposed studies and 16projects, as recommended to us by the Restoration Team.

Let me say this, maybe skirting out a little bit, but 18let me explain one of the reasons we've done that. There's 19been views expressed by the public, some of you may hold the 20same views, that -- pardon me? That's all right. -- that -- 21that these agencies and members of the Restoration Team are 22simply making these project recommendations to further their 23own agency, and to provide an economic, you know, base and so 24on and so forth. And obviously, and maybe this is a flaw in 25the system, but it's one of the reasons we have the public

advisory group composed of you people, that -- to guard against that -- that possibility.

We've had Dr. Spies and members of his peer review group look independently at these proposals, which we did in the 1992 season, and to furnish us with his views as to, you know, whether these projects are justifiable, and in many respects we have relied heavily on Dr. Spies' independent views in that regard. Dr. Spies and his staff will be available to you in connection with your review of these projects.

So I should say another thing about the Trustee Council 10that's very important I think is under the terms of the $1 \mid 1$ agreement between the State and Federal Government, the Trustee $_{12}$ Council must act unanimously, and by that I mean each member --13each of the six members has an independent veto over any $_{\parallel}$ 4project, and if John Sandor, for example, has a strong 150bjection to any particular project, simply by his saying "I 16don't vote for that project. I'm unable to accept it, " I mean, 17that kills the project. And we've had criticism from the public, some members of the public about how that should work, $\P_{\mathtt{S}}$ but I tell you, in my view, and I think in the view of the OTrustee Council generally, that unanimity clause has worked In some ways, rather than making the Trustee Council nore divisive or divisive, it's served to bring us together, 23because I think not one of us really wants to be a sole and 4independent voice which -- which rejects any particular project.

Now, what is to be your fundamental purpose here? I'm speaking for myself largely, not necessarily for other members of the Trustee Council. Mr. Sandor and Mr. McVee can do that, but

Of course, the Public Advisory Group is provided for in the agreement, and it's a requirement of the consent decree and order entered by Judge Holland. At first we in the Trustee Council sat down and decided how many members of the Trustee -of the Public Advisory Group we would want, and then -actually it was probably the reverse. We sat down and thought $_{\parallel}$ nabout the various interest groups which we thought would be productive to help the Trustee Council discharge their 12responsibilities under the agreement. And, you know, you can 13 see the various groups which we put together: sport hunting 14 and fishing, environmental, science, government, conservation, 15aquaculture, forest, tourism, native interests, subsistence. $_{\parallel 6}$ And then from that, after we got those various groups together, $\sqrt{1}$ 7we said, "Well, how many members should there be, and should we 18 have some people from the public on the committee?" We first $\eta_{\mathfrak{S}}$ arrived at 15, to be comprised of three members of the public oat large. Later on in the process we decided to enlarge the public group to five. We thought we would get, you know, a pbetter public representation. So we changed our view and made 3the public at large five, increased the total membership to 17. In addition to that, because my good friends in the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

5Legislature, like Mr. Davidson, they didn't want the Hickel

appointees, if I may say so, to have too much say in this, and the Executive

MR. DAVIDSON: I hope you're not speaking for me.

MR. COLE: in the Executive Branch -- no, I'm speaking generally, thanks -- and the Executive Branch to have oversight, you know. And -- and it was -frankly, it was my thought that the Legislature, which has been very interested in this whole project to have representatives there to be able to -- to have, you might say, a hands-on \parallel_{O} understanding of what is going on in this Council. Be- -- and $1 \mid 1$ there is a sound reason for that, and one of them is -- is in 12 order to achieve a balance in the separation of powers between 13the Legislative right to appropriate monies, and the Executive 14Branch, that the Legislature really does have an interest in ₁5seeing how these monies are being expended, and we have a 16provision in recently passed legislation that makes all these 17expenditures go through the Legislative Budget and Audit RCommittee. And that way the Legislature has a sense of how ∥omuch money is going to the State and -- the State agencies, to be able to have a sense in the Legislature of the budgets of 1 these various agencies, and principally it's the Department of 2Fish and Game and the Department of Environmental Conservation 3with respect to the State. So we have one member of the 4Legislature appointed by the Speaker of the House, and another √smember of the Legislature appointed by the Senate President to

sit in as ex-officio members of the Public Advisory Group.

Now, what is your -- like I say, let me just see if I can bring this to a conclusion with respect to your function. Obviously, you know, you've read the papers, there's a wide diversity of views as to how these monies should be expended. That -- that is a task which the Trustee Council has found, believe me, not easy. Obviously there's a very strong public view that these monies should be primarily expended for the acquisition of habitat and to protect the Prince William Sound generally from logging and -- and the destruction of habitat 10there. There is another widely held view that we should $1 \mid 1$ continue with studies to enable us to make the restoration projects driven by science. There's other views that these 13 scientific studies are simply waste and will lead to nothing 14more than gathering dust in the -- in the bowels of some 15library some place, and it will just be of use to, you know, 16 further the -- the interest of scientists in the various 17bureaucratic agencies.

So obviously you people well understand yourselves as 19to the various tensions about how this money should be 20expended, and I think it's certainly accurate to say that we 21look to you people to furnish us with views as to how these 22monies should be spent, what projects we should -- we should 23adopt, what the long-range policies should be for the 24expenditures of these funds.

Finally, let me say this, and I feel strongly

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

personally about this, under the terms of the settlement and the decree, these monies are to be used for restoration, replacement, and enhancement of the damaged resources.

Category one. Or the acquisition of equivalent resources and services. Now, in my view that's a mandate from the federal court, and we're simply required to comply with it, and we have as far as I'm concerned complied with that so far.

Now, let me add to that we have a very broad question as to what is comprised, and I'm sure you will want to know, is an equivalent resource, and most of all difficult problem is 10 what is an equivalent service. We'd look to the regulations in 11 this area and promulgated by the Department of the Interior, 12 and I must say they're not very helpful. Not very helpful as 13 to what's within the scope. But anyway, that's something we'll 14 have to struggle with.

We have, in the process of preparing for you a 16memorandum on that subject. It's not quite done, because we 17want to make certain that the Department of Justice agrees with 18every word that's in there. We do not want the State -- and 19the State, particularly the Department of Law, to be accused of 20sort of loading the deck with our personal views. We want the 21blessings of the Department of Justice on that subject.

Obviously, you know, you've seen the proposed

24restoration projects for 1993. They have been distilled from

25over 400 recommendations from the public generally at large and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

 $\frac{1}{2}$ Probably within a week or two, we will get them.

from the various State and federal agencies for the 1993 projects. The Trustee Council has reviewed those. They've been reviewed in addition by Dr. Spies and his group, and we will be looking to you to review those projects, and to furnish us with your recommendations on them.

In addition, a very sensitive subject, the Trustee

Council has -- has, you might say, contracted with The Nature
Nature Conservancy to take a look at the areas of threatened

habitat in Prince William Sound and to furnish us with its

recommendations as to what -- to what areas of the sensitive

habitat in Prince William Sound are threatened, and to furnish

the with its recommendations concerning the acquisition of that

threatened habitat.

13 I think that generally concludes my remarks.

14Commissioner Sandor? Commissioner -- or Trustee McVee? Would 15you like to make some further comments, please?

MR. McVEE: Well, thank you very much, 17Mr. Cole.

I thought about this meeting for some time and -- and 19all of the things that I guess that I felt like should be said, 20and knowing that the time is going to be short to do that, so I 1tried to -- I tried to boil it down, so -- and -- and hit upon 22some very key items, things that hopefully will help you in the 23immediate future, and so I -- I put it in writing, so I'm going 24to -- to a large extent read that statement so I don't miss 25those thoughts and maybe it will make it -- make it go a little

R & R COURT REPORTERS

faster.

25

But I'm very pleased that each of you agreed to serve on the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Public Advisory Group. Like most government programs, you now have been given an acronym, P.A.G., and I know how Attorney General Cole hates acronyms, but

MR. COLE: Never do I know what they mean, thank you.

MR. McVEE: But -- I appreciate that the longer he be -- he's in government, the more of these he will -- he lowill have to face up to, but you will now that you're here that li-- you now will hear that you're a member of the P.A.G. As libest that I can tell, that there are no pejorative connotations light from this term, and certainly -- certainly none were intended.

You will have, you know, considerable contact with the population of Interior, with Doug Mutter, who some -- I sure that some of you have -- have talked to on the phone. And the way that business is done in the Trustee Council, that programs projects are taken on by a lead agency, and I guess that we were either out of the room or raised our hand at the wrong time, but anyway we have the responsibility for the -- the advisory group. And it's -- it's operated under -- under process and I guess that we attempt of the responsibility for the -- the advisory group. And it's -- it's operated under -- under process and I guess that we attempt of the responsibility for the -- the advisory group. And it's -- it's operated under -- under process and I guess that we are process are process and I guess that we are process are process and I guess that we are process are process are process are process and I guess that we are process are process are process and I guess that we are process are

In -- in turn, there's certain, you know, State rules

R & R COURT REPORTERS

or State laws that also apply to us, the Open Meetings Law is an example, so we have that to contend with.

Like the State of Alaska, nothing related to this Oil Spill has been small. It was the largest oil spill in the United States, affecting fish and wildlife, as well as the people and services who rely upon them in substantial areas within Prince William Sound as well as the Gulf of Alaska.

It was also the largest ever environmental litigation settlement, and it's going to take a major effort to put a complete -- complete restoration program in place.

When the settlement was adopted, the Secretary of -- of 1 Interior and, I am sure, the other Trustees, viewed it as a 2 model for the conduct of -- conduct of joint Federal/State 3 activities in such large ecosystem-wide spills. The court-1 4 approved settlement agreed -- agreement required joint 5 decision-making by the U.S. and the State, rather than 6 utilizing arbitrary allocations to attempt to assign the 1 recovery based on concepts of ownership of the impacted 1 8 resources.

Your presence here today reflects another of the 20settlement's requirements, that of public involvement 21throughout the entire restoration process, both directly and 22through this public advisory group. This requirement for 23public participation was included at the personal initiative of 24the Trustees, and is clear recognition that the resulting work 25product will be far superior with the active participation by

R & R COURT REPORTERS

272-3022

you and the public at large.

The success of this program will be a model for future restoration efforts, and its failures will be equally obvious to everyone.

The Trustees are very aware of the criticism leveled by many members of the public and the national and local media on the lack of progress that has been made on actually expending the settlement money for restoration of injured resources.

Similar concerns have been expressed for -- expressed with respect to the level of money being spent for administrative support of the not yet begun actual restoration implementation program and for additional studies. The Department of Interior feels that there is validity to such concerns and we recognize that is essential that the process remain responsive to public accomment and recommendations.

And this morning you witnessed the interest of our 16Delegation and -- and they made some expression of Congress -- 17Congress' over-all expression of interest in this whole area.

Progress has been made on development of a draft
prestoration plan, for public and P.A.G. review, during the year
that has elapsed since the settlement was approved by the
court. Even so, the Council has been advised that the staff
cannot complete preparation of the draft restoration plan that
sis now -- that is suitable for public review until late winter
and spring. Both the law governing the Superfund and the
beginning the superfund and the
specific parameters of Interior's Natural Resource Damage Assessment

Regulations provide that adoption of a restoration plan is necessary before commencing expenditures for restoration implementation. The one exception to this policy is where emergency situations present such an imminent threat to resources or services that any delay would exacerbate the injuries. Such -- such action will still require compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Your advice will be particularly important with respect to the proposed budget/work plan for the period running from March 1, '93, through September 30, '93, and it's a blue book, loone of the many handouts that you have here. A seven-month libudget was proposed in order to conform future budgets to the lighteral fiscal year budget cycle.

The proposed work plan was mailed to the general public 14 last week and is included in your materials. Comments from the 15 public on the proposed work plan are due by November 20. The 16 Council has scheduled a meeting on December 11th to review the 17 public comments and further consider this budget. I would 18 recommend that you consider scheduling you next meeting prior 19 to December 11th in order to focus your comments and concerns 20 on the draft budget for the Council's benefit.

I want to be very frank and straightforward with you 2now, because I think it's essential that you understand the 3nature and issues of problems that the Trustee Council must 24deal with in the near future. And I would -- I have put these 25into two basic categories: Those which will come before the

P.A.G. concerning the restoration plan land programs; and those concerns on management and administration of the Trustee Council operations and organizations.

Examples of the first category of issues which I would anticipate the P.A.G.'ll -- P.A.G. will review are the scope of spending that should be made under the '93 work plan prior to finalizing the Restoration Plan. Is too much money proposed to be spent in the absence of a completed Restoration Plan? Is too much money being spent for overhead and administrative costs?

- Were the criteria used by the Restoration Team or the 11Trustee Council in approving a particular project the 12appropriate ones for the intended purposes?
- Review of specific projects for feasibility, priority, 14urgency, cost of administrative and overhead. Are -- are all 15the studies proposed necessary? From the public's standpoint, 16how many studies are justified?
- Is the Restoration Plan being completed without undue 18delay? Have the appropriate resources been devoted to 19completion of the Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact 20Statement?
- Since the standard under law is to restore the 22resources to their pre-spill base line levels, the levels they 23would have been but for the Spill, how should it be determined 24when services have been restored?
 - The second category of issues, organization and

25

management problems, which have, perhaps, resulted from the Council not fully appreciating the scope of the task and the amount of time necessary to start an organization of this kind. The Council, as mentioned by Attorney General Cole, operates on the basis of unanimous agreement.

I don't expect these problems will necessarily come before the P.A.G., but I think if you're aware of them, the Council will -- that the Council will have to deal with these land similar administrative concerns, it will help you. We have been basically through a start-up phase I would say, and now I think we need to look at a more efficient operation. And there are a series of issues, just as examples, and I will touch on some of them:

- For nearly 11 months, the Council has operated with an 14interim Administrative Director and has yet to fill the 15permanent position.
- Rather than having its own staff, the Council has used 17personnel from each Trustee department or agency to form the 18Restoration Team, to carry out the day-to-day management 19efforts. Mr. Cole mentioned this. We are concerned that this 20creates some agency bias to procure for each agency its share 21of funds rather than to objectively approve projects which are 22essential for restoration efforts.
- Schedules for many activities have not been developed, and when they are developed, we have problems meeting belowed. We're concerned this tardiness and that revised

updated deadlines are not being established and made available to the public so they know what's going on.

The procurement process has generally failed to utilize the competitive procurement procedures at this point.

Finally, the role that the P.A.G. will undertake is one that you and the Trustee Council ultimately decide is needed. The Trustee Council will from time to time undoubtedly make recommendations or suggestions for you to examine -- examine. How do you consider them and what positions you wish to take, are solely up to you.

10 With you help and the participation from the general 11public, we believe that a program can be put together of which 12everyone can be proud.

I'll be pleased to answer any questions now or in the 14future, and I want to ask you not -- not to hesitate to call me 15at any time if you have questions or need some information.

16Thank you very much.

MR. COLE: Thank you, Mr. McVee.

Commissioner Sandor, would you like to make some premarks at this time?

17

MR. SANDOR: Thank you, Attorney General Cole, 21 and those very excellent summaries by Mr. Cole and Curt McVee 22 will prompt me to make just some very view -- very few comments 23 and observations. And I make these comments and observations 24 from a perspective of a -- of a 40-year career in natural 25 resources and environmental administration, but mostly as a

R & R COURT REPORTERS

federal bureaucrat and mostly from the standpoint of natural resource protection and administration. It was my good fortune to have most of this in -- in the State of Alaska itself.

It's been a special pleasure to work with the Trustee
Council and -- and I'd like to make this observation based on
this -- this rather lengthy career in -- in natural resource
administration, that a lot has actually been done, and much
more than I think perhaps people realize. The Exxon Valdez Oil
Spill of over 10 million gallons is the largest in -- in the
United States. However, it is only one of 18 spills of
1010 million gallons or more over the last 30 years throughout
11the world, and this is not an unlikely event that may yet
12happen again. Certainly hopefully not in -- within Alaskan
13waters, but it will happen again. And I think it's important
14to place what is happening now in that perspective.

The Amoco Cadiz which actually broke up about 14 years 16ago off the coast of France spilled over 60 million gallons of 17-- over six times the amount of -- of oil that spilled in -- in 18the Exxon Valdez. Not as sensitive an area, and not as 19important an area to be sure. One of the real important 20lessons from that, however, was that the litigation and the 21settlement of that Amoco Cadiz catastrophe took 14 years in 22resolution, and was only resolved, finally settled the first of 23this year, 14 years after the spill itself occurred, for a 24total settlement of something in the range of \$250 million.

We're extremely fortunate in this day of -- of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

litigation and constant litigation, on-going litigation, to have had this settlement reached really so -- in such a relatively short period of time so that we can actually get on with the job of restoration, and that's been one of the most satisfying aspects of this -- this thing. We are getting about the job of -- of restoration of -- of the natural resources and services that's been damaged.

The other observation I would make to -- to you as members of the Public Advisory Group, is that this group of three Federal agencies and three State agencies have been 10 working together in -- in remarkable harmony. Not that we $1 \mid 1$ haven't had battles, we've -- we've had battles, but it's --12it's really been an amazing thing to see three State and three 13 Federal agencies working as we've worked together, and it's $_{\parallel}$ 4easy to -- to criticize and perhaps second guess some of the 15decisions that are made out of this -- that have been made out 160f this group. But as both Curt McVee and Charlie Cole have #7pointed out, the scientific studies that -- that actually led $\eta_{\rm g}$ to -- to the settlement, helped lead to the settlement, have to \P_9 be continued, and it's important that they were -- that they -othat the work continue to be able to not only complete the 2_1 studies, but to set the basis and groundwork for additional 2 restoration work of species that have been damaged, resources 3and services that have been damaged so that they can in fact be $\frac{1}{2}$ 4-- be restored.

I believe that as -- as you get into -- to looking at

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

the studies that have -- are underway and the many, many
millions and millions and millions of dollars of proposals for
not only restoration work, but for acquisition, that you'll see
the tremendous challenges that -- that you face. And I see
ourselves sitting in a partnership effort, to -- to look at
these proposals, to help set priorities in -- in evaluating
these and then to working with the various agencies involved,
the organizations involved. The Nature Conservancy has had
three contracts, two pend- -- two under say and -- and an
earlier one that's been of great help in -- in setting the
lostage for this evaluation.

But as you will see in the proposals that come before 12you, that it's going to be very difficult, very, very difficult 13indeed to set priorities that will please everybody.

But I -- but I believe in conclusion that one -15certainly express my personal appreciation for -- for your
16willingness to serve in what is going to be both an exciting
17challenge, but sometimes frustrating. And we look forward to -18- to our partnership together in developing programs and
19activities which best meet the needs of the resources and
20communities and the people who have been impacted by the oil
21spill, and that as we work together in looking at proposals
22which are put before us that we do this in -- in a way that's
33within strict confines of the settlement agreement and the
24consent decree, looking at restoration, replacement,
25enhancement and the acquisition of equivalent resources and

services. We have a tremendous partnership. We have a lot of resources. Dr. Spies, the chief scientist, the 40-some peer reviewers, peer scientific reviewers, tremendous resources that's available to -- to all of us.

I see through this partnership that you're a special pathway to the public, to the people, to the resources, the communities that have been damaged by the Spill, and I believe that working together in this partnership effort that we can in fact not only bring about the restoration and replacement, enhancement of the -- the resources and services damaged in 10this area, but provide a guide to those other regions of the 11world that have been impacted by spills such as this.

- So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to make 13these comments, and thank again the public advisory group for 14their willingness to tackle this difficult job. Thank you.
- MR. COLE: Thank you, Commissioner Sandor.
- 16Mr. Meacham, would you like to speak on behalf of 17Commissioner Rosier?
- MR. MEACHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- I would also like to thank you on behalf of 20Commissioner Rosier for your willingness to participate in this 21group. Commissioner Rosier had to be in Washington, D.C. this 22week and -- and was unable to participate.
- My name is Chuck Meacham. I'm Deputy Commissioner with 24the Department of Fish and Game and Commissioner Rosier's 25designated alternate for the process here.

As with Commissioner Sandor, I offer you both congratulations and condolences. I think you'll -- you'll find that this is both rewarding and -- and frustrating, but I do believe that you will find the rewards are far more -- far more numerous than the -- the frustrations. With my limited experience in the -- the oil spill-related activities, I certainly did so. I spent two years as a fisheries program manager with the Department's oil spill studies immediately after the oil spill.

I'm sure as you all realize, we do have a tremendous 100pportunity here, a really tremendous opportunity to make 11things right. And I mean right for the resource and right for 12the people. And the Department and Commissioner Rosier look 13forward to working with you to do -- to do just that. Thank 14you.

MR. COLE: Thank you, Mr. Meacham.

16Representative Davidson, would you like to make some remarks on 17behalf of the Legislature?

18 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIDSON: Thank you,

19Mr. Attorney General. I would simply say that the House indeed 20takes -- the House of Representatives and the entire 21Legislature takes a very keen interest in how we resolve some 22of the issues that will come before this group. And I won't 23attempt to paraphrase what others will say, but I think that we 24-- we are concerned about how the -- the system will work here, 25and that the primary thing, of course, is to get the resources

R & R COURT REPORTERS

that we're dealing with here out to -- to the replacement and enhancement of the damage that was done, and listen to the people who were most directly affected, and that was the way I think that the Legislature acted last time.

I don't know that -- I don't know you determine which acquisitions are most favorably driven by science, but I'm sure that this body will be able to examine many projects and offer that advice to this august body of councilors, and we look forward to working with you.

It's also -- I will add my thanks to the citizens here 10 and their willingness to serve, because it is not always an 11 easy task to serve merely as an advisor to a group who will 12 have ultimate control of what decisions you'll make, but 13 certainly they will take into consideration I'm sure the full 14 measure of what the consensus of the group as well as even 15 minority opinions might have from our -- our advisory group 16 here.

So with that I just would like to say I'm glad we're 18all here. The process moves forward, and hopefully we can move 19with undue haste to resolve some of the frustrations and 20grievances that people have out there.

MR. COLE: Thank you, Mr. Davidson.

21

Can I have just about --? I want to say that 23Senator Kertulla was the appointee of the President of the 24Senate. Senator Kertulla's sister is very ill, and as a result 25he's not able to be here today.

But I'd also like to introduce Senator Hoffman, who is here today. Welcome, Senator.

SENATOR HOFFMAN: Thank you.

MR. COLE: Yes, sir. I think now is -- let's have questions, if you don't mind?

DR. FRENCH: Okay. I would like clarification of two points you made, Mr. Cole. The first is how was the chief scientist selected, since we're obviously going to be asked to put a lot of weight on his decisions, and who constitutes his peer review group?

10 MR. COLE: Let me say this: The chief 11scientist

DR. FRENCH: By the way, I have known Dr. Spies $_{13}$ for over a decade.

MR. COLE: Yes. Thank you. I hope you have as 15much respect for him as we do.

But he had been retained by the Department of Law early 170n to advise it in connection with the development of its 18litigation against Exxon, and as a result of his experience in 19working with the Department of Law, and the contract which he 20had a the time, the decision was made by the Trustee Council to 21continue that relationship. We in the Department of Law had 22found his work to be excellent. That's the reason for that.

