13.08.01 Septembor 1994 (1052) . .

13.08.01 - Reading File

September 1994



IN REPLY REFER TO:

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE Alaska Regional Office 2525 Gambell Street, Room 107 Anchorage, Alaska 99503-2892



TO:

Jim Ayers, Executive Director, EVOS Molly McCammon, Director of Operations, EVOS Dave Gibbons, Agency Liaison - USFS Bryon Morris, Agency Liaison - NOAA Veronica Gilbert, Agency Liaison - ADNR Mark Broderson, Agency Liaison - ADEC Jerome Montegue, Agency Liaison - ADF&G Robert Spies, Chief Scientist

Tami V Rebecca V Sherre -

From: Sanford P. Rabinowitch, Agency Liaison - Department of the Interior

Subject: End of Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Duties

Date: September 28, 1994

As of this date my dutiës as the Department of the Interior's Agency Liaison for the Exxon Valdez oil spill have come to an end. I have accepted a new position with the Subsistence Division of the National Park Service, in Anchorage.

There are two small exceptions to the immediate end of duties. For a short time, likely until November 3, 1994, I will continue to work on the Restoration Plan and on Park Service acquisition efforts related to the restoration program for the department. For all other matters please immediately begin working directly with Catherine Berg at the Fish & Wildlife Service and Leslie Holland-Bartels at the National Biological Survey. Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me at 257-2653.

c:\sandy\evos\theend.w51

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



4

September 23, 1994

Judy Lietzau POB 2195 Cordova, Alaska 99574

Dear Ms. Lietzau:

Thank you for your letter of September 16, 1994 regarding the Trustee Council actions to protect lands owned by Eyak Corporation. Your comments have been forwarded to all the Trustee Council members.

As you know, the Trustee Council took action on May 3, to protect lands around Cordova owned by Eyak/Sherstone Corporations. Representatives of the Trustee Council and Eyak/Sherstone are still in discussions regarding a larger proposed acquisition. I'm sure your comments will be considered as this progresses.

Thank you again for your continued interest in the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council actions.

Sincerely Myers

lames R. Ayers

Executive Director

ira/raw

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



September 26, 1994

Kay and Mike Adams POB 961 Cordova, Alaska 99574

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Adams:

Thank you for your September 16, 1994 letter regarding the Trustee Council action to protect lands owned by Eyak Corporation. Your comments have been forwarded to all the Trustee Council members.

As you know, the Trustee Council took action on May 3, to protect lands around Cordova owned by Eyak/Sherstone Corporations. Representatives of the Trustee Council and Eyak/Sherstone are still in discussions regarding a larger proposed acquisition. I'm sure your comments will be considered as this progresses.

Thank you again for your continued interest in the *Exxon Valdez* Trustee Council actions.

Sincerely,

amio

Ayers

Jamès R. Ayers Executive Director

jra/raw

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



MEMORANDUM

To: Distribution

mm/raw

From: Molly McCammon W Director of Operations

Date: September 23, 1994

Subj: Science Workshop Planning Session

The next planning session for the 1995 Science Strategy Workshop is Monday, September 26 at 9:00 a.m. Please let Rebecca Williams know if you will be at the Anchorage Restoration Office or want to be included in the conference call.

Attached are the four draft agendas that we received this past week. They should provide a good focus for discussion during Monday's meeting. L.J. Evans will also provide information on meeting space.

Trustee Agencies State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

Science Workshop Distribution:

*

	Name	Fax
	Agency Liaisons	
L	Andy Gunther	510/373-7834
V	Judy Bittner	762-2628
\checkmark	Jim Bodkin®	786-3636
V	Kathy Frost	452-6410
V	Dave Irons	786-3641
	Bob Loeffler	
	Sandy	257-2510
V	Rabinowitch	
V	Joe Sullivan	522-3148
V	Bruce Wright	789-6608
V	Alex Wertheimer	789-6608
L	Molly	
	McCammon	

Francis 13 jacquestotal

McCammon 10+2

Draft Winter Workshop Agenda

Prepared by Molly McCammon

These are my thoughts on an agenda for the January work shop.

DAY 1, Tues., 1-5 pm:	Introduction Directions to Participants Ecosystem goals, Restoration Objectives
	Panel discussion on other research efforts FOCI PICES Arctic Research Commission other?

5-7pm Social gathering

DAY 2, Wed., 8-10 sessions, running concurrently, but scheduled to minimize conflicts between p.i.s. Researchers would give results of 94 field work, discuss 95 plans, etc.

Sessions would include:

Research strategies:

What is causing decline of pink salmon and herring in PWS What is causing long-term decline of mammals & seabirds, possibly combined with

What is inhibiting nearshore recovery

Is it continuing exposure to oil? What are effects of marine pollution?