Now, frankly, I do not know all of the members of his 24peer review group. Mr. Tillery, the head of the Department of 25Law, Environmental Section, would you like to add anything to

R & R COURT REPORTERS

my response?

MR. TILLERY: No, but I also don't know all the names of the peer group. Mark, can you help us out?

MR. COLE: Mr. Broderson?

MR. BRODERSON: I do not have all of them
either. That's the contract under the Department of Natural
Resources right now. There's a list of about 50 of them.
They've been picked over the three years since the Spill by
people who have been most responsive to using their good
judgment to help us review things is what it basically comes
down to. People who can come in and -- and give us unbiased
popinions, whether we want to hear them or not, and that's
pretty important to us, and that's what we look for in peer

MR. COLE: Yeah. We can get you that 15information.

DR. FRENCH: Okay. I'd appreciate that.

MR. COLE: Sure.

16

DR. FRENCH: As an aquatic toxicologist of 19sorts for over 15 years, I'd like to state that there are not 20very many people that are unbiased in the field. It's a very 21polarized field, and whereas Dr. Spies is a very good 22scientist, independence isn't one of the traits -- the traits I 23would normally attribute to him.

The other question I needed clarification on was with a prespect to damaged resources. Most of the NRDA work, and as I

R & R COURT REPORTERS

understand it, the legislation which provided for the NRDA work to be done, basically required that there be a high probability that the results of that work would be usable in litigation, that they would provide, to be crass about it, a body count, some measurable, legally acceptable characterization of that resource as being damaged, and so therefore early on in the process, correct me if I'm not correct, but it's my understanding that a number of types of projects were not undertaken at that point simply because they would not be using techniques or would not be likely to produce a high probability noutcome of legally determined damage. In other words, an nemphasis on acute rather than chronic toxicity.

Now, with respect to many of the other oil spills, a including the Amoco Valdez -- Amoco Cadiz, there has been the several indications of chronic toxicity, particularly to spills, and some of the areas of my own personal finterest, and many of projects that are undertaken and many of projects that are undertaken and many of the projects that are in the '93 Work Plan, at least to my speading, are continuations of projects that are designed to sponitor acute toxicity and recovery from acute toxicity.

We still lack the knowledge of what really tends to -
1 to be measurable as chronic toxicity. One of the reasons we

2 didn't undertake it in the first place is we didn't really

3 understand the system. One of the reasons some federal

4 investigators expected the oil to stay in -- in Prince William

5 Sound when the Spill first occurred was a lack of understanding

of the dynamics of the North Pacific, be they physical
coeanography or be they biological or be they of human
resources. A great deal of knowledge is not there, and for us
to assess the damage and for us to prevent situations like this
from occurring in the future, for us to enable the
determination of future damage as directed under paragraph 17
of the settlement, namely re-opener of -- for unknown injury,
to allow those types of information to be accumulated, we're
going to have to take a somewhat broader view of a damaged
resource than a purely NRDA one. At least that's my
operspective.

MR. COLE: Well, let me say this: I'm sure 11 1/2 that you will have a full opportunity to express those views in 13the various meetings of the Public Advisory Group, and receive $\sqrt{4}$ I'm sure in response the views of other members of the group as √sto how these resources should be allocated. As you know, we've 16been under a rather severe criticism as recently as a couple of ₁ weeks ago from the President or the CEO of the Sierra Club, ngthat we've made a lot of, quote, unnecessary expenditures for ∥ostudies, so, you know, that's going to be one of you \mathfrak{A}_0 assignments, to present your views and the views of others to 1 the members of the Public Advisory Group and furnish the 72Trustees with the recommendations as to what studies should be 3undertaken, what -- in other areas where we haven't already 14done so. You'll certainly have an opportunity to in addition √sconfer with the representatives of the Department of Fish and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Game, who have made their recommendations for projects in the 1993 budget.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Yes, sir?

MR. McVEE: Yeah, let me just add further

comment. I think that the Trustee Council has struggled with
with the problem you're addressing on several occasions, and

-- and argued maybe to some extent as to whether there is the

proper balance between the data that we have available to us

for -- for the various damaged resources. And -- and I think

that -- that we are looking for help in that direction from any

source that's available to us, and that the -- the court decree

and the -- and the judgment does allow for us to do further -
afurther studies. And -- but, you know, I think they have to be

accarefully thought out and carefully designed and efficient and

sall that.

DR. FRENCH: Oh, yeah, I agree completely. I 17mean, if you -- if you're going to look at a body bag, there's 18only so many perspectives you can have on a body bag, but the 19broader perspective may be important and may lead to some -- 20some useful information.

MR. McVEE: Yes, I agree.

MR. COLE: Mr. McCune:

MR. McCUNE: Yes, I just wanted to understand 24the process just a little bit more now. The Restoration Team 25gets all the projects from the public groups, agencies,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Yes.

MR. McCUNE: and also you said Mr. Spies has the final say on any project,

MR. COLE: No.

MR. McCUNE: is that -- is that

MR. COLE: No.

MR. McCUNE: what you said, or?

MR. COLE: Absolutely not. He is simply one other source of advice to the Trustee Council, and like I say, one of the reasons, I can speak for myself, that I look to 10Dr. Spies is I want to have a test as to whether, you know, 11Commissioner Rosier, for example, but only for example, has 12said, "Gee, we've -- we want more information out here in the 13Department of Fish and Game with respect to the red salmon down 14in the Cook Inlet, and we need it badly to make restoration 15decisions," and so -- and we say, "Well, Dr. Spies, you know, 16what about that? What's your views on that?" It's just an 17independent source of advice like the Public Advisory Group in 18my view will be to the Trustee Council. He -- his views are 19entitled, and I don't think they're given any more weight than 20anyone else. It's just an independent source.

MR. McCUNE: Okay. To go a little bit further 2then, once those project are forwarded, they're forwarded to 2the Trustee Council, as -- as the Restoration Team votes on 2those projects and weeds them out, is that correct?

MR. COLE: Yes, I think that's substantive

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

correct. It

12

MR. McCUNE: So then

MR. COLE: hasn't come to the Trustee Council yet, I mean. Then we send them out to the public as we've done, and you have the public comment on every one of them, and send them to this group for comment.

MR. McCUNE: Okay. That's where we're going to break in, after the projects have come from the Restoration

Team and been forwarded to the Trustees?

MR. COLE: I would say that's where we are now.

MR. McCUNE: Okay. I just wanted to

MR. COLE: the 1993 plan.

MR. McCUNE: we come

MR. COLE: I don't necessarily say that 15that will be the case in the ensuing years, but that's where we 16are right now. Okay?

MR. McCUNE: Okay. Yes.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Is that true, Commissioner and Mr. McVee?

MR. SANDOR: Yeah, I think that's certainly the lawy I see it for this present material that's -- that's now out law for public review, but I see the Public Advisory Group as also being especially helpful in really looking at the process by which we, one, invite, solicit proposals for consideration, sevaluating them and prioritizing, and even providing advice

R & R COURT REPORTERS

about the over-all operation of the -- of the -- this whole process.

Bear in mind we've been in business, you know, less than a year, and so we've had to begin primarily with the --with the basic information that was developed since the spill occurred, and we see some opportunities for strengthening the Restoration Team itself, and -- and I -- and also for the executive directorship relationship with the Restoration Team and the -- the Council itself.

We have an interim director, we expect to have -- make 10a selection of a permanent director, but we're really even 1looking at the ways of strengthening those -- those activities. 12 That is the work of the Restoration Team, the -- and the flow 13of the work of the executive director with the Restoration 14Team, and the work of the Trustee Council.

I see, Mr. Chairman, the Public Advisory Group as being 16able to offer some perspectives on how this total process of --17of developing our work, to strengthen our work, so -- but for 18the -- what's on the table now is the material that's out for 19public review.

MR. COLE: Let me -- let me say this. You 21know, we -- we may have -- first, we're -- we've struggled for 22this first year trying to find out way. There's no other group 31ike this in the United States, and we don't have any channels 24to look to, or history to look to. We're pioneering this road, 25 and so we're looking to the Advisory Group to give us guidance

as to where we're going. I mean, we may have sort of lost control of this in my view to the -- the State and Federal agencies. I don't know. But we -- I certainly would like the Public Advisory Groups thought on that. Are we getting too bureaucratic? Are we functioning well in that regard? I don't know. And I think that Commissioner Sandor and the State -- and other State and Federal Trustees feel likewise. I mean, you know, this is no narrow thing.

Did you want to say something, Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: No.

MR. COLE: I think Mr. Totemoff first.

MR. TOTEMOFF: Yeah, thanks. I was wondering 12if there would be additional consideration given to projects 13for 1993? I know the draft is out after public comment. Would 14there be further consideration by the Trustee Council or 15P.A.G.?

MR. COLE: Let me defer that to -- is 17Dr. Gibbons here today? Or he's

MR. MUTTER: No.

10

MR. COLE: Does anybody have any thoughts on 20that? Frankly I don't know the answer to that. I don't --21does anybody else want to take a shot at it? Commissioner 22Sandor?

MR. SANDOR: Well, I believe that -- that the 24Public Advisory Group as it scrutinizes the plan that's out 25there, if it identifies not only the -- the strengths and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

weaknesses in the proposals that are out on the table, but if you actually see and identify something that's been overlooked, something -- some gaps, by all means present them, and I -- it seems to me those ought to be added to the package.

Bear in mind there's a number of things that -- that
are underway that have not yet come together that will be very
crucial for our December 11 meeting, and I think as either
Charlie Cole or Curt McVee had pointed out, we hope you can
meet again before the December 11 meeting to -- to really
scrutinize what's there. And if -- if we've missed something,
or if everybody's missed something, by all means lay it on the
11table.

The December 11 meeting is going to be a crucial ameeting, but it's also going to help set the stage for the development of the next -- next year's program. Mr. Totemoff, swe need your help in not only identifying what's on the table, but what's missing.

MR. COLE: Mr. McVee?

17

25

MR. McVEE: Yes. In -- in the blue back in 19your package, there are a series of questions asked the public, 20and -- and one of them is "do you believe there are other 1projects that directly address injured resources or services 2that are not contained in this document? If so, please 3identify the project." So we're asking people for -- for their 24thoughts in that respect.

MR. COLE: Mr. Meacham?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. MEACHAM: No other comments.

I'm told that's a periwinkle color. MR. COLE: That was quite a shock to me, but -- because, you know, periwinkles to me was those little snails that we used to find, you know, along the irrigation ditches, but anyway it's nice to know.

Yes, Ms. Fischer first.

MS. FISCHER: Mr. Cole and Trustee Council members, some of the things that I'm sure that other members of this Council have also been approached on, and I realize that 10you've done a lot of work, and I -- I complement on the 11 hearings that you've had. I've sat through some of them with \parallel_2 you, listening over the telephone. Do we also go out to 13different groups and listen to them? I know I'm getting 4 invitations, I'm sure some of the others are, and get their 15 input, and if it's in here, explain it to them? I would say yes. MR. COLE: 16 MS. FISCHER: Would that be our -- part of our 17 #gresponsibility, too? You get to be a funnel of all this 19 MR. COLE: 20 MS. FISCHER: I understand. 21

MR. COLE: information from the public, 22 3bring it in to the Public Advisory Group to hear, you know. We 1/24 want broad public input. That's one of the principal √sapproaches that we in the Trustee Council want. It's one of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

the principal approaches dictated by the consent decree and order. And I think Mr. McCloud (sic) was next.

MR. CLOUD: Well, on the -- on the subject of contractors, I guess you already have who are on-going out there, is that are contractors for certain tasks chosen on a competitive bid process or sole-source award?

MR. COLE: I think I can answer this. I -- as
I recall, and I have not looked at this legislation passed in
the last session, but as I recall, except for administrative
type contracts, now I mean like for power and, you know, things
lolike that, electricity, and related things, these work projects
lare to be funnelled through the State and Federal agencies,
landber one, and we cannot under the statute go out and the
Trustee Council contract with North Pacific Air Photo, for
lexample, for aerial photography ourselves. We have to assign
that project to one of the State or Federal agencies. And then
they're required on a competitive bid proposals under the

I must say that I personally had some reservations

1 pabout that statutory requirement, but, you know, sometimes, you

2 oknow, you read the tea leaves and -- and you say that will be

2 1 fine. We thought that in any event we could look at that and

2 2 see how this works, you know, the first year, whether we have

3 problems with that or whether we don't, but the short answer is

4 competitive bids under the State and Federal Procurement Codes.

MR. CLOUD: So that the contract you already

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

have working out there to evaluate the threatened areas, is -- was that competitive bid?

MR. COLE: Yes, Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: No. It was -- it may have originally I guess been a competitive -- there was some competition, but it was set up through lead agency, which is the Forest Service in that case, but as Mr. Cole mentioned, that -- that we have to comply with either State or Federal procurement processes. I think during this -- this phase, what I call -- rather this initial start-up phase during this year, 10that we have -- we have not probably had the opportunity, maybe $_{1}$ 1 the lead time to some extent, maybe part of the planning -- our planning has not been perfected enough in advance so that we -- $_{1}$ we could take advantage of the competitive situation, and I $_{\parallel 4}$ feel personally whether the rest of the Trustee Council agree $\sqrt{5}$ swith me at this point, but that is something that we have to That's why we have to have good schedules, to know $\sqrt{1}$ 7what we -- what we're going to go out in advance, but I do know 18 that the rest of the Trustee Council's members have addressed ¶othe issue of competitive contracts and -- and have been very d₀supportive of that, but I think it's something that along with 1 organization and trying to be more efficient, we also need to - $\sqrt{2}$ - to get our act together in that respect.

MR. COLE: Mr. McCorkle?

23

MR. McCORKLE: Thank you, Mr. Cole. Three just 25 very brief questions. Number one, will it be possible to get a

R & R COURT REPORTERS

53 copy of Mr. McVee's remarks today? You mentioned that they were in writing, so maybe you could send us along a copy later, or do you have MR. McVEE: I have some copies. MR. McCORKLE: You have 17 copies right there. Thank you. MR. COLE: Consummate bureaucrat. MR. McCORKLE: Number two, does the PAG have any staff or is there any plans to do that or are we minimizing costs and not having staff? It seems to me the amount of work \parallel_0 that the advisory group may have to do might call for some 11/1 kinds of help or assistance, and MR. COLE: I think the answer to both of those 1 3 questions is yes. MR. McCORKLE: Wait and see. Okay. 14 MR. COLE: Nothing but a qualified yes. 115 MR. McCORKLE: And then when it meets, will 16 17there be minutes or proceedings of each meeting in the record 180r do we have to keep our own notes? I'm not sure we've gotten there, but 19 MR. COLE: 20 MR. McVEE: Maybe if Doug has 21 MR. MUTTER: We'll -- we'll issue a meeting 22 3summary after each meeting and prior to the next meeting. MR. McCORKLE: Thank you. 24

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: Let me point out in that regard, all

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

25

meetings of the Trustee Council are recorded, and a transcript is prepared, so that we have a record of essentially every word that's said at these meetings, and people will be able to refer to them, you may have copies of them if you wish. We will, I'm certain, provide you with the, you know, the requisite support staff. I don't think there's any doubt about it. We recognize you're going to have to have some support staff.

The next question?

MR. GAVORA: Is the Council, Advisory Council going to be organized, formally organized?

 $_{10}$ MR. COLE: I think that's up, largely up to the $_{11}$ Advisory Group itself.

MR. McVEE: The charter, Mr. Cole, the charter 13calls for a chairman and vice charter, but when you make that 14selection, I think, and who is -- is your business.

MR. COLE: I think we should give them a copy 160f that charter.

MR. McVEE: I think they have.

MR. COLE: Do you have a copy of that charter?

19 SEVERAL: Yes.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Okay.

MR. McVEE: It may be mixed in with this mass 22 of paper that has descended upon you here.

MR. COLE: Yes, Brad?

MR. PHILLIPS: Charlie, does the Council expect 25that this group will mostly or in large on our reaction to

R & R COURT REPORTERS

questions you give to us to consider, or do you expect this group to go out and make their own agenda? And, second, how is the information, if any develops on our group, transmitted to the Council? Is it on an individual basis or a consensus basis or?

MR. COLE: My -- my personal view is that that's up to the group itself to formulate its own internal operating procedures.

Mr. Mutter, do you -- do you have any views on that?

MR. MUTTER: Yes, that's correct. We have a

10draft guidelines, background that is in your packet, but one of

11the topics at perhaps the next meeting would be for the P.A.G.

12to determine how they want to make recommendations to the

13Trustee Council, as well as to elect officers to -- a chair and

14a vice chair for the group. So that's information that still

15needs to be dealt with by the group.

MR. PHILLIPS: How about the matter of subject 17 matter that we are to deal with? Is it of our own making or is 18 it just strictly in response to the Trustees' request for 19 opinions?

MR. COLE: Let me take a pass at that. I think 21it's a very broad commitment or -- to the Advisory Group to 22furnish us with your over-all recommendations. There's nothing 23in that decree that says the Advisory Group shall just be 24limited in any particular fashion. That's my view.

MR. PHILLIPS: Uh-huh.

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: I mean, I -- I think we all want broad expression of views. Like Commissioner Sandor said, tell us where you think we've gone afield if we have, areas which we think -- you think we should address, et cetera, et cetera.

Now, I want to say this, you know, in the past year we've had a lot of criticism about what we've done from all fields, but few constructive suggestions as to what we should do. I mean, everybody says, you know, I mean, "you've got too many studies," well, I mean, tell us which ones that -- that's what we'd like to know you think are excessive, that, you know, loit's off the chart as Judge Holland would say.

You want us to buy land? Habitat? Tell us where you look and us to buy habitat, you know, why we should buy that landshah, why it's essential. Not just, you know, "Go buy habitat." I mean, run out to Prince William Sound with you lack book and see if you can't buy some habitat some place, so lowe can say we bought habitat.

I mean, you know, we want sound advice that's 18constructive, you know. And that's what we're looking for. 19And, look, here's -- here's what I say, I mean, all of us are 20busy. Commissioner Sandor is busy, I'm busy, all the members 21of the Trustee Council are busy, but we're looking for broad 22public input from the public generally, funnelled through you 23people.

I'm pleased to say Mr. Tillery has given me this
paragraph four, it says "The Group"

R & R COURT REPORTERS

should supplement our efforts at public participation by going out to their interest groups, and being sure that they're informed." You know. And coming to us with constructive decisions to help us, you know, discharge our obligations, too.

And I -- I tell you, it's -- to me it's been a real pleasure to work with the other members of the Trustee Council in the past year. They're as finest a group of -- I always exclude myself -- other people that I've ever known to work with. It's just been a pleasure, the privilege of working with them. We've plowed a lot of uncharted ground, sailed through a lot of unchartered waters, and I think done pretty well, but we loan do better, and -- and we're looking for your help.

MR. McVEE: Mr. Cole, one of the things I guess
13in working with advisory groups I've noticed in the past, or
14I've felt to be very beneficial is the dialogue that goes with
15-- on within a diverse -- the diverse interests, and I think
16that's one of the things that -- things that I really look
17forward to, and -- and, you know, seeing the minority reports
18that come out as well as the -- the other reports, because
19these -- I think these things will be most helpful to -- to us
20in the Trustee Council in reaching a conclusion on various

And I would hope that you -- that you don't just look

23at issues that we place before you. In fact I think that -
24that most of you would become very discouraged if that were the

25case and probably would not want to continue. But I hope that

you take some initiative to -- to broaden out and look at other issues.

> MR. TOTEMOFF: I've got one

MR. COLE: Yes, Mr. Totemoff?

MR. TOTEMOFF: one last question now.

You mentioned earlier that it was pretty much up to the Public Advisory Group on how to handle their affairs as far as communication, transmitting of that communication to the Trustee Council and to our respective interest groups. Would -- would it be pretty much up to the Public Advisory Group to $\sqrt{100}$ develop a budget regarding that to the Trustee Council, or is 11there a cap on us?

MR. COLE: I think the answer to you question 13 is yes and, no, there's -- I think it's largely up to you to $_{\parallel}$ 4make recommendations as to what you think, you know, a budget ||should entail and require, and there's no cap that I'm aware 160f. Commissioner Sandor? Meacham? No? No cap. 17we're public servants.

Yes, Ms. Fischer? 18

19 MS. FISCHER: Yeah, one more question. nentioned that we should meet with you I believe on December 2111th?

MR. COLE: No, let me restate that. 22

MS. FISCHER: Okay. 23

The -- the Trustee Council itself MR. COLE: 24 √swill meet on December 11th to make what essentially are the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

final decisions on the 1993 Work Plan. We would expect the group to meet before that, however many times it feels is necessary, and furnish us as soon in advance of December 11th as it can with its recommendations on this work plan. Now, with that, did you have a further question?

MS. FISCHER: Well, then -- more or less, yeah, you pretty much answered it, but then we're going to need to be meeting for the next -- quite frequently to get things together and to go over this and come up with some ideas, or to -- to go with your recommendations.

10 MR. COLE: Whatever you think is necessary, I 11 would say, to discharge your assignment.

MS. FISCHER: Okay.

MR. COLE: Ms. Brodie?

MS. BRODIE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Cole. I don't 15have a question. I just wanted to say how much I appreciate 16the introductory remarks that you've all made and that 17representing the groups that have been the most voluble in 18criticism, I do also want to say I appreciate having been 19appointed to this group, and that we do intend to work 20cooperatively, which is not to say that we will never criticize 21again in the future, but we do wish to participate in this and 22work with you, and -- and I am sure that you all want a 23successful restoration plan as we do.

MR. COLE: Thank you. I should tell other 25members of the Advisory Group that Ms. Brodie has attended

R & R COURT REPORTERS

nearly every meeting of the Trustee Council since its formulation, and has -- has been very familiar with our work, and has had the occasion to offer I believe constructive suggestions at virtually every meeting, so she -- she knows what's gone on.

MS. BRODIE: Thank you.

MR. COLE: Yes, Mr. King?

MR. KING: I haven't been through all these proposals, so this is sort of a theoretical question, but I assume that there may be some that we'd want more information 100n, and what are the possibilities of that -- for that? Can we 11invite people to come to our meetings?

MR. COLE: Yes.

MR. KING: Do we go through the agencies or

14 ?

MR. COLE: I would think you should speak

16either with Mr. Mutter or Dr. Gibbons, who's the current

17Executive Director, but we will certainly furnish you with all

180f the support

Let -- let me say this, for example, just so you'll 20know one of the problems. If you look at those proposed 21projects, you'll see four or five archeological study proposed 22projects. Now, and I'll -- I mean, environmental groups say 3"Buy land," the subsistence people say, "Look, what are you 24doing for subsistence out there?" The tourism people say, 25"What are you doing for the whales?" I mean, let me tell you,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

I mean, making decisions on things like those -- and then the archeological people say, "Well, you have to preserve our heritage. This oil spill caused water to get in there. It opened up new areas. People are raiding these archaeological sites. We can't lose them, we must preserve them.

Furthermore, we must have public information hearings to tell the people about that." Those are all in my view very, very difficult decisions, and -- and we have to make that cut, you know? And that's just an example of some of the problems which we face, and so I would say that, for example, in the loarcheological area, you can call the State archeological lipeople, the various native groups have very deep interests in 2those studies.

I mean, you know, it's sort of wide open for you, and, 14you know, just give us some help. I think that's the broad 15thing.

16 Yes, sir?

MR. McCUNE: Mr. Cole, as you know, and as the 18Trustees Council members know, that you get a wide variety of -19- of proposals. Some of them has nothing to do with 20restoration. So as I was looking through all the by-laws and 21all the different things that we and you have been through, I 22haven't really seen the criteria for what projects are, you 23know, real restoration projects and what aren't, besides 24Mr. Cole's comments during the State restoration money process. So do we have that in writing somewhere?

MR. COLE: You mean what the rules are as it were, in quotes?

MR. McCUNE: Yes.

MR. COLE: Rules? I think we'll likely be able to give that to you maybe within the next week or ten days, in writing. Mr. Tillery, it's up to you. Can you --? Yeah. I think we can do that.

Mr. McVee?

MR. McVEE: Yes, I think, you know, that's the key point. The -- the R.T., Restoration Team, did develop some 10criteria which they used for their screening purposes. Now, 11those haven't been -- they may not be the final criteria the 12Trustee Council will use.

- The other thing I think that's in play here is -- is 14the Restoration Plan which we were talking -- which we had 15talked about, which is in the process of being developed, and 16the draft will be out sometime in mid winter, but that will go 17in a lot more depth into criteria and priorities and options, 18alternatives and so on. So one key question is, you know, what 19do we do now, what do we -- what do we lock in on now for the 20'93 program when we haven't gone through that -- that exercise, 21and we haven't had the public exposure of that over-all 22planning exercise.
- MR. COLE: Let me say this: There again we're 24looking to this group to tell us what its views are on the 25necessary restoration, (a) studies, projects for direct

```
63
 restoration, for indirect restoration, et cetera.
                                                      I mean, you
 know, that's -- that's one of your charges. I mean, that
 restoration is a pretty broad term, so as you can see, as you
 look through this plus or minus 60 proposed projects -- some of
 those I -- I will say now I doubt if they make the cut in
 December. You know, the cut, you know, that's when your score
 isn't really quite high enough to -- but some of those aren't
 going to make the cut, but -- from my standpoint, but we would
 like your views on the ones which should or shouldn't, why they
 should or shouldn't, maybe expand them a little bit, maybe
10 contract them a little bit, maybe other proposals, projects for
1 next year, you know.
          Yes, sir?
1 2
                  MR. DIEHL: I -- I see that the heads of the --
13
14the Regional Forester and the -- and Steve Pennoyer are not
\parallel5here. I -- I was wondering, you know, about the competitive,
16 you know, this work here as I understand it has not been put up
17for competitive bids, right?
                  MR. COLE:
                            It will be though.
18
                             It will be.
19
                  MR. DIEHL:
                  MR. COLE:
                             Those projects will not be done
20
21 · · · · ·
                  MR. DIEHL: All right.
                                          So ....
22
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

MR. COLE:

23

25

4bids.

.... other than by competitive

MR. DIEHL: So the figures in the projects are

64 rough estimates or what? MR. COLE: Yes, I think so. Is that --Mr. Meacham? MR. MEACHAM: I think you're going to have both competitive bid and other in this. I know I've seen a list that -- that includes a number of projects that we're recommending both a competitive bid, and MR. COLE: But some of them will be done MR. MEACHAM: (indiscernible) almost all. MR. COLE: Some of them will be done, for doexample, with -- with Agency personnel, i.e., personnel within 1 the Department of Fish and Game. MR. DIEHL: Right. 12 MR. COLE: Did that help your 13 MR. DIEHL: Yeah, but 14 answer your question a little MR. COLE: 15 16bit? MR. DIEHL: Is there a breakdown of the budgets 17 18 for each of these projects? 19 MR. COLE: Yes. MR. DIEHL: Okay. 20 MR. COLE: I have seen, and I have personally neriewed very detailed breakdown of the budget to each almost 3acquisition of goods down to maybe \$50.00 or something like 4that. It's a very detailed breakdown, and if -- if it's not in

R & R COURT REPORTERS

√sthe material you have, well, we'll certainly furnish it to you.

And, like I say, we'd like your advice, for example, on whether some of these projects are simply too rich for our blood, whether some of those estimates are too high.

Mr. Mutter, would you?

MR. MUTTER: I think that's in the periwinkle book.

MR. COLE: It's in the periwinkle book I'm told. Anyway, there's -- it seems to be, yes. For example, you can look -- if you look at page 113, you will see how -- that's an example of one of the -- project number 93024 is 10broken down. Page 113. Yes?

- MS. BERGMANN: There is additional detail 12that's going to be made available within
- 13 MR. BRODERSON: Roughly a week.
- MS. BERGMANN: a week or so that will 15provide the kinds of detail that Mr. Cole was talking about, 16and it would be available for all of the P.A.G. members as well 17as interested members of the public.
- MR. COLE: There's so much data on these projects you'll swelter and suffocate under it, if you have the time to go through it, I assure you, but a lot of it's there.

 MR. COLE: There's so much data on these projects you'll swelter and suffocate under it, if you have the almost too much.
- 22 Yes, Doctor?
- DR. FRENCH: Well, in terms of the time frame 24then, we're expect- -- to be expecting more material within 25about a week?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. BRODERSON: The extremely detailed budgets will be out in about a week, there's

DR. FRENCH: Well, I guess what I'm trying to do is think about our scheduling for future meetings and -- and what -- at what point we can expect to have most of what we're going to have in front of us prior to going out and getting other public review and other information. From this group, is there much -- we're -- we should anticipate beyond the next week to ten days?

MR. COLE: No, I would say from your 10standpoint, I would hope not, but, you know, it takes a lot of 11time to read this stuff and study it, devour it, evaluate it 12all.

13 Yes?

MR. BRODERSON: Jerome I think has another 15thought there.

DR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. COLE: Yes?

DR. MONTAGUE: All the information that is ever people to be available is here in -- in this building, in OSPIC, and is accessible to all these people. I think what Mark is talking about is making up a bunch of additional copies.

MR. COLE: Yes. Any further questions? Did -23sir, did we talk about Dr. -- you know, I mean Commissioner
24Rosier not being here, and Mr. Pennoyer and so forth, did -25did you have a further thought on that that you wanted?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. DIEHL: No, I was just -- the whole things was, you know, details about -- about the monies and everything, and -- and them not being here. MR. COLE: But like I say, you're welcome to go to those agencies and MR. DIEHL: Yes. MR. COLE: ask them questions, and I'm sure you'll have no difficulty in getting MR. DIEHL: Right. MR. COLE: a full answer. Anything else 10before we break for lunch? MR. MUTTER: Mr. Cole? 11 Yes? MR. COLE: Yes. 1 2 I'd to if we could before we break MR. MUTTER: 13 4 for lunch just take care of one administrative detail. We have 15a couple of professionals here from the Fish and Wildlife 16Service I believe that will explain how we're going to do ₁travel and expense reimbursements, and I think they need to get $\eta_{\rm g}$ back to work. If we could just take about five minutes and phave them explain some of that, would that be? MR. COLE: Sure. If there's no objection from 20 $_{1}$ the group here. MR. MUTTER: Okay. Gina? Kathy? Do you want 22 3to do your thing for us? Here's a microphone here. MS. MARTINEZ: Oh, I talk loud enough. I don't 24 need that.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

My name is Gina Martinez, and I work for the Fish and Wildlife Service. This is Kathy Miller, and she also works for the Fish and Wildlife Service. We will be processing both your travel vouchers, and then I will be doing the travel authorizations authorizing you to come.

Do you want to go ahead and pass those out?

I have prepared folders for everybody that has samples
of what -- what the paperwork that we get in should look like
from you, so it's got references for -- those of you who are
only going to need to claim mileage, it's got references in
there. Then it also shows once you give us something, what
l(ph) you're going to get it back, what it's going to look like.

For those of you -- I don't -- I'm -- this I just came 13 into about three days ago, so I'm kind of -- I don't know 14 everybody's names and everything, but I want it known for the 15 record that we are here to help you. If you ever have any 16 questions whether it's whether we're going to pay for travel 17 for you to go to any of these meetings, other -- outside of 18 this PAG meeting, or if it's how to make your travel 19 arrangements, how -- you can't get ahold of the LIFECO Travel 20 Center, how can you, you know, get your stuff done. You're not 21 going to be out of -- or you're going to be out of town, you're 22 not going to be able to file your travel voucher in a timely 23 manner, what can you do to, you know, expedite that? Certain 24 questions like that, that if you have any problems, or if you 25 had any questions on the travel that you needed to do to come

to this trip, if you had any problems that you ran into across the way, feel free to ask us this.

In the folder that you have -- First of all, we'll start off with the -- the hand-outs in the folder. The -- this gold colored piece of paper here, this is what we ask that you fill out when you get done travelling and you're ready to file your claim. You will all be paid per diem while you're in town, and that is at the Anchorage rate. And I believe you got a hand-out that showed what the different locality rates are in Alaska. But it's a front and back page. It just says when you 10 left your house, when you left the airport, from whatever city $1 \mid 1$ or town you're coming -- community you're coming from. Then on 12the back, if you were authorized a rental car on your travel authorization, if you had to pay parking while you were at the $_{\parallel 4}$ meeting, if you had to get a taxi to get to and from the 15airport if you were not authorized a rental car, those types of 16^{--} types of expenses go on the back of this form.

Then the green sheet of paper shows a sample of a trip 18that I made up for just me. That if -- once I filled out the 19green piece of paper, front and back, what your actual travel 20voucher that's going to go in for reimbursement is going to 21look like is page two of that. It's got your name, mailing 22address. Mailing address is going to be where your check are 23going to be mailed from the Finance Center. So this is just a 24kind of complete sample.

Once you get done travelling, you complete the -- the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

goldenrod copy and then the second page of this is going to be what -- what the actual voucher is going to look like, so that you don't get this strange form and don't have a clue in the world what to do with it. Government forms can be very intimidating and very complicated. So we've tried to simplify that for you.

The pink piece of paper is just for your information on how I and Kathy or one of our people that work with us are going to calculate your per diem. The per diem is -- is pro rated on a -- on a quarter day basis, for every six hours on the first and last day of travel. Every other day -- if you're in travel a complete day, then you get the whole day, then you get the whole day at that per diem rate, and that just kind of a sexplains this. If you want to read that, that's fine. You adon't have to.

The blue pieces of paper in here are copies of a claim 16 for reimbursement if there's no per diem authorized. If you're 17 not in travel status for ten hours or more, you're not 18 authorized per diem. But if you got a rental car, or if you 19 had to pay a taxi fare, if you had to pay parking, you can 20 claim that on an 1164 and still be reimbursed for those costs.

Also in your folder you have blank forms of an 1164 and 22a travel voucher. We ask that you sign these. Well, we can do 3this two ways. You can either sign them blank now and we can 24fill them in with the information that you provide us, and you 25will get copies of those back once they're signed and approved.

Or you can fill out the form, send it in and have it signed 'f for approval, and then send it back -- or filled out for accuracy, then send it back to you and you can sign it and approve if you want to, then send it back in again for approval signatures. That's why we request that you sign it now blank. That's -- I mean, but that's a preference.

Travel vouchers will take four to six weeks to be done.

If you chose not to sign them blank now and chose to have us

prepare them, then send them to you for signature and then send
them back for approving signatures, it could be six to eight
noweeks. That's a preference.

- That is your money. You will be out-of-pocket money,

 12there is no travel advances authorized for any of this. That's

 13another incentive for you to sign them blank now.
- Questions? Nobody had any problems making their travel parrangements for this meeting?
- 16 Can you think of anything else?
- MR. MUTTER: No, I'm sure we'll stumble our way 18through this for a couple of meetings before we get the hang of 19it. This is a government work after all.
- MS. MARTINEZ: That's true.
- MR. MUTTER: Thank you very much, Gina and 22 Kathy. Thank you, Mr. Cole.
- MS. MILLER: Oh, by the way, here's some 24envelopes they can send in to us.
- MS. MARTINEZ Oh, we also have envelopes here -

R & R COURT REPORTERS

- If you could pass those out, too? -- that are addressed to Kathy Miller, and she will be actually doing the vouchers. I will do the authorizations, she will be doing the vouchers.

Once you complete your forms, you can just send them back in these sealed -- sealed envelopes, and they'll go directly to her. How many of them are here?

MS. MILLER: There's about 50.

MS. MARTINEZ: Okay. If each -- if each of you want to take about three -- pull three of them, then continue passing them around.

10 MS. MILLER: And make sure to keep you 11 receipts. Very important.

17

MS. MARTINEZ: Yeah. Also in your red folder, 13 or your orange folder, is a copy of a lodging receipt. The one 14 thing that is mandatory is that if you acquire any lodging, 15 even if it's only for \$6.00 at some bunkhouse somewhere, you 16 have got to have a lodging receipt. It doesn't matter of cost.

And the other thing, the lodging receipt has to show 19that the fee was paid. If you stay here in Anchorage, and the 20total bill is \$75.00, if your lodging receipt says "balance 1due, \$75.00," and doesn't zero that out, then we need a copy of 2either a credit card or a cash register receipt that shows that 23you have physically paid that balance. And there's a sample 24like I said in your orange folder about what a paid balance and 25a zero balance receipt would look like.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. KING: need to complete the travel, so we'll have to get home before we can complete this thing? MS. MARTINEZ: That, or you can just sign blank forms and -- and leave them with Doug, and he can get them to us. But we need to get you receipts MR. MUTTER: when you're all done, including your MS. MARTINEZ: Yes, exactly. MR. MUTTER: airline coupon. MR. KING: So the best way to do would be just 10 MS. MARTINEZ: To send a blank 11 MR. MUTTER: When you get home 1 2 MS. MARTINEZ: Yeah. 13 MR. KING: Get it out in the mail. 14 MR. MUTTER: Right. 15 MS. MARTINEZ: Using those envelopes, and 16 I don't know if you -- have they been given Kathy's 18 1 9phone number? MR. MUTTER: Yes. 20 MS. MARTINEZ: Okay. And also in that envelope √2 is one of my business cards. You can feel free to call me at any time also. Kathy will be the primary person doing the 14travel vouchers, the reimbursements. If she is out, then I ₅will step in and -- and do that for her.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. COLE: 1:30. Thank you.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. MUTTER: Shall we reconvene the meeting, please? I think just about everyone has returned.

We have a couple of additional administrative items
that I'd like to go through with you before we get into the
meat of this afternoon's discussion. First of all, you
probably noticed that you've got a lot of paper and materials
that you've been sent and -- and have placed in front of you.

10And we've set up a couple of notebooks hopefully to help you to
11control the flow of your paper. We may have to add additional
12notebooks in the future.

- What we'll try and do is indicate when you get

 14 materials what tabs and what notebooks to insert things in, to

 15 help you keep track of things. And if there's -- there are

 16 materials that you would like distributed to the group, why,

 17 maybe we can do the same thing. Or if you think you have

 18 suggestions for additional tabs or information that ought to be

 19 provided, why you can let me know, and we'll set that

 20 information up. There is a lot of paper to go through, so we

 21 thought there ought to be some way to keep control of that.
- And some of the materials in front of you should be a marked with tabs. You can go ahead and insert those.
- You also have a hand-out, three tables on habitat, 25potential habitat acquisition. Those all go into your second

volume, tab five. They aren't marked. There's three tables 'that you received this morning.

There's another item that we need to discuss. If you wish, you can decide this toward the end of the day, but we need to schedule the next meeting of the Public Advisory Group, and you heard Mr. Cole mention this morning that December 11th the Trustee Council will be meeting to make decisions about that 1993 work program and would like to have the Public Advisory Group recommendations prior to that meeting to help them in their decisions. You have a copy of the proposed 10projects for '93, that's the periwinkle book in volume two of 11your notebooks.

- To set up a Public Advisory Group meeting, we almost 13 need 30 days advanced notice. We've got requirements to 14 advertise the meeting in the Federal Register, to advertise the 15 meeting in local newspapers and generally to let people know 16 ahead of time that there's going to be a meeting. So keep that 17 in mind as you decide to schedule meetings, that there's a 18 certain time lag that we -- we have to conform with.
- I've put together a suggested agenda and a time for a 20second meeting, Wednesday, December 2nd. You can mull that 21over and -- and decide if you want to do that.
- Now, let me pass around the proposed agenda. The key 23item of -- of concern at your next meeting would probably be 24the 1993 program plan since that's the -- the major decision 25item that the Trustee Council is going to be undertaking, so

we've devoted a substantial amount on the agenda for that second meeting to the '93 work plan.

Another item that the P.A.G. needs to take some action on is the election of officers. The charter calls for a chair person and a vice chair person. Now, if you wish to deliberate on that at this meeting today, you can do so. If you'd rather wait until the second meeting to do an election of officers, you can do that. I've put it on as the first item of second meeting agenda.

Also in your handouts is a draft background and 10guidelines, operating procedures if you will, for the Public 1 Advisory Group, and there are some things in there that you can 12decide to do differently. There are some items in there that 1 are mandated by the charter and some of the Federal and State $_{\parallel 4}$ laws that govern advisory groups. You need to take a look at 15that, and you don't have to make a decision at the second 16meeting of the group, but at some point in time, you'll want to 17decide on those operating procedures that you wish to follow. The fourth item that needs to be discussed at a future 18 ¶omeeting is the status of the draft Restoration Plan. noguite a bit of activity going to put together a long-term 1 restoration plan, and there's a work group that's been 22 established doing that work, and they're ready in December to 3present some information to you about the direction that's dayler and -- and solicit some suggestions and to get you

R & R COURT REPORTERS

5recommendations.

So there's basically four items on -- on the proposed agenda, and the bulk being the '93 work plan.

Do you want to discuss the -- the meeting time and -- and the agenda at this point, or would you rather -- we need to make a decision sometime today on that. Okay. How does December 2 sound?

MS. FISCHER: Fine.

MR. CLOUD: I move for December 2.

MS. FISCHER: And I'll second it.

MR. MUTTER: Okay. Any discussion?

MR. PHILLIPS: Could I suggest an earlier hour 1_1 for meeting? The day's half over at 9:30 for me.

 12 MR. MUTTER: Okay. One of the problems we have 13 is getting people from outside of Anchorage into town, and --

14would 8:30 cause problems? I think 8:30 might cause problems.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, we don't want to cause

16problems.

DR. FRENCH: For those of us coming from 18Kodiak, that would cause a problem, although going later than 19five would not cause a problem. I mean, we could add on to the 20end of the day. That would -- that would be find I think from 21that perspective.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do you anticipate a one-day 23meeting? Is that it?

MR. MUTTER: You -- you can meet more if you 25desire to, but I thought everybody's pretty busy with other

R & R COURT REPORTERS

things, that we'd try and keep these to one-day meetings.

Maybe it makes sense to meet at noon and -- starting at noon and meet until noon the next day, if that would accommodate travel better for people out of state (sic).

MS. FISCHER: I think it would.

DR. FRENCH: Yeah. That would also provide
some time -- I'm not quite sure how this fits into the open
meeting laws, and maybe it's not an appropriate statement, but
it would provide time for informal discussion amongst various
members of the group, until we're strict- -- that's strictly
loforbidden in -- in the sense of the open meeting provisions,
lbut it allows more unstructured time for discussion of projects
land approaches which I think is going to be very critical at
lathis juncture, because most of us don't really know each other
lavery well, or have much opportunity for informal contact
soutside of the process, although hopefully that will develop,
lootherwise we're not going to get our work done.

MR. MUTTER: Well, is there a feeling of the 18group then that it might be useful to meet say -- say starting 19on noon on the second and adjourn at noon on the 3rd of 20December?

MS. BENTON: It'll give a little more time with 22handouts.

MR. DIEHL: Some -- some of us do have to work $_{24}$ for a living and,

MR. MUTTER: Right.

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. DIEHL: that -- that means two days gone instead of one out of the week, and that's the problem for those in the Anchorage area.

MR. MUTTER: Mr. McCune?

MR. McCUNE: Maybe -- I'd like of like to stick with what we've got going right here right now, and then we'll see if we need to do something different. You know, I have -- it's pretty well -- 9:30, I mean, we should be able to -- everybody -- that accommodates everybody so far, so that's my opinion anyway.

MR. MUTTER: Okay.

MS. FISCHER: Maybe -- I agree with Jerry, too, 2because the Valdez plane leaves at 8:30, so -- or 8:45, so it 13gets us in here, if it's on time, right around 9:30, quarter to 14ten. But I would -- I agree with Mr. Brad Phillips over there 15that I would like to see the meetings -- meetings start 16earlier. Why not come in the night before, and then that way 17if groups wanted to get together, meet that day, and then leave 18that afternoon, it would still be the same as what you're 19saying, but still it's giving everyone a chance to meet if we 20wanted to, that you'd meet before,

DR. FRENCH: Yeah. Yeah, the

MS. FISCHER: and we're not taking two

23full days.

21

 24 MS. BRODIE: I would like to -- to try to 25 minimize the costs of our meetings, because the money that we

R & R COURT REPORTERS

spend on this is money that doesn't go for restoration, and so maybe this is easy for me to say, because I'm an Anchorage person, but insofar as if people don't really need to pay for a hotel, I'd rather not -- I'd rather not structure our meetings so that a lot of people are needing hotels when we can avoid that.

DR. FRENCH: I was -- I was just checking the schedule here, and the first flight we can get in from -- from Kodiak is scheduled to arrive at the airport at 9:20 in the morning, so technically even that's tight considering the 10Kodiak weather. So realistically Rick and I would probably 11have to come in the night before if we wanted to make sure that 12we'd make even a 9:30 meeting.

MS. FISCHER: And I -- yeah, I -- most of us
14live out in the outlying areas, and we travel a long ways to
15come here. Not that we're looking for anything special or
16anything, but people that live in Anchorage, yes, it's
17beneficial -- beneficial to them, but to us it's not. So many
18of us do have to travel quite a distance, and the weather is a
19big factor for us. And we don't want to miss the meetings. I
20think we're taking our time, too, to make sure that we are
21here, and if we can be assured of starting at a good hour in
22the morning getting in here late in the evening to help that, I
23think it would be to the benefit of the -- pardon me?

MR. DIEHL: Yeah, I see nothing wrong with

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25that.

82

MS. FISCHER: Yeah. It would be to the benefit of the whole organization so that we can all be here.

MR. MUTTER: I think there's no question that some people are going to have to spend a couple of days for a one-day meeting

MS. FISCHER: Yeah.

MR. MUTTER: just because of logistics.

MS. FISCHER: Right.

MR. KING: We had a pretty good example of the kind of problems coming from Juneau today. A number of the people that were here this morning were scheduled on -- to come in last night and were bumped, or the flight was canceled due to weather, but we were able to get re-scheduled in time to get ahere at 9:30. I think we landed at 9:25 or something out at the airport. But we had two options, and the first one failed, but the second one worked out. So I'd say that's an example of flow a little redundancy might help.

MR. MUTTER: Well, maybe for the time being we 18 ought to go with the one day, start at 9:30 to accommodate late 19 arrivals. We may not get started until 10. Some people may 20 have to come in the night before, which is acceptable, and give 21 it a shot that way.

You may wish at some point in time to have meetings in 23locations other than Anchorage, and that's -- that's up to you 24folks to decide that, too. Initially we thought we'd meet 25here, because the staff and -- and everyone is here, and

there's a lot of information here in this building.

DR. FRENCH: Along those same lines, if we chose to have subgroup meetings as public hearings or whatever at various other locations, would we be bound by the 30-day public notice rule, or will we be bound by the two-week State rule, or which rule will we be bound by?

MR. MUTTER: Well, we -- we need to notify people in the Federal Register 15 days ahead of time, and I'm saying 30 days, because it just takes a little time to get things

- DR. FRENCH: Right.
- MR. MUTTER: into the Federal Register and

 $_{12}$ published and

- DR. FRENCH: Right.
- MR. MUTTER: I think we're
- √ DR. FRENCH: So realistically there's --

16there's very little way we'd be able to do anything before 17pretty close to this December 2nd date?

MR. MUTTER: Right. Right. How does that date 19look to everyone?

MS. FISCHER: I looks fine.

MR. MUTTER: Okay. What about the election of 22 officers? Is it acceptable to wait until the second meeting to 23 do that? What's your preference?

 24 MS. FISCHER: I would recommend that be the 25 first order of business at the second meeting, and it gives

R & R COURT REPORTERS

everybody a chance now to start getting acquainted.

MR. MUTTER: Okay. Then we'll -- we'll go ahead and advertise December 2nd in this room starting at 9:30 for your second meeting. And does this agenda meet your satisfaction?

MR. KING: Are you going to take care of the officers before the meeting?

MR. MUTTER: We'll do a call to order and have an election of officers and then carry on with the meeting.

MR. PHILLIPS: Will there be some staff 10assistance at that time for -- at that meeting?

MR. MUTTER: For what purposes?

MR. PHILLIPS: Whatever purpose that you've 13got. If the group decides they want to do something, you 14should have somebody be able to do it. I'm just wondering -- I 15don't see a committee like this functioning forever without 16some kind of staff assistance. I just wondered if there would 17be anybody even on a temporary basis from one of the agencies 18that would be available?

MR. MUTTER: Right. We'll work that out. 20Okay.

Next I'd like to introduce Keith Goltz who's with the 22Department of the Interior, Solicitor's Office, to say a few 23works about ethics and serving on public advisory groups. 24Keith?

MR. GOLTZ: Okay. My name is Keith Goltz, I am

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

an attorney. I heard the word "voluble" this morning though, and I'm going to try to avoid being too voluble at this point, but I -- I was interested in Mr. King's story about meeting Charlie Cole in the 50s while he was chasing poachers. I can't really top that story, but I can say that I met Brad Phillips in the 60s while he was President of the Senate, and I was in the Department of Law. Since that time I've been with the Department of Justice, in private practice, and now for the last ten years with the Department of the Interior.

And it's in that capacity I want to talk to you today 10about Federal statutes, which is certainly going to be 11exciting. They've been described by Federal judges as 12authoritative writings done in haste by people of moderate 13ability. I don't know if that's entirely accurate, but it is 14true that most statutes have a core that is clear, and they 15have margins that are fuzzy and unclear.

And what I want to do today is talk to you a little bit 17about the core of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. That 18also has an acronym, FACA, like ANILCA, this is FACA. This Act 19is part of a cluster, a quartet of statutes that make up the 20Open Government Laws. Those laws together are the Sunshine in 21Government Act, the Administrative Procedures Act, the Freedom 22of Information Act, and FACA. And if you stay around this 23environment very long, you're probably going to want to get to 24know all four of them.