General Restoration groupings:

Archaeology Subsistence Recreation Fish & shellfish enhancement and replacement Fish stock separation & management: genetics, tagging, otolith marking

Each session at its conclusion would develop a synthesis report, and select presenter(s) for the next day's panels.

DAY 3, Thurs. Synthesis reports from each of groups. Reports would follow specified format. Would allow from question and answer and discussion with entire audience.

DAY 4, Fri., 9am - 1 pm

Discussion of research priorities and restoration strategies; Discuss general health of ecosystem, big picture system interactions, what are we learning? Discussion led by core reviewers.

Follow-up:

Small work group to develop revised science strategy, modify individual strategies in preparation for FY96 project solicitation.

Public forum/discussion & Annual Status Work in March for spill anniversary

To: Molly + L.J. From: Kathy / ideas re agenda - FROST-10F3 Suggestions / ideas re agenda - FROST-10F3

9:00 - 10:00 PLENARY INTRODUCTION Welcome, Misc statements Goals and Objectives/Ayers Studies Process - what are candidates for study? (e.g list of injured species, including additions for 94), how study ideas generated, proposals reviewed & selected, review of studies/reports (brief) Spies? (publically introduce members of Sci Rev Comm (& PAG?) PLENARY TALKS - These should include 1) types/scope of

studies being funded; 2) 94 results; 3) new ideas generated by 94 results and/or new info on status of species (20-30 min/talk) (may be overlap between these and the Show & Tell talks)

10:00 - 10:20 Oceanography, phyto and zooplankton (w/ sea/river hypo?) - McRoy or Cooney?

10:20 - 10:40 Intertidal studies - inverts, eelgrass, etc. Does Peterson know enough detail to do this? not a PI but good speaker.

10:40 - 11:40 Fish

Salmon - synthesis of the suite of salmon studies Herring - " - 11

Forage fishes - what are they, why we care, progress 11:40 - 12:00 Birds

- 12:00 1:20 Lunch
- 1:20 1:40 Marine Mammals

1:40 - 2:00 Trophic connections (stable isotope studies) -Schell presenting both Schell/Kline work? (or only in the interdisciplinary session and omit from here?)

2:00-3:00 What did I forget? - archaeology? social sciences????

3:00 - 3:30 Break

3:30 - 4:30 UPDATE - Other science programs in PWS, northern Gulf (how are we integrating? FOCI PICES Arctic Research Commission (possibly FWS re other bird research and ecosystem

studies; NOAA or ADF&G (Loughlin or Lowry) re other marine mammal programs on sea lions and harbor seals)

4:30 - 6:00 PANEL - Local knowledge and science Panel talking about integration of traditional and local knowledge into scientific studies Panel members - Kate Wynne (working w/ communities to sample seal harvest), Fishing rep, Native rep, Craig Matkin? (uses public sightings for KW work), Jim Fall?, Brendan Kelly (SO Commn, SO & HS)

will leave office Fri 16 Sept - Sat 24 Sept

FROST- 3 of

Day 3

8:30 - 10:00 PANEL (Plenary) - Applying an ecosystem approach (Peterson, Rose,)

And then to circles and squares (boxes and ovals?)!!!??? Required reading material prior to sessions should be report from the Church Workshop! Don't want to reinvent the wheel!

10:30 - 2:00 DISCIPLINARY SESSIONS (Oceo/plankton; Intertidal; Fishes; Birds; Marine Mammals, etc.) (2-3 hrs?)

- * Modifications for 95 based on 94 results and pitfalls
 - * Recommendations for 1996

Lunch in house - sandwiches, etc. as per church meeting?

2:30 - dinner ECOSYSTEM GROUPS/MULTIDISCIPLINARY - groups from workplan

- * Did interdisciplinary/integrative work really occur in 94 or in name only?
- * What worked, what didn't? What was most successful?
- * What were the problems? How can we make it better?
- * Are there other opportunities for integration?

* Modifications for 95 based on 94 results

* Recommendations for 1996

I'm not sure when or how, but during this period we should have sessions/subgroups on forage fishes, stable isotopes, maybe others.

Day 4

PLENARY SESSION

P.2/3

Day 2

SHOW AND TELL

8:00 - 9:00 Oceanography (30-50 min? + Q & A)

9:00 - 10:00 Phytos/zoops (30-50 min + Q & A)

10:00 - 10:30 Break

The following groups are just a first cut - may be better groupings from workplan.

- 10:30- 12:00? "<u>Nearshore Ecosystem"</u>
 - * Inverts
 - * Fishes in the nearshore (appropriate life stages of herring, pink salmon, others?)
 - * Sea ducks, oystercatchers, etc.
 - * Sea otters (river otters too?)