But today I think we'll introduce you to FACA,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

primarily because that's why you're here. You are a FACA committee. You have a FACA charter, and that charter sets out what you can and cannot do. Now, with the size of the pot involved, that's not a very restrictive covenant that you have. You are to give advice on the spending of \$900 million. But even though those are very broad parameters, you should recognize that those parameters are there, and there are rules as to how you conduct your business within those parameters.

Generally those rules require that your meetings be open meetings, available to the public, all of the documents othat you have in front of you, all of your committee documents, are also available to the public, and as somebody pointed out this morning, you take minutes and those minutes, too, are available to the public. Those are the basic rules. There are available to the public. Those are the basic rules there are the public to the public that you regoing to be a speaked in the right direction.

There's also a specific rule that applies only to this 17particular committee. That rule says that you are 18representatives of larger groups, even the public-at-large 19members are representatives of a larger group. You're not 20appointed as individuals. Now, that distinction may cause you 21to yawn until you realize that individuals are subjects to the 22Federal Conflict of Interest laws. Federal Conflict of 23Interest Laws are criminal laws which prohibit anybody from 24giving advice on any matter in which he has a financial 25interest.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 277-0572 272-7515 272-3022 FAX 274-8982 Now, there is, as in most statutes, an exception. And that is -- it's called a waiver provision, and if anybody wants to make full financial disclosure to the decision-maker, in this case the Secretary of the Interior, he can -- he has the opportunity to determine that the individual's services outweigh the potential for a conflict of interest. And if anybody is interested in having our office pursue that for you, we will do that.

I should point out, however, that the Secretary is very reluctant to grant those waivers, primarily because of the 10perception that the granting of such a waiver reduces the 11credibility of the committee's actions.

- We know we can't avoid all conflicts, nor do we want 13to. Some of the members here are chosen precisely because they 14have an interest in what happens in Prince William Sound. To 15avoid getting in conflict with any of the Federal laws 16regarding conflict of interest, we recommend two things:
- Remember that you are representing a wider interest, so a spreame your discourse as representatives of that interest.
- And then, secondly, participate in no decision that 20might have a direct impact on your financial well-being. If a 21topic comes before this committee that might have or might 22result in a direct financial impact, excuse yourself from the 23deliberations, and make sure, as you should do anyway, that 24there is a vote taken on the record, and that you're not one of 25the voters.

Now, none of this is meant really to chill your participation in this group. It's only meant to warn you of a potential pitfall. And if all else fails, you're going to avoid that pitfall if you simply don't participate in matters that may have a direct financial impact. If you do that, you're going to stay in the center of the statute, and you're going to avoid all that muddle on the margins.

Now, we're going to be available either individually or a group forum to help anybody that may have questions. I'll be here today. I'll be here at the future meetings if you want 10me. It's entirely up to you. You can call me directly if you 1 have a personal question. It would probably be better though 1 to go through Doug. Either way is -- is acceptable. If -- if 1 you have any -- don't have any questions now, that's all I have 1 this time.

- MR. McCUNE: Ah, shoot. How do you define that 16financial interest?
- 17 MR. GOLTZ: All right. Okay.
- MR. McCUNE: Let's say, for example, I'm a 19commercial fisherman,
- 20 MR. GOLTZ: Right.

21

22restoration project that enhances fish in Prince William Sound.
23 Well, that will benefit a whole group of people besides
24myself, but it also would benefit me if I went fishing in that
25area where those fish decide to come back. Is that -- is that

MR. McCUNE: and -- and I am for a

R & R COURT REPORTERS

a conflict of interest or not?

MR. GOLTZ: We think not. We think that what we're talking about here is a direct financial interest. If you owned a piece of property on the Sound and one of the proposals was for purchasing that piece of property, you should get out of that deliberation. There probably will be some areas where it's simply not all that clear. Maybe an enhancement project in your district in a very confined area that you personally fish. I think that's the kind of case you might want to discuss on a one-to-one basis.

You have to consider the -- the criminal code, I think 1you also have to consider in a more general sense how your 1 2 participation is likely to be perceived by people who might not 1 3 share your point of view.

You're -- you're already getting me away from the 15center of the Statute, and I'm sure we're going to get there 16quickly. My number is 271-4131. You can call me, or I can 17come down here, or I can stay here.

You might not -- I think until you actually sit down 19 and look at a proposal, you aren't going to know whether you 20 should excuse yourself or not. If it was me, and I saw a 21 proposal that triggered a bell in my head, I probably wouldn't 22 push that line very far. I'd probably excuse myself right 23 away. It's a pretty disparate group, and I think that there's 24 going to be enough discussion without you, and I -- frankly I 25 wouldn't take much of a risk myself.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MS. BRODIE: This is a similar question to
Mr. McCune's, and that's it would seem to me that, for
instance, for forest products and native landowner interests
couldn't help but have some things come up that are potentially
conflicts of interest to them, and so it's a question of how
broadly it's interpreted. Does that mean that anything having
to do with habitat acquisition would be a conflict, or is it
only purchase of habitat where they own the land or the timber
rights?

MR. GOLTZ: Well, I'm not -- I'm not going to 10be able to tell you exactly where that line is. The statute 11isn't that well drawn. The statute requires us to have a broad 12representation of all interests, and in this context, I would 13certainly argue that tourism and forest products and landowners 14and commercial fishing could hardly be excluded and still have 15a credible advisory committee.

As to the -- how you approach an individual project, I
17think you have to take a look at direct financial impact, and 18- and how direct, I think is a matter of judgment and in large
19major -- measure, that's the individual's judgment. I'm
20certainly willing to assist in that, but I think that as the
21group evolves, you'll probably get a collective sense of when
22somebody should come in and when somebody should come out. And
23I think it would not be useful to set down very precisely rules
24at this point, because you want to start with the whole, and
25not start excluding people right at the very beginning. At

least that's my personal opinion.

MS. FISCHER: The question that I have would be on the Open Meetings Act. I know in Fairbanks they ruled now where no more than one person can meet at a time. Are we included in that, or like if we come in the night before and decided to get together, would we be covered under the announcements, since we're going to have a meeting the next day?

MR. GOLTZ: I was hoping that the State Attorney would stick around.

MS. FISCHER: Because that's become a real 11sticky problem here in the State.

MR. GOLTZ: That's a State statute. You're 13probably subject to that, too, even though this is a Federal 14committee, it has State participants, and -- and they are 15bound.

I don't know the answer to that question.

MR. CLOUD: Well, wouldn't there be a 18 distinction between the Trustees themselves holding a meeting 19 and a public advisory group talking amongst each other?

MR. GOLTZ: There may be. I don't -- I don't 21want to speak for the State. I can find out. That may very 22well be the distinction. You aren't decision-makers. You are 23advisers.

24 Yeah?

25

DR. FRENCH: Yeah. We have what we call a

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Restoration Council in Kodiak, and both Rick and I are members of it, and it does go by both meetings.

But if we either volunteered to or -- or were asked to present information on the Public Advisory Group, and solicited input from that group, would be violating the Open Meetings Statute on that?

MR. GOLTZ: No, frankly I -- no, I don't think so. You're -- you're talking about meeting with a third entity,

DR. FRENCH: Yeah.

MR. GOLTZ: and I think that's probably 1 part of your charge, to communicate with a constituency.

DR. FRENCH: Okay. That -- I was -- I was 13hoping that would be the answer, but, yeah, good.

MR. GOLTZ: The one thing you do -- you want to 15avoid, start -- starting pos- -- creating a posture of you as 16expert, even though you may be, you're not here for that 17purpose. You're here to represent broader views. Hopefully, 18there's enough concentric circles here that by drawing them 19around all of these views, we've included the entire public. 20That's the idea of this. If there are any holes in it that 21show up, you should let us know that, because we -- we may want 20to broaden this and -- and re-do the charter.

This is -- and I think Charlie Cole gave a very

and I think Charlie Cole gave a very

this is a funnel

and I think Charlie Cole gave a very

this is a funnel

and I think Charlie Cole gave a very

this is a funnel

and I think Charlie Cole gave a very

this is a funnel

and I think Charlie Cole gave a very

this is a funnel

and I think Charlie Cole gave a very

action. I'm sure it's -- you're going to find it untidy, but democracy always has been.

MR. TOTEMOFF: As far as defining the edges on this, and not participating in any decision-making process, where -- where is that line drawn? When it comes times to vote or are we allowed to go out and do fact finding and actual -- actually bringing in the projects and input from our respective interest groups?

MR. GOLTZ: I think what you want to avoid is the perception that you got this seat to enhance your personal 10well-being, your personal financial well-being. Anything that 11might add to that perception should be an alarm bell. Now, I - 12- frankly I don't think that alarm bell rings as long as you 13speak in tones that include all native landowners, or 14Mr. Phillips speaks in ways that include all commercial 15tourism. I don't think that's what these statutes were 16intended to avoid. They're really at bottom line intended to 17avoid tainting the decision-making process with personal 18financial motivations. The ball you want to keep your eye on 19is representing the group, and the ball you want to avoid is --20is the green one in your pocket.

MR. MUTTER: Any other questions?

MR. GOLTZ: I don't think this is going to be a 23real large problem, except in a couple of cases maybe for you 24and maybe for forest products, as far as I know. I mean, I 25looked down at some of the projects, and I -- I think you have

R & R COURT REPORTERS

21

to be aware of it, you have to keep it in you mind, but it shouldn't become such a tumor that you can't do the work. You're -- you're here to do the work and represent a group. MR. MUTTER: One of the things you need to take a look at in the operating procedures, or the -- is the process for voting and how you want to do that, too, and that -- that should be on the agenda for the next meeting. Any other questions of Keith? MR. GOLTZ: If there aren't any others, I'm going to seek opportunities to be silent, but I will be in the 10back of the room. MR. MUTTER: Yes? 11 Is there an agenda for today's MS. BRODIE: 1 2 13meeting? This is an agenda for the next meeting, correct? MR. MUTTER: You should have one in your white 14 $\sqrt{1}$ 5-- didn't you get a -- did you get an agenda in the mail? MR. CLOUD: It came in the mail. 16 MR. MUTTER: Here's one. 17 MS. BRODIE: No, I -- I didn't get that. This 18 √gis -- this is an extra? UNIDENTIFIED: There's -- there's some on the 20 $\frac{1}{2}$ table. She's getting them. MR. DIEHL: They're out on the table. 22 MR. MUTTER: There's some extra copies out on 23 4the table by the coffee. UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, she's getting them. 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. MUTTER: Okay.

MS. EVANS: Does anybody else need one?

MR. MUTTER: One -- one thing you ought to take a look at is make sure we've got telephone numbers, addresses and so on for each of you correct in your notebook. If -- if there's anything to be changed, why let me know and I'll take care of that.

MS. FISCHER: Yeah, should we let you know now or after the meeting or what?

MR. MUTTER: How about after the meeting?

MS. FISCHER: Okay.

MR. MUTTER: Okay. Well, at this time I wanted 12to turn the meeting over to Dave Gibbons, who's the interim 13Administrative Director of the Restoration Team, however I 14understand he got stuck in Yakutat or Juneau. He's been out 15moose hunting and couldn't make it in today. And I notice that 16his stand-in, Mr. Broderson, has conveniently stepped away from 17the table.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Mr. Broderson to -- to try to 19get ahold of Alex Swiderski from the Department of Law to try 20to determine an answer to your question about the State's Open 21Meetings Act, so

MR. MUTTER: Okay.

10

25

MS. RUTHERFORD: we don't want to keep 24you holding until the next meeting, and then

MR. MUTTER: Well, at that -- at this time what

R & R COURT REPORTERS

I think would be appropriate to do would be for the Restoration Team to introduce themselves and give you a little information about their background. They're -- they're now at the table, so if we could start with you, Ken?

MR. RICE: I'm Ken Rice. I'm the Department of Agriculture representative for Mike Barton. I'd like to pass on that Mike had to go to Washington, D.C. to talk with his boss today, and was unable to be here to welcome the Public Advisory Group into existence.

I have a background in -- in wildlife management and a 10number of years of experience in -- in resource management with 11the Forest Service. And I'm glad to meet you.

MS. RUTHERFORD: I'm Marty Rutherford. I'm --13I am Charlie Cole's designate on the Restoration Team, however,
14I'm a strange duck in that I'm an employee of the Department of
15Natural Resources. Since the Department of Natural Resources
16is not present on the Trustee Council, I serve as that
17coordination for them. I have a background in political
18science; I was Deputy Commission of the Department of Community
19and Regional Affairs and Director there for nine years. I'm
20looking forward to working with you folks; I've only been a
21part of this project, myself, since December, unlike most of
22these folks who have been involved prior to the Settlement, so
31'm still on somewhat of a learning curve myself.

MS. BERGMANN: Hi, my name is Pamela Bergmann, 25 and I'm the Department of Interior representative to the

Restoration Team, and I'd also like to welcome everyone, and indicate that we're looking forward to working with you. like Marty, am one of the newcomers to the group, I have just been in the Settlement since la- -- well, actually, the NRDA part of the Oil Spill since last October; however, I was involved in the response portion of the Spill since March 24th, 1989. I work for an office called the Office of Environmental Affairs, which is part of the Office of the Secretary for the Department of Interior, which is located here in Anchorage. g have, also, been very active in the Alaska Regional Response 1_0 Team, which is the group of federal and state agencies that do $\sqrt{100}$ contingency planning for oil spills and oil spill response. 12I've been real active in developing guidelines for protecting 13 wildlife resources following the Oil Spill. And my background 14 is in social science, which is a little bit different than a 15lot of the other folks on the Trustee Council and the 16Restoration Team.

DR. MONTAGUE: Thanks, Pam. My name is Jerome 18Montague, I represent Carl Rosier and the Alaska Department of 19Fish & Game on the Restoration Team. My background is an 20ecologist, until recently, I was Director of the Oil Spill 21Impact Assessment & Restoration Division, which is combined, 22recently, with our Habitat Division and a new division is about 23to be named; the Habitat & Restoration Division, and I'll be 24chief of Restoration in that new division. And since we all 25read the Settlement in October, the development of the Public

Advisory Group, last year, has been on our minds frequently, and it's been a long process getting you here, and as I'm sure you'll find, everything we do is a pretty long process. But welcome and it's nice to have the litigation bans lifted and have the public involved.

MR. MORRIS: I'm Byron Morris, I represent

Steve Pennoyer from the National Fishery Service and NOAA on

the Restoration Team. My background on biology- -- Ph.D. in

biological oceanography. Prior to the Spill, I worked in OCS

Oil & Gas leasing programs for NOAA, and prior to that, the

nenvironmental studies programming the Bureau of Land Management

conducted in the State in '77 through '80 is when I was with

them. I'm the old man of the group, I've been on this job

since -- in more ways than one -- since April of '89, and I've

been partly responsible for the Yellow Book, Pink Book, Buff

Book, Green Book and now the Periwinkle Book.

MR. BRODERSON: My turn?

16

17

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

MR. BRODERSON: I'm Mark Broderson with

19Environmental Conservation. Excuse me for dropping out there,

20though, when I went to talk to the State lawyers to find out

21about the Open Meetings Act and see if we could get some

22clarification. So, before I get into myself, I'd like to do

23that one. Craig Tillery from the Department of Law suggests

24that what you all do in terms of conduct between now and the

25next meeting is that it's fine to talk to each other, but don't

R & R COURT REPORTERS

come to any decisions amongst yourselves out of the public arena here, no vote trading, et cetera, and that you should be fine. That he will give you a better guidance than that at either the next meeting or prior to that via mailing, and that should all -- keep all of you out of trouble on that issue. He's not sure if it applies or not, and we'll let you know formally soon.

Now, back to me, I've spent some time with DEC in the 170s. I'm an oceanographer by trade, got tired of government, went commercial fishing for 11 years, had a friend of mine at 10DEC call me up one day and said I wasn't doing my bit for the 11State of Alaska, the Oil Spill had occurred, and I needed to 12come back and work on it, so that's what I've been doing for 13the last two and a half years, and I plan to go back to fishing 14as soon as this over. So

- 15 MS. BRODIE: In another 10 years.
- MR. BRODERSON: In another 10 years, yes, God 17forbid; but although, there is money coming in for the year 182001, which we'll get into shortly. I guess that's enough 19about me.
- MR. MUTTER: Mark, I'm going to turn the agenda 21 over to you.
- MR. BRODERSON: Okay.
- 23 MR. MUTTER: Have at it.
- MR. BRODERSON: I guess you all heard that Dave 25Gibbons, unfortunately, was unable to be here, and I consider

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
100
  that unfortunate, also, since I now get to run the meeting.
 extends his apologies, he spent most of yesterday trying to get
 into Juneau to get up here today, and finally got into Juneau
 today and figured the heck with all of this, he was going to
 stay there since he couldn't get here in time today to help.
 Since we're running a little behind and we do want to get into
 the meat of this, I thought we could skip over the brief
 history and the Court agreement since the Attorney General
 basically covered that this morning. If there are any
 questions, we could certainly come back to it, but we'll skip
100 over that and get down to the part that I'm sure is near and
1/1 dear to everyone's heart, which is money; and that's my one
<sub>12</sub>section which I will try and get out of the way quickly, and
_{1}3then we get onto the other parts of it. I have a couple of
_{\parallel 4}handouts here for folks that I created late last night, so it's
15not in your books and you'll all need to put it in your books,
∥6if you don't mind. Pass some that way and the majority of it
17this way.
                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where does it go in the
18
1 9booklet?
                  MR. BRODERSON:
                                  Pardon?
20
                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where does it go in the
21
2book?
                                  I looked and I couldn't figure
                  MR. BRODERSON:
23
#4it out, so hopefully, somebody else is smarter than I am.
          (Off record comments)
25
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. BRODERSON: The first one you see is a nice stair-step, which is intended to give you an idea of when the money comes in and the amounts that we receive, and it's, more or less, self-explanatory. We're coming up on the 150 million dollar payment to be paid December 1st of 1992. The next payment, in September 1st of '93, is 100 million dollars; and then, every year after that, on September 1st, we pick up 70 million through the year 2001, which comes up to a nice round number of 900 million.

The other page here is an attempt to show, roughly, Nowhere we are now with the cash on-hand. The first line up 11 there in 12/9/91, Exxon made its first payment of 100 million ₁₂dollars. I'm used to thinking in thousands, but this 13particular table is in millions. It gives an idea of the $_{\parallel 4}$ magnitude of this whole project, that one does use millions ₁5rather than thousands. In 12/9 of '91, part of the 100 million 16 went for reimbursements, as the Attorney General talked about 17this morning; that was 54.5 million. The '92 Work Plan was 1/819.3 million, that has not all been expended, but I, for ∥opurposes of this discussion, will assume it is. The next payment coming in from Exxon on December 1st is 150 million, 1 out of that monies, Exxon gets part of it back; actually, they never pay us. The estimates that I have heard have ranged from 2340 to 50 million dollars, this is for cleanup both this summer 4and last summer. And so for purposes of discussion, to give √syou some idea of the money we're talking about, I've just put

45 million down here; it could be more, it could be less, but it's in that ballpark.

The Blue Book, I'm unfortunately not an artist and so periwinkle just leaves me cold. The Blue Book there is currently at a value of 37.8 million dollars, that's not been approved by the Trustee Council, but again, I was trying to get some order of magnitude down here for you all to look at to see the cash on-hand. Let's see, where are we on this? leaves 93.4 in the account balance in the court registry at this point. There will be some reimbursement probably comes $_{\parallel}$ out of this this year, also, on the December 1st payment. $1 \parallel 1$ has not been determined yet, to the best of my knowledge, if 1/2 you want to draw your own conclusion, I'd use the 54.5 number ₁ again this year as last year, at least that's what I heard the $_{\parallel 4}$ Attorney General say this morning, for purposes of discussion. 15 If -- my understanding is is that if we find we need more η_{6} money than that, then we won't take that full amount of $\sqrt{1}$ 7reimbursement, but that's a decision that has not yet been η_{R} made. And so, I've put a question mark there, it's idle \P_{9} speculation on my part to go any farther than I have on that. The next payment -- so, basically, what we have here, alafter you've paid for the '93 Work Plan, and if you assume 254.5, you've still got in the neighborhood of 40 million 3dollars sitting in the Joint Trust Fund. So, there's the money 4that we have in-hand now. A year from now, we'll get another

R & R COURT REPORTERS

√5100 million from Exxon, and then 70 million dollars every year

after that through 2001.

Any questions on that?

MS. BENTON: Are we ever going to know a total figure for the question mark for what's actually been spent by the Agencies that needs to be reimbursed?

MR. BRODERSON: Yeah. The question mark for this year will be determined shortly.

MS. BENTON: I understand that. But what's really owed

MR. BRODERSON: In terms of the total 10reimbursement, there's actually a little footnote down here $_{1}$ where I tried not to get into it 'cause I was trying to save $\frac{1}{2}$ time, but if folks want to, we can go into that and spend a 13little time on that, and I'll wave my hands and you'll realize $_{\parallel 4}$ I haven't told you any more than when I started. But there are 15 two solid numbers, one in the Settlement is 67 million for the 16Federal Government and 75 million for the State Government $\sqrt{1}$ 7through -- well, there's two different time periods -- but Ressentially, through January 1st, 1991 -- or is it -- yeah, \parallel 9January 1st, 1991 for the litigation, for cleanup and for damage assessment and restoration up through that time. The periods that are fuzzy are the periods since then to now. The damage assessment and restoration is a fixed 22 period, we'll have a handle on that one in the next few months. The litigation is ongoing, it's got a cap on it of a million

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

√5dollars a month, it can't exceed that under terms of the

104

Settlement and it cannot exceed 40 million dollars total. I -- closer than that, I just flat out don't know.

On cleanup costs, cleanup is, essentially, over.

Another one of my tasks is to close that one out on the State side, we're down to two people full-time and two people part-time currently still working on cleanup; so, we're not spending very much money there any more. We'll have a number on that one, I suspect, in about six months. So, it's coming, we just don't have it right now. And in terms of spending out of the Settlement, there's very little being expended any more, it's strictly past expenditures that have already occurred.

11 Yeah, Pam.

MS. BRODIE: Has there been any kind of 13 auditing of the money already spend; and if not, will that 14 happen automatically or how does it happen; how is that 15 decision made?

MR. BRODERSON: On the monies that Exxon has 17spent, the Coast Guard is about two days away from finishing an 18audit of that; they've been back in Houston for about three 19months doing a very careful audit of that one. The monies on 20the State side have been audited through a contractor that we 21have down in Seattle, and that's how we're taking care of our 22costs. And I don't know how they're being done on the Federal 23side. Does anybody know on the Federal side, in terms of 24pulling together the State -- or the Federal reimbursement 25charges?

So, on the numbers, the 67 million and the 75 million dollars, on those two numbers, auditing is not necessary; that was done as part of the Settlement, that the two sides -- the two governments satisfied themselves that the other government was giving them a valid number. And so, my understanding is is that there will not be further auditing of those amounts.

The amounts since the 1st of January, '91, I believe that there is negotiations going on as to what type of auditing should be done on that to satisfy each other's curiosity about the other's numbers. But that's the extent of my knowledge on 10that subject.

- MS. BRODIE: How can we or other members of the 12public get more information about how that 67 million and 75 million dollars was, in fact, spent?
- MR. BRODERSON: It's -- yeah, it's a negotiated 15figure between the two governments, and I think that's
- MS. BRODIE: Because the reason I push 17this
- MR. BRODERSON: Um-hum.
- MS. BRODIE: is because it is money that 20comes out of the Settlement.
- MR. BRODERSON: Right.
- MS. BRODIE: And so, it's money that can't be a spent on restoration.
- MR. BRODERSON: Well, except when the 25Settlement amount -- total Settlement amount was determined,

R & R COURT REPORTERS

these two numbers were taken into account to make the Settlement number high enough to account for those numbers. And they're negotiated amounts, and I don't think that there's any more information available on it, but I could certainly ask and try and find out.

MS. BRODIE: Our objection, ever since the Settlement, has been that we didn't feel it really was a billion dollars, it's called a billion dollars. But because there were these automatic -- for several reasons, including the fact that these things were automatically taken out, we lodidn't feel that that should be counted as part of the last thement. And there's -- we've never felt we had a handle on what happened to that money.

MR. BRODERSON: Well, it's part of the 14Settlement, it's not, necessarily, going to restoration. The 15Settlement was to pay for both restoration and the cleanup 16costs and damage assessment costs that the governments 17incurred. For these monies to be let go and not collected by 18the governments is injurious to taxpayers outside of the Spill 19....

MS. BRODIE: No.

MR. BRODERSON: affected area, so

MS. BRODIE: No. I didn't mean to imply that, 23but just that there's a difference between court costs and what 24you're getting as compensation for your damages. So, that 25these were part of our court costs rather than -- I don't want

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to get into this too much, it's just that we're looking for more information on that.

MR. BRODERSON: I think the answer --

MS. BRODIE: Yeah.

MR. BRODERSON: I don't know how to get you more information on that one, I don't have it.

MS. BRODIE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Walt Jerrad (ph) may know the Federal procedures for accounting on this.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, the Federal 10Government now is in the process of trying to collect all its 11costs, and we're hoping to have that pulled together by some 12time early '93 of what those costs are going to be for that 13second period of time.

MR. BRODERSON: Back on -- one thing I should 15mention on the 75 million, it's not an automatic thing that the 16Government has to take it. The numbers that I've been hearing 17lately on the State side is that we're, actually, only going to 18request about 72 rather than the 75. That whomever is doing 19the accounting, as I say, we have a private contractor doing it 20for us, we're only going to take the amount that we actually 21expend, that is opposed to the amount that we actually could 22take. And the number that I was given about three days ago is 23that it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 72 million not 3475 million.

Yeah, Pam.

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MS. BERGMANN: On the response side for those costs, those all ended up going through the Coast Guard for approval and verification. And there had to be approval ahead of time before any expenditures were made, that you couldn't just go out and do whatever, and then go to the Coast Guard and say by the way, here's a bill for this. So, those were all pre-approved ahead of time, and then all of that financial information went through one office within the Coast Guard, through their own accounting people to make sure that they agreed that those were fair costs for reimbursement for So, I recall, somewhere along the way, that there 10response. $_{1}$ was some sort of OMB or someone was working on an audit of I can't speak to the costs that were incurred on 12those costs. $_{\parallel}$ 3the NRDA studies, and that was before I was really part of this $\sqrt{4}$ group, and I don't know how that piece was handled. \parallel 5least, on the response side, there was a requirement that the 1_6 Coast Guard put forward the people -- you know, hoops that the 17people had to jump through or agencies had to jump through in 1 gorder get those costs approved. MR. BRODERSON: 19 For the DR. MONTAGUE: The damage assessment studies, 20

DR. MONTAGUE: The damage assessment studies, 21the costs are very straightforward, they're all in the Work 22Plan books, the actual budgets that were approved for each 23agency to spend. They can be reimbursed up to the amount they 24were authorized, not for over-expenditures. But we don't know, 25until we do the accounting, whether they spent the full amount

they were authorized to spend. But the authorized budgets for the damage assessment effort are contained in each of those year's study plans.

MR. BRODERSON: I should mention that what Pam was talking about there in terms of the Coast Guard authorizing those for the Federal side, the State had a similar person, in terms of the State on-scene coordinator, that had to approve all State expenditures.

What I'm trying to get at with MS. BRODIE: d these questions is that I get anecdotal remarks from people, nand I don't know how to judge them; that say well, some of $1 \parallel 1$ these studies are costing more than they should, they could be $_{12}$ done more cheaply than this, and maybe that's not true, I don't 13know. But if I look at a study and it says so much for 14personnel and so much for travel, I don't know how to interpret 15that. I don't think the Trustees know how to interpret whether 16these are appropriate costs. And even if you give us all the #7information, it doesn't mean we're going to be able to be able 18 to judge it. And I'm hoping we can have some people who do $\| \circ \|_0$ know how to compare these with what is normally spent for this okind of study to give us some judgment. And what's past, you 1/2 know, we can't really get that money back, but in terms of the 121993 study, we look at this Work Plan, it says it's going to 3cost so much, and I'd like some expert, outside the agency 4 expert, input into whether these studies can be done 5competently for less money.

MR. BRODERSON: Should I try that or does somebody else want to answer it?

DR. MONTAGUE: In terms of studies, and that was the example you gave, Dr. Spies and the peer reviewers are research experts outside the agency. They comment to us on, you know, the cost effectiveness of a project, and I'm sure they would give you their opinions on them. And they may not - you know, they may not agree with what's in the Blue Book at the moment, but they'll give you their opinion.

MR. BRODERSON: As valuable as this 10conversation is, we are getting off of the agenda, and perhaps, 11we need to save this for the next session. Hello? Do you want 12to ask one more question after I've said that?

- DR. FRENCH: No. I just wanted to present the 14opposite side of the issue, and that is that, of course, you're 15probably all very well aware that when you force the University 16to under-recover the actual costs on projects that
- MR. BRODERSON: They have (ph) 50%, I don't see 18what the problem is.
- DR. FRENCH: You're putting forward a position 20 of under-recovery of several million dollars, and you're well 1 aware of it, and those costs are being passed on and borne by 2 the students and the users of the University system when those 2 monies cannot be recovered.
- MR. BRODERSON: Yes. Excuse me for being so 25flip there, I'm sorry. So, anyway, we probably should get back

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to the

DR. FRENCH: ONR has audited those under those numbers, by the way.

MR. BRODERSON: Yeah. We probably should get back to the agenda here to get through and try and put all of this in some kind of context in terms of the Restoration Plan and the Environmental Impact Statement, et cetera; and then, perhaps, the questions could be asked either at the end of this or at the next session.

I sus- -- let's see, according to the agenda here, 10we're supposed to drop on to Public Involvement here, which 11Marty Rutherford's going to address.

MS. RUTHERFORD: I apologize for not being here 3this morning, I was pulled into a meeting with the Governor, 4but Doug allowed me to roll the role of the Public Advisory 5Group and the public participation discussion together. I 6understand that the Trustees did spend some time talking about 7the role, but I think it's worthwhile to just briefly go 18through it one more time.

The role of the Public Advisory Group -- and if it's 20 all right with you, I think I'll use the acronym, the PAG, 21 because pretty soon -- in fact, you're going to hear a lot of 22 acronyms, we're going to -- RT, Restoration Team; NRDA, which I 31 sheard several people say, Natural Resource Damage Assessment.

24 It took me six months to figure it out, I think we probably 25 should give you guys a list of them, it'll help in the long

112

run.

But the role of the PAG is laid out in the Charter that was approved by the Trustee Council and signed by the Secretary of Interior this month; it was actually amended and resigned. By the way, the Charter is located in your Volume Number 1, Section 4(B). Doug Mutter, your designated Federal officer, has also provided some of the very same information in that document that's called Background & Guidelines; it's also in Section 4(C); and where it talks about duties, it's on Page 6. And the Duty Statement is pretty straightforward; it indicates 10 that the Public Advisory Group shall advise the Trustee Council η_1 on all decisions relating to injury assessment, restoration ₁₂activities or other use of natural resource damage recoveries, 13 including the planning for, the evaluation of and allocation of 14available funds; the planning for, evaluation of and conduct of 15 injury assessments; the planning for, evaluation of and conduct 160f restoration activities and the coordination of all those 17three.

Of these four tasks, the -- by far and away the most pimportant in our opinion is the planning for, evaluation of and conduct of restoration activities. It's through working together on this task that we'll find a way to make Alaska whole, to make the affected areas as much like they were prior March 24th, 1989 as is humanly possible. The other duties that's probably true for all of us.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

Towards this goal, the Public Advisory Group itself
will be involved with the development of the Draft Restoration
Plan, and eventually, the Final Restoration Plan; as well,
secondarily, as the review of the '93 Work Plan, the
development and review of the '94 Work Plan, the monitoring
program for the damage resources. You will also -- and I think
this is equally as important, you will facilitate, and as
Charlie says, you'll be the funnel; you'll facilitate the
process of working with your constituencies in insuring that
they understand, and participate and have input to all of these
loproducts.

However, your responsibilities of working with the 12public are shared ones. The Trustee Council itself and the 13Restoration Team will also continue to hold public meetings and 14hearings concerning the very same issues that I mentioned 15before. It's through this combined effort that we hope to 16develop an excellent public participation program, I don't 17think anyone would argue that we haven't had one to date. It 18will, however, require very good coordination, and we're really 19committed to that; in fact, we're really excited about you're 20being seated today. We're looking for some significant 21improvement in this area.

I, also, want to tell you a little bit about what's 23been happening to date concerning public involvement, and a bit 24about the group that's called the Public Participation Work 25Group and its tasks. As you're all aware, the Trustee Council

has held many public meetings itself, beginning with its

December 5th, 1991 organizational meeting which set up the

operating structure for the post-Settlement activities. I,

also, know that you were informed that with the exception of

some discussions on confidential personnel matters, all of

these meetings have been open meetings, and that practice has

now been formalized in Alaska Statute; I think it's S.B. 478.

Most of these meetings have utilized the State Legislative

teleconference facilities which allows you to participate with

all the remote sites, and I'm sure you'll probably want to

10consider that yourselves, in the future.

In addition, since December of '91, two series of 12statewide public hearing have been conducted by the Restoration 13 Team on behalf of the Trustee Council. The purpose of the 1/4 first series, which was held in January and February of this 15year, was to solicit comments regarding the public 16participation in the injury assessment and restoration process. $\sqrt{1}$ 7 These meetings were held throughout the affected area, and it 18was Anchorage, Juneau, Chenega Bay, Cordova, Fairbanks, $\parallel_{\mathfrak{I}}$ Tatitlek, Homer, Seward and so forth; all throughout the and Fairbanks. The 1 comments from these meetings were then evaluated, and necommendations were provided to the Trustee Council regarding 3the role, the structure and the operating procedures for the da Public Advisory Group. days

The second series of meetings were held in April and

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

25

May of this year, and provided the public with an opportunity to comment on the Restoration Framework. It also included an opportunity for them to comment on the '92 Draft Work Plan; however, they had just received it, so that was a little bit of sharing of what was in and some response back; we got most of those through the mails, however. And finally, the last thing we dealt with as part of that series was the composition of the Public Advisory Group. Again, the hearings were held throughout the affected area and in Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau.

As a bit of general information, all the papers that 10 nare discussed during the Trustee Council meetings are provided 12to the public either at the meetings or through the Oil Spill 1 3 Public Information Center, which we call OSPIC, another 14acronym; it's located right across the hall here in this 15building. A transcript of each meeting is made and is also 16publicly available. In addition, in early June of this year, $\sqrt{1}$ 7the Trustee Council decided to make available to the public, nsthrough, again, OSPIC, the Natural Resource Damage Assessment, ∥gagain NRDA, scientific studies, including their interim and ofinal reports and their detailed study plans. I think additional copies of these were provided to libraries 12throughout the State and, I believe, around the country. 3 new study information or as new reports are made available from 4 ongoing studies, these will also be added to OSPIC and made ₅available.

Now, a little bit about who and what the Public

Participation Work Group is. This is a work group that was set

up through the administrative function and consists of five

people; Ken Rice of the Forest Service, and is on the

Restoration Team, is on it; Peg Carrer (ph) with the Alaska

Department of Fish & Game; L.J. Evans, who's seated right back

there in the green, who you probably all have met or I'm sure

you will get to know well, she serves as the Public Outreach

person working for Dave Gibbons as part of this administrative

function; Sandra Rabinowich (ph), who's seated right next to

10her is with the National Park Service and is also part of the

11restoration process; and I serve as Chair.

This group had the task of developing the structure and 13the process for advertising and choosing the Public Advisory 14Group members. We developed the Draft Public Advisory Group 15Operating Procedures. We assisted the Restoration Team with 16the two sets of public hearings that were held to date. And we 17helped develop the handouts and text describing the issues that 18were provided at those meetings.

The Work Group will continue on and end its function, phopefully, in March of this year. This year's tasks, which are lin -- noted in the Blue Book, as all the Work Group tasks are noted in the Periwinkle Blue '94 Work -- '93 Work Plan Work agroup Book. This year's tasks include coordination with you, the Public Advisory Group, concerning public hearings that will as held by yourselves, the Restoration Team and the Trustee

Council. We are to assist the Restoration Team and the Trustee Council with organizing their public hearings; review the public information or public participation element of the Draft Restoration Plan, once it's developed; define the goals, objectives and strategies of public participation, which we'll, hopefully, look to you for some fairly significant guidance; facilitate and review public information materials and to define new public informational products and processes which need to be created to improve the whole process of communicating with the public.

I think that wraps up everything I want to say. I just 1 want to, once again, say I'm really glad you're seated and 1 going to be part of this, and if you have any questions about 1 this, I'll be glad to try to answer them.

MR. BRODERSON: In theory, we're supposed to 15take a break now, would folks object if we pushed on for a 16while, considering we got kind of a late start after lunch? 170kay. The next topic is the Restoration Plan, which is really 18the reason we're all here, and without further ado, I'll turn 19it over to John Strand and Bob Loffler.

(Off record comments)

20

MS. BRODIE: I'm sorry, I have one question 22going back to the funds, and that was I think the first payment 23was 90 million dollars and, yet, this says 100 million?

MR. BRODERSON: Did I screw it up?

MR. BRODERSON: Did I screw it up?

 $_{25}$ (Indiscernible) about 2:00 o'clock yesterday when I did this,

in the morning.

MS. BRODIE: So, I think this would change, also, the bottomline of what's available.

MR. BRODERSON: Okay. Yeah. I got (indiscernible - microphone off).

MR. STRAND: Well, thank you, Mark. I'm sure I can speak for everybody on the Restoration Planning Working Group, we're very pleased that the Public Advisory Group has been formed, and we welcome the opportunity to brief you today, and look forward to working with you in the future. Like many nof the other work groups, some of which Marty spoke about just 1 recently, each of the Trustee agencies sends a representative 12to the Restoration Planning Working Group. I represent the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration; Bob, to my left, 14Bob Loffler represents the Alaska Department of Environmental 1 5 Conservation. Sandy Rabinowich is in the back, representing 16the Park Service, Department of the Interior. Art Weiner has 1/7been a long-time member of our group, representing DNR; he has now been, I think, sent to Habitats & Lands. Veronica Gilbert ¶gis not here, but she represents Department of Natural OResources. Carol Gorbicks (ph), Fish & Wildlife Service, 1 Department of the Interior. Ray Thompson from Park Service --22excuse me, from Forest Service. And Mark Fraeker (ph) from the 3Alaska Department of Fish & Game adds to the group.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

As a working group, we've been in existence since, I

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

√sthink, January of 1990; although, we were not fully manned,

that is every Trustee Council -- or every Trustee Agency having a member until about June of 1990. We've been working for two -- two and a half years there, therefore, with one goal in sight, and that's to produce the Draft Restoration Plan. And as you might expect, we're hard at work on that task at present.

Pending completion of a rigorous internal review of that document, I believe it's still the intent of the Trustees to publish this document in March of 1993. We, internally, will have a working draft for review sometime in December; locertainly, key elements of that Restoration Plan will be lavailable to the Public Advisory Group; perhaps, some of those lower will be available at your next meeting on December 2nd.

- The presentation today will largely focus on how our 14planning group has approached the task of developing the 15Restoration Plan, with special emphasis on our current 16activities. Today's presentation will, also, discuss the very 17important role that the Public Advisory Group can play in the 18restoration planning process. While we only have 20 minutes 19today, I would ask that you consider this just an introduction 20to the topic of restoration planning. I know that we are, 21again, on your agenda for December 2nd, and we'll get into much 22more of the details of our efforts at that time.
- Before I ask Bob Loffler to continue with today's 24presentation, I thought I would call to your attention, 25however, two very important documents that our group has put

together on behalf of the Trustee Council and the Trustee

Agencies. I think that each of these will provide you a good review of our planning group's activities to date, and give you a better understanding of the logic that we adopted to approach this task of producing the Draft Restoration Plan.

The first of these documents is the Restoration
Planning Work Group summary report produced in 1990, we call
this the Blue Book. It may not be in your folders just yet,
but I'll make sure that Doug gets copies for your folder. This
document highlights the approach that our working group took to
collect ideas and concepts for how one could restore injured
resources and services. And it provides, I think, a good
caccount of the results of the workshops, and symposia and
spublic scoping meetings that were held for that purposes.

The second document, I know this is in your folders, is 15the Restoration Framework document, produced, I believe, in 16April of 1992. And this will serve us -- providing a process 17and structure to guide the restoration of injured resources and 18 services. It's really the blueprint and the guidebook for how 19 we are approaching the development of the Restoration Plan. 20 Many of the ideas and concepts that were put forth first time 21 in this book are further developed, evaluated and better 22 described in the Restoration Planning -- the Restoration 23 Framework document.

I'll, now, ask Bob to continue today's briefing.

25Again, I welcome the opportunity to work with you, and we'll

see you again on the 2nd of December. Bob.

MR. LOFFLER: Okay. What I would like to do is three things. I'd like to give you an introduction in the basics of the Restoration Plan, sort of what the concepts are, the mechanics, the steps. Then, I'd like to talk about involvement by the Public Advisory Group; that is, where we'd like your help, where we think you can be the most effective. And finally, give you sort of a brief schedule so you'll know, like, when you can expect to see us again, and what we'll be carrying under our arms.

So, with that, let me start with sort of the basics. 10 1/1 Well, conceptually, the Restoration Plan, in concept, isn't all 12too complicated. It's really -- the information base for it is 13 really three questions. Was it injured by the Spill? $_{\parallel}$ 4recovering? What, if anything, can we do to help; that is, ₁5what restoration techniques exist, how effective are they? Those simple questions, of course, hide a lot of 16 $\sqrt{100}$ 7complexity. And was it injured by the Spill, some places where η_{8} -- some places, the information's quite good; some places, the sinformation is not particularly good. Is it recovering? helpful to know if the population is declining, stable, 1 recovering, mostly recovered or if they're continuing some 12lethal injuries. And on what, if anything, can we do to help 33 is a complex question. What I'd like to do is spend on a 4 second on this question and tell you where we came with -- how

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

√sthe techniques were developed that we're analyzing so far.

Back in 1990, there was a variety of scientific and public symposia, feasibility studies, literature support, agency ideas, and they culminated in this book. This book is - portions of it are listing of ideas for restoration. We, then -- the group, then, went out for public review. On the basis of public comments, staff evaluation. They distilled some of those ideas into categories, which are listed in here.

Now, we use the term "restoration option" to be a category of techniques. So, you could list everything we could possibly do for the Spill area, but my life's too short to think of them loall now; that is, they'll all come up. So, what they are is they're grouped into categories; and we use the name "options" light as a category of techniques.

Well, those options, some of them -- most of them are
14in here, they went out for public comment. There has been
15public comment, some staff evaluation, and they're further
16distilled (ph), and that's what we're looking at now. So,
17we're, right now, in the process of getting our information
18base together, being was it injured by the Spill, the status of
19recovery and what techniques are available the injury. And I'm
20including techniques to prevent further degradation,
21replacement techniques, the whole range. Well, in the best of
22all worlds, what we do is we take all the things that we wanted
23to do and then we'd go do them, and you wouldn't need a
24Restoration Plan. Unfortunately, even with quite a wealthy
25settlement, there's not enough money to buy all the land we

want, to do all the techniques we want, some choices are required. The plan is the way we make those -- is both the information base and it's the way we make those choices.

We're, now, in the process of putting together groups of alternatives. So, let me talk for a second about what that And those alternatives are being sort of different combinations of choices. Since that's where we're going, let me give that a minute. We do that as a way to show the public and yourselves the choices facing the Trustees. It's to focus the pubic review and comment on a reasonable range of viable 10 choices. Now, what an alternative is is it's some policies, $_{1}$ 1 it's a way to approach restoration, and then what techniques we 12should use. So, it's techniques, what we call options, groups 130f things that correspond to some policies needing approach. 14That's -- for example, it's possible to put together an ₁ salternative where most of the funding emphasizes protection; 16things like habitat acquisition, other protection techniques. $\sqrt{1}$ 7It's possible to put together another them or another series of policies which would, of course, be more detailed when they go $\sqrt{1}$ gout to the public, certainly, after your review, that emphasize \mathfrak{g}_0 other things. But those are approaches we can use, and they're 1a way of showing the public the choices.

Some simple concepts, when we build them, are that 23 alternatives should represent the range of significant agency 4 and public opinion. That we want to represent that range, but 25 don't multiply them so great as to cause confusion, that is

shoot the three to five alternatives, and don't do things that are dumb, which means if there's no controversy, don't create a strong-man alternative, one that creates controversy. If there's general agreement on some things, it's a good idea, we might put it in awe (ph). But in any case, we have the information base, injury, status of recovery, the effective techniques, we're going to alternatives, different approaches, different ways to combine them. And finally, in the future, one will be selected, and that will be the long-range plan with updates.

So, that's, I won't say Restoration Planning 101, it's 10 naybe Restoration Planning 1 or a half or something. But the 12 next portion of this is where we think where we would like your $_{1}$ 3help, where we think you can be the most effective. Well, the 4 first part is to help review our information base. 15believe there has been a great amount of scientific inquiry and 16bright minds that have put together a lot of our information, nany of the fishermen know parts of the Spill area quite well and may have something to add. Certainly, a lot of people pliving in the villages, the kayakers, people who run tour boats, may have ideas that weren't thought up. So, what we'd $\sqrt{1}$ like, is through you, to get a review of our information basis. And What we will be putting out to you is a summary of the injury 3recovery and techniques. And we'd like you to take that back 4and give us comments; that is comments as individuals, not √necessarily as a group; this is if someone has a good idea,

we'd like to know it. And it's not necessary at that point for -- or it helps us to get the variety of ideas. The next part is before they go to the public to review the alternatives, and we'll like your comments on those before we decide that these are the right ones to give the public.

So, that's where we think you can be the most help and what we'd like your help on. The last portion of my talk is when that'll happen. Well, part of it, we're hoping to happen in December; so, in mid-December, we're hoping to have that information base as running as we can, or at least, a preliminary version. So, we'll have summaries of this to give If -- as my grandmother used to say, from your lips to $_{12}$ God's ears, which is to say, we hope it'll be December 2nd, at your next meeting, we present it to you, but I can't quarantee η_4 it. We're aiming for December. And then, we'd like you to ₁| 5review it for -- I'm not sure, but at least a month and give 16 your comments back. And when we'll have alternatives, I'm not ¶7quite sure, but it's got to be within the next couple of months, because we're going to put the alternatives out to the ¶opublic; we're shooting for late March with public meetings in DApril, that's our goal.

So, that's where we're going, where I would like your 2help or where we'd like your help, and what we're going to give 3you. Are there questions, comments? Sure.

DR. FRENCH: Yeah. I have the same problem 25that I had this morning with Attorney General Cole's comments

in terms of damage, finding damage. Most of your damage assessment, most of the parameters you have to deal with are those defined by the NRDA framework; those that we're allowed to measure clear, discernible damage. Take, for example, the many resources out there that we couldn't define specific damage to that we didn't really have the tools to look at the specific damage to; not we didn't know the background levels.

Now, as a specific example, let's take halibut. In the years since the Oil Spill, we've got a pretty good idea what the distribution and what the location of zero through three loyear old halibut are; and they're in fairly shallow waters, ligenerally up in the heads of the bays where they where they lowere fairly effec- -- could have been fairly affected by the lateral soil Spill. However, the only project I know that was under the lateral squidelines that would have attempted to was shot down sbefore it got through the process, but that's neither here nor lethere. The fact is that those fish aren't going to show up as lateral tribution to the recreational fishery for at least seven smore years. And, we may, 1999, come up with another lateral and unexpected injury assessment.

However, before that, there should be ways that somehow 22we, either in the Restoration Framework, or at least, in the 23work plans for the upcoming years, that we might be able to 24look at that basis and get a better idea of whether or not 25we're seeing a change occurring before it actually comes to

that crunch that my God, we've only got half the recruits we expected or whatever. We just don't have a lot of the background data, and you're building a Restoration Framework on sand.

DR. MONTAGUE: Dr. French, could I comment upon that?

DR. FRENCH: Yeah.

DR. MONTAGUE: First of all, if you're -- I
mean if the only time the information could have been collected
is in the past, then we're never going to get it, so we'll just
have to live with not having it. If chronic injuries need
leffort that they're not getting now, new projects need to
livestigate injuries that we did not use to look at; it's open,
syou know, get in there.

DR. FRENCH: Yeah. Exactly, that's all I'm

15trying to get towards, that we need to keep our minds open as

16to what might be other areas of injuries. We don't want to get

17tunnel vision as to what is an established damaged resource,

18those do need restoration, I don't question that. But there

19are good possibilities that there are areas that there were

20damage, either chronic or, in this case, it could have even

21been acute, and it would have been undetected. And so we need

22to keep a fairly broad scope is all I'm saying. We don't want

3to build a Restoration Framework that -- I heard you saying

24and, at least, I read this Blue Book as saying, you know, we

25need a definitive definition of injury before we can even start

on a restoration frame (ph).

MR. LOFFLER: I think what you're saying is not inconsistent with what we need to do. And I think part of the idea of getting your review before going to the public is finding out those glitches. But I think that would not (ph) study therefore doesn't exist is not necessarily, anyway, the model of the plan.

DR. FRENCH: Okay.

MR. STRAND: You know, in the -- as we write the plan for review, in the part of the plan that deals with implementation, I think you will see a section that captured what you're concerned about; that if new information is derived that suggests that there is injury that's not been disclosed appreviously, that then that becomes fair game or warrants that consideration of future restoration. I think that caveat, that sentree will be there, it's my understanding it will.

DR. FRENCH: Yeah. Okay. And with response to 7this past study/not study, I mean part of my whole reason -- 18part of my whole interest in this process is attempting to get 19to a position where if an when another oil spill occurs, we're 20not back to trying to build it on exactly the same data base, 21that we're in the same position of having great difficulty in 22assessing damage. And I'm not saying you can only do it by 23going backwards, but I am saying if we broaden the scope of our 24studies and look at a broader base, we'll be in a better 25position next time.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. STRAND: As we evolve the more comprehensive and integrated monitoring program, I think we need to capture the essence of that to look beyond just monitoring the injured -- the obviously injured species, but look more at the ecological relationships to these species to have a broader base for looking at change and a response to a disturbance in the future. I think that's possible if one properly designs the monitoring program.

MR. BRODERSON: Any other questions?

MR. KING: I'm not clear exactly on whether 10you're saying we need to be thinking about commenting on 11something that's here or something that you're going to present 12us in December.

MR. LOFFLER: I will present it. No, no. I'll 14present -- it will either be available at the meeting in 15December or we'll have to mail it to you afterwards. Actually, 16one quick comment is that you bring up a good -- a larger 17issue, which is the amount of uncertainty. And there is a 18large amount of uncertainty in both the damage recovery and in 19the effectiveness of the options of even things that were 20studied. And part of the challenge of the plan is making 21choices in the face of uncertainty.

MR. BRODERSON: The more -- to add to that, the 23more money we spend becoming certain, the less we have to 24repair it; and so, it's a trade-off figuring out how soon can 25you be comfortable with the level of information you have to go

R & R COURT REPORTERS

out and respond. It's one of the major policy questions that faces the Trustee Council, and it's one of the things that you all can be very helpful in giving them some input on when do we feel comfortable enough to expend the dollars. And it's probably a different answer for each alternative or option that we have.

One other, though, minor thing, some questions were asked this morning about definitions on such as equivalent resources, injury, et cetera, and draft attempts at those definitions were attempted in the framework. And for those of loyou who are interested in the thinking at that time, you might want to go back and look at those definitions, that we spent several months trying to come to something that was definitive.

But as I say, they are still in the draft stage, but that would be a good place to start in wanting to know what sconstitutes direct restoration, what constitutes replacement, fowhat constitutes acquisition of equivalent resources, is to go to add the Framework document.

18 Let's see, any additional or are we -- should we move 190n?

MR. STRAND: Thank you, Mark.

DR. FRENCH: Thank you.

20

21

25

MR. BRODERSON: Okay. If we're going to take a 23break, now is the time, otherwise we'll keep pushing ahead; 24what's the pleasure of the group?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's take a break.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MS. BERGMANN: A short break.

MR. BRODERSON: Should we try to take a short break, five or ten minutes, and get back to

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. BRODERSON: Well, let's see. Now, I think
what we're going to try and go to next is the Environmental
Impact Statement that needs to go along with the Restoration
Plan. As with any good government process, there's a lot of
NEPA compliance that has to go along with it to make sure that
the government does it right. Ken Rice with the Forest Service

MR. RICE: Some of you are probably familiar 13with what NEPA stands for and what it is, and others of you may 14consider it to be just another delay tactic or justification 15statement that agencies put together. Basically, as you're 16aware, the Trustee Council is make of three State and three 17Federal Council members. The Federal Council members are bound 18by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 as amended, 19NEPA or another acronym for those of you who need to learn more 20than half a dozen acronyms today.

MR. BRODERSON: I didn't say that 'cause I 22didn't know what it stood for, but I'm sure that he did get it 23right (ph).

MR. RICE: This Act, in its most basic terms, prequires Federal agencies to disclose and consider the affects

R & R COURT REPORTERS

of their actions in an Environmental Impact Statement when such actions may have a significant affect on the human environment. If you don't know whether you're going to have a significant affect, you can do something less than a full-blown Environmental Impact Statement, and I can talk to you individually, or if you have questions about that, we can get into all the written up (ph) cases of it. But anyway, let me leave it at that for now. The Restoration Plan will be -- will have an Environmental Impact Statement at the February 4th and 5th, I think were the dates, anyway, the Trustee Council nomeeting in early February. The Trustee Council agreed that the Settlement funds are joint funds and decisions have the be made by all six members, that the Trustee Council would abe bound by the National Environmental Policy Act.

Decisions in the Restoration Plan will set the basis

15for future restoration activities. The Trustee Council will be
16analyzing alternative approaches to restoring the resources and
17services injured by the Oil Spill, as Bob and John discussed
18just before our break. These will be displayed in a broad,
19general way, and in a very broad, general way, we will be
20looking at the impacts of these alternatives in the
21Environmental Impact Statement. We hope to publish -- we will
22be publishing the EIS concurrently with the Restoration Plan,
23so that both documents will be stand-alone document. In other
24words, you can pick up the Restoration Plan and look at all the
25various ways or various themes and approaches that restoration

could be accomplished. It will have some additional information in there. The Environmental Impact Statement will analyze those exact same alternatives, have -- disclose the affects of implementing those. In other words, estimates of what changes would occur to the environment out there over the course of the 10 year period as the Restoration Plan is implemented.

A contractor, Walkoff & Associates (ph), has been chosen to conduct the analysis and write the EIS. Walkoff & Associates have been involved with the oil spill process for 10several years; they were under contract with the Justice They had people that were familiar with what was 1 Department. 12going on and could step into the project without a long delay 13between being able to get up to speed and get this going. 14are currently collecting background material, determining the 15scope of the analysis that will be performed. All of you 16should have received a letter inviting you to the last, early 17stage of the scoping meetings that we're going to have as this 18EIS is being developed. Now, we've set up this last scoping ¶omeeting to be, basically, an open-house. In other words, there $\not a_0$ will be several of us available in this room to take comments 1 from agencies interested, individuals knowledgeable, people -anybody who has some interest in the restoration planning process. Now, if you decide to do this, here's what concerns 24me about that; what are the issues, what's important to √sindividuals, what are the values that you bring that you want

R & R COURT REPORTERS

to be displayed and information gathered on -- in this EIS process. We'll be doing that next -- the 4th of November, which I think is Wednesday, the day after -- yeah, the 4th of November, anyway, on Wednesday.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The day after the election.

MR. RICE: The day after the election, that's right; the election's on Tuesday. And you're invited to come and sit down with us on a one-on-one basis and give us some feedback; we'll be recording those, making sure we understand 10what it is that people are bringing to the table, and then 11using that to help define the range of things that we're going 12to have to look at. Scoping is sort of a narrowing down 13process, you look at it as trying to focus in on what's 14important, what do you have to analyze that's important; throw 15out the extraneous stuff, the stuff that doesn't really mean 16anything, and focus in on what's really critical there.

As I mentioned, because the Restoration Plan will not 18be making site specific decision about where and when 19restoration options would be applied, the EIS will not be able 20to disclose site specific impact. It will, however, look at 21the cumulative impacts of conducting a large number of 22restoration options over the next 10 or more years. Individual 23projects, as the work plans are being developed, may require 24site specific NEPA analysis and documentation. And some of 25those projects may be large enough that they would require a

stand-alone Environmental Impact Statement; some of them may only require an environmental analysis of the environmental assessment, that doesn't go quite as far as a full-blown Environmental Impact Statement. Others of them, studies for example, probably don't require any further NEPA analysis and documentation.

Are there any questions? Yes, Chuck.

MR. TOTEMOFF: Under our 1993 Work Plan, and I realize it's a couple of other agenda items ahead here, but if we're -- you know, there's a lot of talk about evident threat 10° for habitat, namely timber. But -- and no where do I see a $1 \mid 1$ concentrated effort, if I may speak on the subsistence part for ₁₂a minute, do I see a concentrated effort to address the chronic 1 3 subsistence problems expressed, especially, in the rural areas. $_{\parallel 4}$ There is one project identified in the '93 Work Plan, but 15that's just to begin the process of identifying those resources 16that were injured or damaged or irreparably harmed. Is -- will $\sqrt{1}$ 7there be any suggestions to try to meet, the immediate need for 18 those people that depend heavily on subsistence resources in ∥gthe form of replacement or harvesting in other areas? MR. RICE: As you mentioned, one of the 20 projects, I think it's 93017 addresses some of the res- -- the psubsistence resources needs. I think we've had a lot of 3discussion as we were developing the '93 Work Plan on how to deal with subsistence -- the subsistence service or resource. 5And we'd gotten some advice from our legal counsel as to what

we could or couldn't do within that, and some of that is reflected in the recommendations we have made to the Trustee Council. In other areas, it's still a little -- in my mind, at least, it may not be as gray in some other people's mind as it is in mine, but in my mind, it's still a gray area that needs further refinement and further clarification. And I would see that clarification coming out of the Restoration Plan that would more clearly define just what kinds of activities could be conducted towards the subsistence service.

Anybody want to add anything to that?

MS. RUTHERFORD: I would, if I could.

MR. RICE: Sure.

10

11

MS. RUTHERFORD: The legal advice that Ken just areferred to was from the Federal legal counsel, and the State 4legal counsel has not yet produced their comments on -- along 5the same -- addressing the same questions. And in fact, we sewere talking to them about it last week, and they hope to have 7their information out to us here in the near future. And I sthink that there may be some differences on that issue, and it 19may allow for -- once it's resolved, it may allow for a little 20more flexible approach to some of the subsistence issues, and 21hopefully, that'll be well resolved before the Draft 22Restoration Plan and, also, before the '94 Work Plan 23development. But it is a little unclear right now, Chuck; but 493017 does provide for some of that. I think there's 25\$53,000.00 in there for trying to harvest resources or gather

R & R COURT REPORTERS

resources from a different area. Maybe Jerome could go into some detail on that particular project.

MR. BRODERSON: Maybe what we should do on these questions, can we wait on further elaboration on this until we get down to the Work Plan part of the agenda,

MR. TOTEMOFF: Sure.

MR. BRODERSON: is that okay? Is there any other questions on the Environmental Impact Statement, any questions for Ken? No. Okay. If not, moving right along into

MR. GOLTZ: Well, maybe I'll just

₁take --

12

MR. BRODERSON: Okay.

MR. GOLTZ: it'll just take a second.

14You've drawn a two edge sword. And I think the edge you were

15focusing on was what are we doing for the subsistence

16resources. There's another aspect to it, and it fits in with

17the NEPA process. On Federal lands, there's the 810 (ph)

18process, which I'm sure you're familiar with, but some of you

19may not be, and that may apply to some of these projects. And

20in a nutshell, what that says is do no harm; or if you're going

21to do harm to subsistence resources, these are the steps and

22the ways that you get that done. But the 810 process will be

23part of, at least, some of this, maybe most of it. It is

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

5considered in that way on Federal lands.

MR. BRODERSON: Any other questions on this?

Okay. Well, onto the next section here there, Habitat

Protection. It's come to my attention that I was remiss in not explaining a little bit on the structure of the process here.

And that I believe it was Charlie Cole, this morning, touched on there's a Restoration Team that works for the Trustee

Council, and then under the Restoration Team there are a number of work groups; RPWG, the Restoration Planning Work Group, you've already from; the Environmental Compliance Work Group headed up by Ken; another group is the Habitat Protection Work 10Group, which is chaired by Marty and Dave Gibbons, and she's 1now going to talk about habitat protection.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Actually, I handed this one agoing to talk about it.

MR. RICE: Habitat protection for injured

15resources and services is an idea that first surfaced during

16the first Restoration Planning Work Group scoping meetings in

171990. And if you look at the August 1990 progress report, you

18can see where those ideas were captured. And we've, basically,

19been in the process of evaluating that. Several resources

20injured by the Oil Spill utilize uplands; marbled murrlets,

21bald eagles, harlequin ducks, salmon, dolly vardon, char, cut
22throat (ph) trout are examples of resources that were injured

23by the Oil Spill that are linked to the uplands. Services

24would include recreation for pleasure boating, sport hunting,

25fishing, subsistence, wilderness values and intrinsic values.

Public concern over potential logging and general support for habitat protection has convinced the Trustee Council that they need to accelerate the evaluation and possible implementation of this option ahead of the Restoration Plan. In order to do this, the Restoration Team has proposed an interim process for Trustee Council approval that will provide the Trustee Council some initial information in late December or early January.

This past July, we published the Restoration Framework Supplement, which is in your handouts, in your Black binder, in 10 Volume 1; it's affectionately known as Ugly Book.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Volume 2.

11

MR. RICE: Volume 2, excuse me. Well, Tab 1.

13It's about the same color as this building, I think. Most of

14you have probably already looked at this document, I won't go

15into it here. Elements of this supplement, hopefully, in a

16more understandable format and where necessary, modified will

17go into the Draft Restoration Plan. It has several flow charts

18in it and discussions of fairly -- the steps that we think need

19to go -- that we need to go through in order to implement a

We have asked the scientists involved in the damage 22assessment and restoration studies to provide us with some 3information that will be useful in our evaluation. At the 24start of the meeting this morning, you should have received 25four tables; these tables, I think, are supposed to go in

Volume 2, Tab 5. Table 4 in there is a summary of some of the information we have received back from the scientists. In other words, we sent out a questionnaire and said what do you know about the injured resources, what do you know about their habitats, what are the limiting factors affecting those, what information would we need in order to further understand the processes going on with these resource and their linkage to upland habitats, and we summarized some of the comments in there.

We have entered into a contract with the Nature 10 Conservancy, as Attorney General Cole mentioned this morning, 1/1 to build on the information that's been provided in Table 4 by ₁₂interviewing key users, scientists, residents and other 13knowledgeable people about the resources and their habitats and $_{\parallel}$ 4services injured by the Oil Spill. This information will be 1 savailable to us by mid-November and will be used to identify 16and evaluate the suite of proposals we have received this year $\sqrt{1}$ 7for habitat protection and acquisition. We're going to be --18 we started out calling it a workshop, we're going to, ∥obasically, be calling people, conducting in-depth interviews owith them, trying to draw out those key elements of information 1 that's going to help us identify specific habitat, specific nesource needs throughout the Spill area. They're going to be 3doing that the week of November 9th, and be summarizing that --4getting that back to us so we can use that information.

Table 1 in the handouts in Tab 5 shows all the lands

R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

have been identified by the public and willing sellers for habitat protection. As you can see, it covers a lot of land within the Spill affected area. On the wall here, we have put a map, which unfortunately, is not very large. Basically, the green area -- the dark green and the light green are Federal and State lands. And what is this, a peach color, salmon color?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Peach.

MR. RICE: Anyway, peach colored lands are all the private lands within the Spill affected area. By looking loat all the proposals that are in Table 1, it covers -- one liproposal or another covers the vast majority of the peach local land there.

Table 2, which is stapled to that, to Table 1,

14summarizes some of the information we have on imminent threat

15on some of the recent or projected timber harvested lands

16within the Spill affected area. This information was gathered,

17primarily, from State permitting requirements and reflects what

18the State has for information on where proposed activities

19would go. The acreage figures in there probably are fairly

20gross; in other words, they cover all of the area that might be

1 under permit, specific logging operations would not necessarily

2 impact all of those acres. It may occur over the course of two

23or three years, probably in 1993, not all of these lands -- not

24all of this 14,000 acres at the bottom of the estimate acres

25there would be harvested. But certainly, over the course of a

couple of years, most of that may be.

Table 3 summarizes some additional information of all the permits that are out there in terms of any kind of land disturbing activity that we, at least, have information on now. And some of Table 3 was used to -- was summarized forward into Table 2.

We plan to use this information, as well as other available information, in evaluating imminent threat lands for inclusion in an interim protection process. As I said earlier, the interim protection process is the process the Trustee 100 Council intends to use until the Restoration Plan is in place. \parallel_1 The 1993 Draft Work Plan contains several other projects that ₁₂will provide necessary information for the interim and 13 comprehensive habitat protection process. These projects are 1/4 designed to provide the Trustee Council the information they Isneed to understand the resources and how implementing habitat 16protection or any other restoration option will benefit the 17resources and services injured by the Oil Spill. One of those 18 projects is another contract with the Nature Conservancy to go \parallel 90ut and identify -- basically, go around to all the agencies and any non-government organizations that might have 1 information and say what information do you have that might be 2relevant, what form is it in, what's the accuracy of that 3information, what's the precision of that information, what's 24the scale; just what is it that you've got. We're pulling that ₂₅all together, and hopefully, going to be able to use that to

further determine what additional information may be important for fully understanding the linkage between the injured resources and their habitat so that we can further identify where those habitats are, which ones of them are most important and what protection mechanisms may be applied to that.

We hope to go to the Trustee Council, as I said, in
December of January with the information we've been able to
pull together very recently with, hopefully, some
recommendations for movement on that. We're also working on
how to not just look at imminent threat lands but also those
lands where opportunities are being provided to us to enter
linto some kind of agreements. Chenega Corporation has
lindicated that they are willing to work with us, and we just
sneed to look at those landowners who said they're also willing
to work with us and not just the ones where we think logging is
sgoing to occur today or tomorrow; but we also have other
some some states of the control of

Are there any questions. Chuck. Yes, sir.

18

21

25

DR. FRENCH: On Table 2, things that are listed 20 as harvested are harvested already, right?

MR. RICE: I think that's correct.

DR. FRENCH: So, I mean, the Afognak Joint

23 Venture is trying to sell us -- or sell whatever entity is

24 buying 14,000 acres of which 12,000's already been harvested?

MR. RICE: I don't think they're -- they're not

the same acres. The Afognak Joint Venture has some lands where they are going in and logging it, but what they've approached us with for entering into this protection process are lands are that they may ultimately go in and harvest over the next three or five years, especially if they can't see some movement towards providing revenue for that land. But it's not lands that have already been harvested.

DR. FRENCH: Well, as I understood it, they
were trying to sell all their holdings on Afognak Island, when
there's two listings on the bottom of Table 2 here, one at
1012,000 acres, which is listed as harvested, one at 2,500 which
list listed as projected harvest. And the projected harvest is
12clearly projectable, but it doesn't seem to me that the other
1312,000 is really protecting any trees, even for the people that
14want to protect trees.

MR. BRODERSON: I don't believe that Afognak is 16attempting to sell all of their holdings, it's only a fraction 17of that. You might be able to shed some light on that?

DR. FRENCH: Well

25

MS. BENTON: If I can answer that at all. The 20Afognak Joint Venture holdings that have not been harvested are 1separate from Concor Forest Products holdings that have been 2harvested. And on Afognak Island, Concor Forest Products is 2not a willing seller, nor have they ever been. So, you're 24dealing with two separate entities.

DR. FRENCH: Okay. 'Cause I know Jim

R & R COURT REPORTERS

145 Carmichael has told me they're willing to sell everything they've got. Right, but that's separate MS. BENTON: from the other holdings. DR. FRENCH: Okay. MS. RUTHERFORD: I might note on Table 2, also, where it says harvested, I think what that -- the 12,000 they're referring to here, it's a portion of it is being harvested, it's not totally harvested yet. DR. FRENCH: Yeah, that's what I was wondering \parallel_0 is whether there was any time critical element there. MS. RUTHERFORD: Yeah. That's not really an 11 ₁₂accurate status. MR. RICE: Pam. 13 MS. BRODIE: I'm confused about 14 DR. FRENCH: That's what it said, and I didn't 15 16think that much had been logged yet. MS. BRODIE: the -- some of the numbers, 17 Rbecause, for example, Afognak Joint Venture, I thought they had 19150,000 acres. MR. RICE: Which table are you looking at? 20 MS. BRODIE: Table 2. 21 MR. RICE: Okay. Table 2 is just those acres 22 3where, basically, there are State permits for harvesting. MS. BRODIE: I see, okay. I'm sorry. 24 MR. RICE: And it's just the stuff that's under 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

permit now, it doesn't -- they could come in next week with another permit or, you know, application and say that they're going to be moving into another 10,000 acres. But basically, this is what as -- actually, it's about a month and a half old, the information we had at the time, those areas where it was identified some activity would be occurring.

MS. BRODIE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RICE: Yes, Gerald.

MR. McCUNE: I was a part of this process but,
you know, I've forgotten about how are you going to -- how long
10was the purchase for on -- if you purchased those timber rights
11for land, how long is that for anyway (ph)?

MR. RICE: Well, it would vary, I guess. You accould do a fee simple, in other words, buy all the land -- buy the land the bundle of rights to the land; it's also possible to be account into other agreements, conservation easements, various buffers around streams, for example, that would not result in roomplete transfer of rights. If you bought just the timber srights, I guess it would depend on the negotiations, whether syou were buying it for 10 years for a hundred years. And the Nature Conservancy, in -- last winter, gave us a book on all the various tools that could be used for protecting habitat.

MR. McCUNE: So, if we were looking at habitat 24acquisition here, then everyone of these things would most 25likely be different.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. RICE: They could be different.

MR. McCUNE: Some kind of a different

arrangement.

MR. RICE: They could be.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Could I add something here? During this, what we're calling the interim process or where we're dealing with imminent threat lands, lands that may be logged, what we're going to aim for is moratoriums. aim for, what we're looking for is an opportunity to do further investigation on the lands. The information we'll be applying $_{\parallel}$ nto these imminent threat parcels between now and January is $1 \mid 1$ somewhat limited, and -- but if the Trustees want to move on 12it, they -- you know, they'll say okay. But at that point in 13time, we're looking for just an opportunity to provide time, an $_{\parallel 4}$ opportunity to find -- apply more information as it becomes $\sqrt{1}$ savailable to us, and determine if within those lands, those 16imminently threatened lands, there are particular parcels we $\sqrt{100}$ want to eventually purchase long-term protections for. Now, I say we would like to because it very well may be 18 ∥gthat the landowners aren't willing to consider that. oprobably will vary from parcel to parcel. And to some degree, 1 there will be some competition based upon what the landowner's willing to consider. But again, the Trustees may very well not 3be willing to do fee simple purchasing when they don't know the 4in-depth information about the specific parcels that we'll know

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

5by January. Does that make sense, Gerry.

MR. McCUNE: Sort of, except of the moratorium part of it, it could be very controversial.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Absolutely, we recognize that, and that's why I say right now, that's something we're talking about but we're not -- you know, we're not at all sure that that's what will occur once, you know, we start negotiations with landowners.

MR. McCUNE: Thank you.

MR. RICE: Any other questions? Pam.

MS. BRODIE: Yeah. Excuse me if I ask

1 osomething that you've already explained, 'cause I'm getting to

1 the point where it's hard to absorb everything. What kind of

1 2 negotiations have you had so far with landowners; for instance,

1 3 there are stars here for willing sellers, and yet, I don't

1 4 think that means that other landowners have said no if they

1 5 don't have a star. Does it mean that they haven't come forward

1 6 -- they haven't made the initiative to come forward to you?

1 MR. RICE: Yeah, basically, that's it. If we

1 8 received a proposal as part of the '93 Work Plan ideas where,

1 9 for example, yeah, the AJV or Concor

MS. RUTHERFORD: Just the AJV.

MR. RICE: Or the AJV, for example, came 22forward to us -- or Koniag is what I was -- not Concor, I 23always mix the two up, so catch me on it. Koniag, for example, 24said that they have these lands that they would be willing to 25enter into the process with us, then we identified it as a

R & R COURT REPORTERS

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

20

willing seller. We haven't taken it any farther than that.

We're trying to gather as much information about those lands as we can. But we haven't -- it's premature to enter into any negotiations at this time.

MS. RUTHERFORD: And it doesn't mean that the rest of them are not willing sellers, this is just -- the indication here of willing sellers just has to do with whether or not a proposal was received as part of the '93 ideas effort.

MS. BRODIE: And when in the process would you anticipate contacting some corporation that has not been 10participating at all, but that some of us may say we'd like to 11acquire?

MR. RICE: When would we approach those that all the selves as willing sellers?

MS. BRODIE: Yes. Yes.

14

15

16

117

25

MR. RICE: Well, I think

MR. RICE:

MS. BRODIE: Those who haven't come forward.

..... for the interim process, we've

18probably got enough on the table right now to deal with in 19terms of gathering information about those lands where we do 20have identified willing sellers and possible imminent threat on 21those. In terms of identifying those where maybe the public 22has identified some lands in going out and contacting those 23owners, it would be -- it may be as early as January, but I 24wouldn't -- I'd hate to be quoted on that.

MS. RUTHERFORD: To be real frank, we're not

R & R COURT REPORTERS

real sure on that, the answer to that question, Pam. I mean, it's -- we know we have to move real quickly into what we're calling the comprehensive effort. But -- and that is sort of where we go out and begin talking to the people that haven't already come forward, but we just aren't there yet. And it's of concern to us because we don't want to preclude them, we don't want to, you know, just be considering places where, you know, the chainsaw is running. Like Chenega has come forward and said we're willing to work with you, yet, they're not saying we have any imminent threat activities, they're just 10 saying we want to work with you. We want to enter into some 1/1 kind of agreement with them, and we, certainly, will want to do 1/2 that with others, too, we just aren't there yet. And I really η_3 can't -- I mean, the honest answer is we don't know yet. MR. BRODERSON: As soon as possible. 14 MS. RUTHERFORD: Yeah. 15 Trust us, we're from the Government. MR. RICE: 16 MS. RUTHERFORD: We even make ourselves 17 18nervous. The check's in the mail. 19 MR. BRODERSON: MR. RICE: Any other questions? Yes. 20 MS. BENTON: Will the study from the Nature 2 Conservancy be available before the Trustee Council meeting on $\frac{1}{2}$ December 11th to the public? MR. RICE: The information from the workshops? 24 MS. BENTON: Yes. 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. RICE: Probably, yeah.

MS. BENTON: Okay.

MR. RICE: Yeah. I don't -- we haven't discussed about making it public before then or not, but I'm sure we can arrive at some workable solutions here. The Nature Conservancy Handbook is a very useful document. Some of you probably have copies, we're out of our first printing. And if any of you would like to have copies, let me know and we'll try and get some additional copies printed up for you. Okay. It sounds like most people want a copy.

MS. BENTON: Um-hum.

MR. RICE: Okay. We'll have enough copies made 12up and probably can do that in fairly short order.

DR. FRENCH: How many of us already have 14copies? It looks like you could make at least three less than 15you might otherwise. They're a big book.

MR. RICE: Okay. Well, I need to make more 17than just enough for here, because we do get periodic, other 18needs for it.

19 DR. FRENCH: That's a lot of pages in that.

20 MR. RICE: Yeah.

MS. BENTON: A little more light reading.

MR. RICE: Yes.

21

4dollars.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Tell them about the 20 million

MR. RICE: Okay. We do have one project in the

R & R COURT REPORTERS

'93 Work Plan that identifies up to 20 million dollars. The Trustee Coun- -- we're asking the Trustee Council to basically go to the court registry, pull that money out and then as they identify specific parcels of lands where they want to enter into negotiation and agreement with landowners, then they would be able to access that money to use that. It's sort of, you might say, a good faith -- showing good faith that we are moving forward with the process and that we do have money identified to move if we feel that it's to the resources benefit and the landowners are willing.

MR. BRODERSON: And that's not to say that the 11Trustee Council is just limited to 20 million dollars either, 12they can go back to the court for the additional money that is 13shown on that incorrectly calculated numbers that I gave you 14earlier. This 20 million just makes it easily accessible 15without having to go back into court, but that other money is 16there for Trustee Council discretion to spend as they see fit 17with your input.

MS. RUTHERFORD: In fact, the Trustees had

19fairly significant discussions when they first reviewed the '93

20Work Plan about that amount, because -- and they wanted it to

1be made very clear that that was just an indication of their

2commitment to it, but it in no way indicated a prescribed

3amount, a cap or anything like that.

MR. BRODERSON: Shall we push on to the '93 25Work Plan? Any other questions about this? Pam.

MS. BRODIE: Speaking of that 20 million, it was divided 10 million to a State agency and 10 million to a Federal agency, which surprised me. Does that mean that there is some sense that the money needs to be divided 50/50?

MR. RICE: No. It was just to show that it would either go to the Feds or the State. It could go into both accounts, and then, depending on who the logical land manager would be, then the money could come out of that fund. But there was no prejudgment as to what lands would be going where, it's a topic the Trustee Council needs to wrestle with just to figure out how they're going to determine the lappropriate land manager for anything that is acquired (indiscernible - voice lowers)

MS. RUTHERFORD: An important fact, it's 14 something the Habitat Protection Work Group is wrestling with 15 is to try to give the Trustees some information and guidance on 16 how the -- once the lands are acquired for some type of 17 protection on how they will decide to hold it. So, it is 18 something, also, that we're working on (ph).

MS. BRODIE: It's something that worries me a 20lot since the Federal Government appears to be the more logical 21landowner for most of the land, and I'm afraid that that might 22cause problems.

MS. RUTHERFORD: There's been really no 24significant discussion on it really, no substantive discussion 25on it.

MR. BRODERSON: Just a minute here. We're thinking -- we request your indulgence to switch the '93 Work Plan and the Oil Spill Symposium to make sure that the symposium doesn't slighted. We could very easily spend the rest of the time talking about the '93 Work Plan, so if you all don't mind, we'll have the brief discussion of the symposium by Dr. Morris, and then we'll drop into the '93 Work Plan.

It'll be real quick, I just want DR. MORRIS: to make sure. I just want you to know that we have an Oil Spill Symposium scheduled for next February, the 2nd through 10.5th, we hope you'll all attend. It will be the first time $_{1}$ we'll be presenting the comprehensive results of the damage ₁₂assessment studies and other studies that were conducted on the It will be at the Egan Convention Center, here in √30il Spill. 14Anchorage. You will have to put pressure on Doug Mutter to 15approve travel, otherwise I hope you'll come on your own to 16this; at least for the first day, which will be summary prese- $\sqrt{1}$ 7-- sort of more general public oriented summary presentations 180f the various types of studies that were conducted. The final 19three days will be the individual presentations by principal oinvestigators, more technical, on individual topics. 1 there'll be something for everybody, it'll range from marine pbirds to archeology to subsistence impacts to the state (ph) of 3the oil, marine and terrestrial mammals, marine anadromous 4fish, a number of other things which I haven't thought of right The registration fee is set at \$95.00 for the technical 25now.

sessions; the preliminary session the first day is free. The registration forms should be out within the next couple of weeks (indiscernible) -- that you can respond to. We'll make sure you all get copies individually as well.

But there's a fact sheet there that kind of summarizes the who, what, when, where and why of the symposium and the initial announcement that went out about a month and a half or so ago. And I think you'll all find it of interest to learn the extent of some of the injuries that we've documented, resources and services, in a more detailed fashion that you no maybe have seen so far.

1 Any questions?

24

25

 $\mathbb{1}_2$ MR. TOTEMOFF: Yeah, I've got one.

DR. MORRIS: Yes.

MR. TOTEMOFF: I understand the Exxon

15scientists are not going to be here?

DR. MORRIS: No, they aren't. They chose not 17to use our forum to present their side of the story.

MR. BRODERSON: Those of you who are

DR. MORRIS: We invited them.

MR. BRODERSON: Yeah, we made the effort to 21have them come. Those of you who are interested to hear from 22the Exxon scientists can journey down to Atlanta in late April 23where they will be having a symposium of their information.

DR. MORRIS: They chose a better climate.

MR. BRODERSON: Moving on to the '93 Work Plan

R & R COURT REPORTERS

now. Jerome Montague will discuss this, it's another one of our work groups; we had a '92 Work Group, it died when '92 stopped; the '94 Work Group will start up shortly. So, with that

DR. MONTAGUE: Okay. This is the Blue handout, unfortunately, I didn't follow our procedures and get holes punched; I will leave a hole puncher by the door. This should go under Volume 2, Tab 4, between the '92 and '93 Work Plan.

And this isn't, for the most part, I don't know is any new information, but it's, more or less, just to organize the oppresentation here and prevent -- present some key items that lyou can find by digging, but we'll bring them to the front there.

The schedule for the work plan process, the annual work 14plan process is very consuming, and the Restoration Team is 15fully involved, I would say, more in the development of the 16annual work plans than most any other work group activity. And 17it really is all consuming, and for some behavioral quirk, I do 18enjoy the development of these plans. And I've appreciated you 19alls interest throughout the day in the '93 Work Plan, and I 20will do my best to help you get consumed with it and by it, 21too, because there's a lot to grab ahold of here.

Briefly, going over the schedule, you know, there was 23the Spill, there was an '89/'90 Work Plan, and then '91, it was 24approved in April of '91, the Settlement in October of '91.

25May of this year, we solicited ideas for the '93 Work Plan. In

June of this year, the '92 Work Plan was approved. In October of this year, we completed the Blue Book, and you know, during -- the printing process took a few weeks, and it was issued the 20th of October. The 23rd of October, I believe that's the correct date, you all were established. On the 20th of November, the public comment period ends, and I don't believe that that is necessarily the PAG comment end on that day, I think, and you know, you all can carry on beyond that. December 11th, the Trustee Council approves the projects for the '93 Work Plan. Some time soon after that, we would request 10° funds from the court. A few weeks after the decisions, we will probably finalize the Blue Book either into a new book or just 12 some modifications to its current makeup. And then, between 13the 1st of January and the 1st of March, most projects would 14begin.

One point I want to bring to your attention on the 16schedule is from '91 to '92, there was 14 months, from April of 17'91 to June of '92, till the '92 Plan was approved. But the 18'93 is being done in six months, so it's a very accelerated 19process, and I really don't think we've cut any corners, we've 20just had to work a lot harder. And the reason for that is that 1we're attempting to go from an oil year, which is March 1st to 2February 28th, to the Federal fiscal year. And this was our 2sfirst attempt to do that, and in all future years, we hope the 24annual work plans are completed in August instead of December.

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

We developed a number of assumptions to help the

Restoration Team in developing the work plan, and we took these assumptions to the Council, they rejected many, added a few and modified the ones we kept or the ones they kept, and this is sort of a summary of the assumptions that they sort of turned us loose with on how to develop the plan. And the first point, as I've kind of mentioned, we wanted to have, at least, a draft of the budgets done by the end of August; you know, we missed it by a couple of weeks. But the need for that was to have budgets, at least for the Federal agencies, to the Federal Office of Management & Budget before October 1st.

Another major point is since the Restoration Plan, 1which we heard talked about earlier here, is not done, that we 2should take a conservative approach, meaning we shouldn't have 3as big a program as we may have after we have the Restoration 4Plan. And there's a lot of other elements that kind of fall 5into what a conservative approach is. But one of the main ones 6was that the project should be time critical and that delaying 17them until after the plan's developed and the public and the 18EIS and all those kinds of things are done, be delayed; and 19those that really couldn't be delayed, to consider for this 20year.

Okay. And we divided the projects into various 2categories, and we kind of had some moderate direction on what 3we should try to achieve in those categories. And under the 4damage assessment projects or damage assessment closeout 25projects, 1992 closed out, I believe, something on the order of

35 or 40 injury assessment projects. So, any injury assessment that we have proposed to carry on from '92, there was a high priority to close it out this year. And they weren't considered, if they were supposed to closeout in '92, they were immediately rejected if they showed up as a '93 idea. Damage assessment was only considered if there was reason to believe that injury was continuing and not fully elucidated or there was some strong evidence of -- at least circumstantial evidence of injury that would indicate that we need to start a new injury assessment investigation. In any case, it was to be 10 much smaller than what we had in '92.

The restoration monitoring, many of the projects that 12were proposed in '92 were deferred as monitoring is -- I think 13we all agree, we need to monitor, the amounts you need to 14monitor and whether it needs to be every year. We're working 15on developing a schedule for that, but in any case, we 16anticipated more monitoring projects in '93 than '92.

Restoration manipulation and enhancement projects, 18these are such things as putting in fish ladders and other 19active manipulation. We only had one such project in '92, we 20anticipated to have more than that in '93.

For habitat protection and acquisition, we had guidance 2to try to wrap the three information gathering projects that w 23had from '92, and to develop some processes -- or develop some 24projects to develop the processes for protecting habitats. And 25the Council did recognize there is strong public support for

that, and that, indeed, in '93, they may protect habitats, which will be a first step. It hasn't been done in a previous year.

Restoration management actions was a large category for '92, and we also expected it to be large for '93.

Technical support projects, depending upon which other projects went, there, indeed, would be technical support projects. And we anticipated that while a conservative approach would be taken, the plan may be somewhat bigger in '93 than it was in '92. The Blue Book was to -- or the '93 Work 10Plan was to include administrative director, Restoration Team 11and other budgets associated with the process. And endowments 12should be considered.

And those were sort of the -- that was the guidance we 14had from the Council on what kind of a plan to develop. So, 15our first step, after that, was the litigation band had just 16been lifted, the public could get involved, so we immediately 17opened it up to the public, and we came up with a one-page idea 18format and solicited ideas far and wide from the public and the 19agencies. And the reason we went with a one-page idea is we 20didn't want to people to spend a lot of effort developing 21something that would likely be rejected. We just wanted to get 22an idea. And well, let's see. Those are the ideas that we 33received. There was 463.

 $_{24}$ Mid-June, we received 463 of these ideas, approximately $_{25}$ two-thirds from the agencies and a third from the public.

After duplicates and other comments were -- duplicates and ideas that were more accurately categorized as comments, once those had been removed, there were 358 ideas that remained. And to get some idea of the scope of what these 463 projects would do, discounting one idea, which was to spend the entire billion on removing the Alaska Pipeline. The remain ideas would have amount to about 6 or 700 million dollars. So, with the guidance the Council had given us and with the number of ideas and the size of the program that these ideas warranted, we had a big job ahead of us to pare it down.

And on the -- I'm sure you're thinking, you know, why 1 two-thirds agencies and a third public, and you know, we 1 2 thought a lot about that, too, as the ideas came in, why that 1 3 was. And you know, the agencies have been involved intimately 1 4 with it for three and a half years; you know, they've had ideas 1 5 on what to do running around in their heads, and all they 1 6 needed was the word go to start putting them in. I imagine 1 7 that as the public gets a lot more involved and they understand 1 8 the injuries more, the public participation and ideas is bound 1 9 to go up.

Okay. Then, we developed a process of -- approved by the Council of how we were going to go through all these ideas and try to actually develop some sort of a work plan. So, abefore we went any further in terms of further developing an alidea, we applied all these criteria here. And we had three key accriteria, or so-called killer criteria, that any idea had to

pass all three of those before it was considered further. And the first one was compliance with the terms of the Settlement. There's a lot of ways they need to comply, but the one that usually affected a project or not is whether there was a link to injury. Two, whether it was technically feasible. And three, whether it complied with laws, regulations and policies. And in terms of Criteria 3, although we looked at, legal counsel further looked at our decisions and, in many cases, reversed them or added new ones.

As I've kind of covered under damage assessment 10projects, if they were a '92 closeout project, they were 11rejected. New and continuing projects only if the injury 12wasn't well enough identified to carry our restorative actions. 13 And under restoration, the idea had to have a definable 14restoration end point, and it had to be time critical, meaning 15there would be significant loss to not do it this year, and/or 16it could have a lost opportunity. And what that means is, for 17instance, the \$50,000 data gathering project may be able to get 18a free ride on a \$300,000.00 oceanographic ship in '93 that 19they wouldn't have in future years; and that's what we meant by 20lost opportunity. And that we not go with a restoration 21project that involved a long-term commitment, but we waive that 22on occasion if the time criticalness or lost opportunity 23aspects seem very noteworthy.

After they had gone through all of that, then the 25Restoration Team and the Chief Scientist looked at all the

ideas that remained and combined any of those that seemed to be logically combined, and had a lot of discussion on whether in spite of having these 463 ideas, were there any major areas that weren't addressed; so, we tried to fill in any gaps.

After all that was done, we had 55 projects that remained. And of those 55, I don't have it written here, but I think it actually represents about 120 ideas when you count the combinations.

And once we made it as far as which 55 they wanted to be developed further, we assigned the project to one of the six 10Trustee agencies to be the lead, and it was their 1responsibility to have a brief project description written and 12a detailed budget. And the -- what's in the Blue Book is, 13basically, the three-page text description, and then there is a 14much larger -- this Red Book, the detailed budgets, which 15Charlie Cole was talking about earlier, and this is available 16to look at. But Mark and his people are correcting it on some 17errors, so until he's done, there's no point in really looking 18in that. But it will be a document of a similar size.

Once these three-page descriptions and detailed budgets 20were received, peer review was conducted under auspices of the 11Chief Scientist. So, the Chief Scientist and a few selected 12peer reviewers looked over what we had. Then the Restoration 13Team, based on that review, made changes to the projects, and 124then voted on the individual merits of the projects. Again, 125the projects were revised, the Chief Scientist alone commented

on the package, and the Restoration Team voted on the projects again in terms of their priorities. And they used -- we used our best professional judgment based upon a number of factors, and I'll read one of them to you. I know several of you asked what -- you know, aside from the criteria I've just gone over, there was additional criteria at this voting stage.

And for example, for a injury assessment project, there
was eight things that we were considering when we made our
votes, and for each category, we have a different set of
evaluation factors; I won't read them all, they're here for you
to look at. Just for injury assessment, what are the affects
for any other actual or planned actions, the potential to
ligimprove the rate or degree of recovery, potential adverse
simpacts on health and safety, relationship of expected costs to
ligimprove the rate or defectiveness, potential for additional
sinjury resulting from the action, importance of starting the
foroject the next year, and reason to believe the injury was
roontinuing or not fully understood. And there is a record of

Then, all the original 55 were presented to the Trustee 20Council. And with our recommendations and our -- by our 21operating procedures, the Restoration Team's recommendations 22are based upon five or six yes votes. So, those projects that 23had five or six yes votes became the Restoration Team's 24recommendation to the Council. And then, the Chief Scientist 25presented an independent recommendation to the Council, which

didn't necessarily -- or didn't match ours. And that's included in the back of the Blue Book.

During that Trustee Council meeting, five of the 55 projects were removed, and the remaining 50 make up Blue Book. And the Trustee Council -- you know, our recommendations and Spies' recommendations are there, the Council has no recommendation at this point; all 50 are in there. And to -here on this page, to give you sort of a snapshot of what's in there now, of the 50 projects under injury assessment, there's 2 projects restoration monitoring, 11 projects management 10actions, 13 projects restoration manipulation, enhancement 12, 11 habitat protection 7, and technical support 5. And the 12technical support includes things like computer support and 1/3 hydrocarbon analysis. And then, we also presented a spread $_{\parallel}$ 4here by resource type, fish, shellfish, birds, mammals, 15intertidal, subtidal, human resources, habitat protection and $_{\parallel}$ 6technical support. The second list has a larger number, 55 $\sqrt{1}$ 7instead of 50, the reason for that is if a project was a bird ₁₈ and sea otter survey, then it would appear both under birds and ∥gmammals; but still, we're talking about 50 projects. Okay. Where do we go from here, other than what I've

Okay. Where do we go from here, other than what I've light pointed out and a few other statistics or status of what represented in Blue Book, is that as we talked about, some soft the projects -- or all the projects are really assigned to a represented in Blue Book, is that as we talked about, some soft the projects -- or all the projects are really assigned to a represented in Blue Book is set up, 36 of

R & R COURT REPORTERS

conducted primarily outside of agencies. And of the funding, approximately 50% in Blue Book, which isn't an approved book, would be agencies and about 50% to the private sector. The Draft Plan of the projects only is about 40 million dollars, and that includes the 20 million dollars set aside for habitat protection actions. That's the whole plan or the whole Blue Book. The Restoration Team recommended a portion of Blue Book as 35 million, including the 20 million for habitat protection action.

At their December 11th meeting, the Trustee Council 10will consider public comments, the Public Advisory Group's 11advice and the recommendations of us, the Restoration Team and 12the Chief Scientist before they make their decision.

The next step, after they approve the work plan, will 14be our job will be to develop detailed project descriptions for 15an agency project or requests for proposals for an outside 16agency project. We receive funds from the court, we'll either 17issue contracts or initiate agency projects, and monitor 18performance and carry out mid-course corrections and changes to 19projects as is necessary.

not in there, it's probably valuable to see if it wasn't already suggested and why it wasn't carried further. You know, since there are that many ideas that didn't get carried further, there's a lot of good projects that will probably be considered in the future.

Is there any questions?

MR. PHILLIPS: In regard to that last suggestion, is there an easy way to find out whether or not the idea was offered and rejected rather than reading through 400 and some

DR. MONTAGUE: Yes, there is, and I should have 10 $1 \mid 1 \mid 1$ just gone through these documents that I talked about, and I'll 12do that now because it answers your question. Okay. 13 have is a notebook -- notebooks, three notebooks of all the $_{\parallel}$ 4original ideas. The notebooks -- or notebook of the project 15evaluation sheets and the voting record of the Restoration 16 Team, the detailed budgets of which Mark Broderson's soon going $\sqrt{1}$ 7to have revised. The Blue Book, what we call the fate of ideas $\eta_{\rm g}$ table, in that, you know, through a number of approaches, \parallel_{9} either by the title of the project, by the proposer's name, you ocan find out what happened to it. And there is this table, and 1/1 it'll tell you, you know, rejected and it'll give the reasons 2 why it was rejected, so on and so forth. So, I'm glad MR. PHILLIPS: Could I just call you and ask 23 24you?

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. RICE: That would be easier.

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

25

168 DR. MONTAGUE: That's fine. MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. DR. MONTAGUE: That's fine. But this isn't as -- I mean it is pretty complicated, but it's there, it's all UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want a there. copy? MR. PHILLIPS: No, I don't want a copy. MR. MOFFIT: By the way, Jerome's phone number is in there (ph). MR. RICE: And call only Jerome. MR. BRODERSON: His number is 555-1212. 10 DR. MONTAGUE: And there's one other document I 11 12didn't mention there. UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please don't. 13 DR. MONTAGUE: But it's the status of the 1992 14 ||sprojects which the Council will have in hand to help them decide on what to do in '93. 17 $\eta_{\rm g}$ considered, that approximately two-thirds were proposed by

MS. BRODIE: You said of the 358 ideas that you ¶gagencies and one-third was proposed by the public?

DR. MONTAGUE: Not necessarily 358, of the 463, 20 11it was two-thirds and one-third.

MS. BRODIE: Okay. Of the final 55 that appear 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ in the workbook, how many of those were proposed by the public? DR. MONTAGUE: Well, as I mentioned the 55 24

√srepresent something like 117 ideas, and those 117 have roughly

R & R COURT REPORTERS

the same breakdown of one third public and two-thirds agency, which we didn't have any mandate to do; I was surprised to see that's that what happened. Other

MS. BRODIE: Is that clear in the descriptions of them, where it initially came from?

DR. MONTAGUE: No. It's clear in those tables that I just -- you know, that you can look up all the ideas in.

And it does say that Project 9317 is made up of these ideas; it doesn't say it in the project description but it says it in these look-up tables, the fate of the ideas table. I know 10there's a lot to digest there, and I'm sure you'll enjoy

11 MR. TOTEMOFF: I've got one question.

MR. PHILLIPS: I wish they were all this

13succinct.

DR. MONTAGUE: Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: That's excellent.

16 MR. TOTEMOFF: You mentioned there's a 50% 17agency money allocated and a 50% private sector, how -- is it 18in any of these volumes?

DR. MONTAGUE: Well, basically, how that is 20determined is if you -- Line 300, which is contract funds, if 21you add up all the Line 300s, it amounts to about half the 22program, and that wasn't even considering -- I'm glad you 23brought that up -- wasn't even considering the habitat 24acquisition. If you add the 20 million for habitat 25acquisition, assuming that's what we did, it would skew it to

R & R COURT REPORTERS

R & R COURT REPORTERS

4group is, by law, for two years. One of the items that you may

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

√swant to discuss is setting up staggered terms for members.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Doug, could I add something to

that?

MR. MUTTER: Um-hum.

MS. RUTHERFORD: Yeah. The Public

Participation Work Group had actually suggested that they do be staggered terms because we didn't want to see the potential for a total turnover, should the Trustee Council ever get to that point. And -- but given the way you were appointed, which was two years terms, it would be have to be like after that. So, I would suggest that maybe you consider that when you look to 10making the suggestions on your operating procedures to the 11Trustee Council, because I don't think a total turnover is a 12good option.

MS. BRODIE: Also, is there something -- maybe 14we already have it -- something that lists the working groups, 15the names of the working groups and who's on them; is that 16something that we could be provided

MS. RUTHERFORD: Yeah, the

MS. BRODIE: without causing too much

19trouble?

20 MR. MUTTER: Sure. There is a tab in your 21 notebook for that,

MS. BRODIE: Okay.

MR. MUTTER: and we're preparing those

24 materials, so we'll get those in the mail to you. Yes.

MS. BRODIE: Okay. Great.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MS. BERGMANN: A follow-up comment on your question. The terms of the PAG members are two years, but those members can be reappointed for additional two year terms, if after serving two years you wish to subject yourself to that; and of course, if the Trustees would like to continue the appointment. So, even under the present situation, it doesn't mean that we're going to have a hundred percent turnover at the end of two years.

MR. MUTTER: Jim.

13

14

MR. CLOUD: Is there a budget for the 10administrative costs of the Council separate from -- what I saw 11was there seemed to be an administrative cost for each project 12that was

DR. MONTAGUE: Okay. That's --

MR. CLOUD: sort of assigned to it.

DR. MONTAGUE: that's overhead that's leasning of the project, but the administrative costs are also leasn here, too; there's the '93 administrative director, '93 leasn too the funds that really supports the project, and that leave of the funds that really do not support any project, leave the project.

2 per se. And I think this is Page 18 and 19 of Blue Book.

MS. BERGMANN: Also, if you're interested in 23more detail on that budget, all the way down to individual 24working groups, that will be contained in the document that 25we've alluding to all day that will be produced in about

R & R COURT REPORTERS

```
173
                  MR. BRODERSON: About a week.
                  MS. BERGMANN:
                                  .... another week.
                  MR. BRODERSON: It's 400 plus pages, so it's
 good nighttime reading.
                  MS. BERGMANN: It's about this thick, but it
 does break down the administrative budget in a great amount of
 detail, .....
                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the amount of .....
                  MS. BERGMANN: ..... as well as the project
 budgets.
                  MS. RUTHERFORD: I might note, too, in the Blue
10
1 \parallel 1 Book that they do have lists of all the work groups and their
12 tasks for this coming year; they don't name the -- which -- who
_{1} _{3} -- the names of the people that are on that work group. And
4then, you know, there's no specific detail beyond just the
15tasks.
                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.
16
                  MR. MUTTER:
                               Jim.
17
                  MR. DIEHL: Just rules of the PAG meetings, I
18
∥9guess, that's kind of a concern; like, what's going to
\downarrow_0constitute a quorum, it's not in the Charter is it?
                  MR. MUTTER: No. But it's in the draft
21
2background and guidelines, and .....
                  MR. DIEHL: To public groups (ph)?
23
                  MR. MUTTER: .... in the handout. Yeah, so
24
√stake a look at that. And that's one of the items to go over at
```

R & R COURT REPORTERS

the next meeting.

Mr. DIEHL: Okay. I'll find that.

MR. MUTTER: Okay. Donna.

MS. FISHER: We have received a lot of material today, and these books are quite thick to be carrying back and forth on the plane; is there one particular -- probably this one that we should continue to bring back and forth or both of them or what?

MR. MUTTER: Well, you may want to pull materials out of the book. At the next meeting, we'll look at 10the operating procedures and the 1993 Periwinkle Book. Okay.

MS. FISHER: Okay.

MR. MUTTER: So, those will be the two key

13items at that point.

MS. FISHER: That we should bring. Okay.

MR. CLOUD: And there'll probably be more.

MS. FISHER: I'm sure there will.

MR. MUTTER: Bring an empty suitcase. John.

DR. FRENCH: I don't have too much in terms of

19specific comments. I'm a little disappointed to see this

20process starting as late as it did, but I can, somewhat,

1 understand the reasons why. I wish there were some ideas we

2 could get to facilitate public input between now and December

32nd, but it looks like we're pretty much hamstrung by the

4public meeting process. So, if anyone has any ideas, I'd be

25happy to hear them. But, yeah, I'm real concerned about

R & R COURT REPORTERS

getting enough public feedback, because I don't think the public process to date has really reflected the entirety of opinion throughout the Spill area.

MR. MUTTER: Paul.

MR. GAVORA: Well, kind of following on what
John says, is I would like to see us to get organized, budget
it so we can function as a body. If we're going to be sitting
here for too long, you know, just being kind of a response
team, I don't think we're going to get our job done. So, I
think the sooner we go and develop a budget, the sooner we get
this thing organized and take on these functions, the better
toff we will be. To me, it was a very informative session
today. I came in very cold on the subject, and I appreciate
that it is not a step forward, I think we need to go and
the spedite the formal setting up so people can go to work and we
the scan accomplish something.

MR. MUTTER: Jim.

16

MR. KING: Well, I think I'm a little

180verwhelmed by the material you've presented us, and I'm

19impressed by the work that's already been done. And I probably

20will have comments after I digest all of this material, but at

21this time, I think I'd just like to say thanks for some good

22presentations today. I know a lot of you have worked very hard

23for this meeting, and I think it went well.

MR. MUTTER: We hope no one wants to quit after 25today. Gerald.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

MR. McCUNE: Well, I don't have too much to
say, except for, you know, at least we got started; we had some
pretty overwhelming stuff here. But although, I'm familiar
with a lot of this process already, one concern I have is that
some people aren't familiar with this process and haven't been
part of this process. I don't know why John wasn't here today,
but you know, there's some reason why he wasn't. So I suggest
that we try to get the minutes of this meeting out to these
members that aren't present so they can see what has been done
so far, because they're going to be way behind from where we're
loat, I can see that right now. So -- and I wouldn't want to sit
lthrough this again.

MR. MUTTER: We'll get a meeting summary out.

13Brad.

MR. PHILLIPS: It seems to me that if our input 15 is going to be meaningful and really be helpful to the 16 Committee, that I feel very much like Paul Gavora does, that 17 we've got to get organized in a hurry. And the only other 18 admonition I have is that I hope that the members of the PAG 19 can be here at each meeting, and have, if not a full group, as 20 close to it as possible, because it'll really hurt our progress 21 if we've got to bring everybody up to speed every time there's 22 another meeting. I'm looking forward to it, but I'll tell you 23 there's got to be a fast learning curve to catch up with you 24 guys that have been at it for two years or three years. And 25 I'm going to do my very best, but I hope we get organized and

our budget going, and a direction as quickly as possible.

MR. MUTTER: Kim.

MS. BENTON: I guess I'll follow it up with the missing member, I know that John wished that he could be here, and unfortunately, December 2nd, he's going to be in Japan, so you'll be stuck with me again. And I appreciate you allowing me to be here, and I'll do everything that I can to make sure that when John can attend, he is fully aware of what's going on. I know he regrets not being able to here, but I appreciate your opportunity to allow me to sit at the table.

MR. MUTTER: Chuck.

10

25

MR. TOTEMOFF: Kind of closing comments, I

2think it's rather more a concern. I am very concerned about

3the conflict of issues -- conflict of interest issues that the

4lawyer over here, the solicited officer (ph), bring up, that

15this brings to mind to a lot of problems. All of us in here

16have our own interests, and if we're disallowed to participate

17at some point in time, I think our interests, or whoever we

18represent in our interest groups, is going to suffer. And I

19would just like to get a definition of where the line will be

20drawn. And it seems like it's case by case issue. But I

21certainly don't want to get myself in trouble, you know, by

22going too far, and I'm sure nobody else does either. That I'd

23just like some follow-up before the next PAG meeting or

24discussions anyway.

MR. GOLTZ: Okay. Well, you or anybody else

R & R COURT REPORTERS

can feel free to call me, and in addition, I'll be here next time, so if we meet any of these problems, we can deal with it. I think they will be -- have to be handled on a case by case basis.

MR. MUTTER: Okay. One of the requirements of the Public Advisory Group in their meeting is that they allow time for members of the public who are sitting in the audience to say a few brief words. Do we have anyone?

SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: Yes.

MR. MUTTER: Senator Sturgulewski. There's a 10microphone right here.

SENATOR STURGULEWSKI: Thank you very much. 11 ₁₂I'm Senator Sturgulewski. I am here as an individual, and wish η_3 to congratulate you when I see that you're a success because 14you already have an acronym; so, therefore, you are alive and 15well. I just wanted to tell you that there has been, I 16believe, some frustration in that there has not been a lot of $\sqrt{100}$ many meetings as I can, and certainly to make comment. ∥owant to, and am passing around, you're getting a tremendous anount of information, but something about which I feel very, 1 very strongly, and that is for the creation of an Exxon Valdez Marine Sciences Endowment that will allow for ongoing 3scientific effort. And have -- this came about, I'm an advisor 24to the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, I had √sfellow colleagues, Senator Zharoff and Senator Cotten, on that

particular advisory group. And we've been very interested and did quite a lot of background work in finding out just who's doing scientific work in our marine environment. And out of a whole lot of discussions, this proposal has involved -- or revolved and involved. You will see on the back of this particular thing, letters of support that we have received; there have also been many other letters that have gone into the staff. And you'll notice in the work that you have, that there was -- the Trustees did ask that there be, under the Restoration Plan, the consideration of an endowment.

So, my purpose here today is really to encourage you to 10 $1 \mid 1$ take a look at this and to consider the longer term interest in 12getting knowledge about our marine environment. It was very 13 interesting. One proposal that came before the Trustees, I 4believe, is in the fiscal year '93 Plan, called for a study to 15be done. And after the study had been, more or less, agreed 16upon, it was for around 100,000 plus, and made a part of the $\sqrt{100}$ $_{1}$ 8 it was indicated that to really be successful, that should be, ¶gin fact, a 10 year study utilizing something like a million odollars. So, we need, I think, in this whole issue of getting 1 baseline information and monitoring, to take the longer view. 72This has strong support from the University of Alaska, you will 3find a letter by Dr. Komasar (ph) there. I am going on the 4statewide board for the -- as an advisor to the Fisheries & 5Marine Science for the University.

So, I hope you will take a close look at this. not want it to be seen as being in conflict, and we've talked about that, with the purchasing of trees to protect the environment. But this is a separate part, and it's just with that that every opportunity I have, I'd just like to advance that proposal. And so far, it's stayed out there as a part of a restoration plan, but I really would like to see it I would have no -- I hasten to add, I would have no activated. role in it other than having brought together the idea, met with members of the scientific and other community, and have 10 been actively involved in trying to see that it gets a place in 11the whole proposal. With that, I thank you very much and wish you well. 1/3 You're going to develop curvature of the back just by carrying \parallel_4 things about, but it's time that you were appointed, and I look 15 forward to further participation. Thank you. MR. MUTTER:

16 MR. MUTTER: Thank you. Does anyone else care 17to speak?

MR. McKEE: My name's Charles McKee. And I

19haven't digested any of your material to the extent that some

20of you people at this board have. I have other information

1that I want to dispense, and I'll just -- here's -- I don't

2have enough, I only printed 11 for this side, I guess I didn't

3know that -- yeah, pass it, you can make copies, there you go.

I'm here today not to embellish on emotionalism or prejudice, I'm here to talk about facts. I would also like to

R & R COURT REPORTERS

bring to your attention today's newspaper by -- in a letter to the Editor by Michael O'Callahan, talking about our local politicians and their endeavor. And what I'm handing you on -- within that document, you've got "League Hires New Director.

Now, this individual represents Alaska Municipal League, he presides over what you would call the Governor of the State of Alaska, which is not (ph).

I mentioned earlier, moments ago, that I'm not here to embellish into emotionalism and prejudice, I have a book here "Money, Banking and the Fed" which is what you're looking at oright now, as private currency, it's illegal (ph) currency when 1you're talking about how to spend the restitution of same, this 12money that you receive from this Oil Spill or you're 13contemplating.

Now, I have another book, "Paper Money in the United 15States" which also included this; private money is included in 16this, but it's also illegal currency.

Now, another thing is Congress gave up the right to 18 issue currency in 19- -- I mean 1913. So, the court is now 19 delegating settlement of illegal currencies. So, what I'm 20 trying to say to you people is I suggested a settlement of 3.5 21 billion dollars in a letter to Judge Holland, I've stated this 22 many times before. I have now found out that there's an 23 organization within the Masonic that is behind this process to 24 monopolize on the currency. And what I have done is researched 25 and found out what the original Treasury seal is and copywrited

that in conclusion with the math that I have got a copyright of, and its redemption coupon. I will be making out a redemption coupon to the Treasury for the issuance of United States note, what they call legal tender issue, and that's called customer and community currency. Now, it's not the type of currency that you use in a safety deposit -- I mean a savings account, it won't draw interest, but you can use it to spend on restoration of the damage done in Prince William Sound, which is what your focus is, but it could be used for anything.

The question is is to what bank, what bank account should I make that out to, of the 3.5 billion. Lloyds of London actually made out a payment of 3.6 to the Crown, we didn't see any of that. And I'm out of the loop, you people are representing people of King. You can find the sword and the definition of the word in the dictionary in that loop that says a people of a sovereign. Not any of you speople are representing me or the people that that word signifies. That's what this currency signifies, though.

And so, I'm also trying to get this case brought before the Supreme Court -- Claims Court Legal Service Corporation and with this Robert Hinkerson (ph) at Alaska Legal Service Corporation, people are dragging their feet because of their Apremier occult organization that's behind this private monetary somonopoly situation which is entirely illegal on our

183 constitutional grounds. So, I haven't even delved into the reason why this organization would even want to cause a oil spill in Prince William Sound, but the likelihood that they were instrumental in that decision is possible, very possible. Thank you, Mr. McKee, and thank MR. MUTTER: you for your handouts, appreciate it. MR. McKEE: Again, what decision would you like to render and which bank shall I make request of this money transfer? MR. MUTTER: I don't think we can answer that 10right now. MR. McKEE: Well, you have my address, please 11 ₁₂keep me in touch. Is there anyone else in the MR. MUTTER: 13 4audience who would like to speak? Carrie, why don't you raise 15your hand back there, if anybody wants to tour the library \parallel_6 facilities, she's the gal that'll take you through. With that, $\sqrt{1}$ 71'll adjourn the meeting until December 2nd, 9:30, same room. (Off record) 18 (END OF PROCEEDINGS) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

CERTIFICATE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA))si.	
STATE OF ALASKA)	
I, Rebecca Nelms, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Courß Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:	
THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 190 contain a full, true and correct Thanscript of Exxon Valdez Of Spill Settlement Trustee Council, taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 29th day of October, 1992, commencing at the hour of 9:30 o'clock a.m., at the Restoration Office, 645 G Street, Anchorage, Alaska; 7	.1
THAT the Transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Kare Squiers and Meredith Downing to the best of their knowledge and ability. 10	
THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.	
12 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 3rd day of November, 1992. 13	
14	
16 Notary Public in and for Alaska My Commission Expires: 10/10/94	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
22	
23	
24	
25	