12:00 - 1:00 Lunch in town or at hotel

1:00 - 2:30 "Pelagic Ecosystem"
 * Forage fishes (including herring)
 * Sea birds
 * Harbor seals, killer whales

3:00 - 3:30 Break

- 3:30 5:00 Restoration studies
 - * Intro about how selected
 - * Fisheries enhancement
 - * Other studies by "type"

5:00 - 6:30 Restoration panel

Group dinner? with keynote speaker? Some sort of option for people to sign up and pay for a catered dinner?

This day is a little fight -

Wertheimer-1 of 2

September 16, 1994

TO: L.J. Evans

From: Alex Wertheimer

Subject: Science Workshop

As per our homework assignments, I have some comments for you on the structure of the science workshop. I'd like to revisit two topics: the plenary session and the format of the program.

I originally thought it was appropriate to have the plenary session as the annual report to the public, similar to last year's forum. However, on reflection I agree with Byron that such a session should incorporate the technical information reported at the science workshop, and thus should follow the workshop. We talked about the need for a smaller working group to meet to finalize revisions of the science strategy for developing the work plan. The public forum could be held in conjunction with the follow-up meeting. I see three benefits from this approach: 1) the forum would then have the benefit of the latest information; 2) the numbers of scientists attending the follow-up meeting would be limited naturally, since PIs would not be required to attend as they are at the annual workshop; 3) the science workshop would not have to allocate time for the plenary session. The objectives for the workshop that Molly detailed in her memo are met with or without a plenary session.

My proposal on the format of the workshop is to have BOTH concurrent and continuous sessions. (Is this the "Best of Both Worlds" or the "Wayne's World" scenario?) I would divide the workshop into four sections.

- I. Introduction and Directions to Participants
- II. Concurrent sessions with presentations by all PIs
- III. Continuous sessions of synthesis presentations by session chairs
- IV. Discussion of priorities and revision of the science strategy

The key to this format is section II. Molly has suggested that someone synthesize and summarize information to present at the workshop for certain rational suites of projects. Whom do we burden with this task? How unbiased can a single individual be in rounding up sets of information from different projects? Is the information even going to be ready, pre-workshop, to be put into a presentable format? Section II addresses these problems by making the suites of projects into sessions. All PIs bring their information to the sessions. At the end of the day, the participants act as a working group to develop a synthesized summary, which the chair presents in Section III. Workshop participants then have the opportunity to hear in Section III a perspective on all the work, and can get a very focused view of what is going on in areas of specific interest or expertise in Section II.

I am not sure how long this format will take; it depends on how many of the project 'themes' are considered necessary. Section II is no problem other than room space; you just add more concurrent sessions. If there are, say, 12, then Section III could be done in one day of 1/2 and 1 hour presentations. If there are 18, we might need 1.5 days. So a schedule might look like this:

Section I. 1/4 day
Section II. Concurrent Sessions, 3/4 day
Synthesis by sessions in evening, or add 1/2 day
Section III. 1-1.5 days, depending on number of themes
Section IV. 1 day

Total: 3-4 days

Wright 20f2

to be most useful to those people who are not willing to listen to all the presentations or those in which they are most interested. A synthesis session would also probably only be a quickly prepared summary of the technical presentation, much as what occurred at the symposium. The real synthesis session is the science workshop.

If we leave the synthesis for the science workshop, and require that everyone have the opportunity to learn about all the projects, scenario 1 is the only option. In this scenario all the PIs, public and others could hear presentations on each project and hold meetings with cohorts during times of presentations of which they are not interested. Also, I think presentations should be given by PIs with projects approved for 1995. These would be brief descriptions of their project goals, etc. and could occur in a 1/2 day period after the technical sessions. I expect the total technical session would then takeat least 3 1/2 full days. The last day of the week could be for the science workshop.

Although I first thought we should have the public Forum at the same time as the technical sessions and science workshop, I now believe the Forum should occur much later when the FY94 work can be better summarized. The Forum and release of the annual report should, therefore, occur on the oil spill anniversary. SEP 22 '94 10:10 OOSDAR

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal m	nemo 7671 # of pages > 7
To Mally Mc Cammon	From Bruce (1) risht
Co	Ça.
<i>t</i> .	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

Wright

P.1/2

September 21, 1994

TO: Molly McCammon and L.J. Evans

FROM: Bruce Wright

SUBJECT: Winter Workshop

So, at least four scenarios have been presented for the winter workshop:

1. In this scenario every PI presents (about 20 minutes each) in consecutive order without a synthesis. The technical session will last about three days followed by a one day Science Strategy Workshop. This science workshop will have similar objectives to the April 1994 workshop in which we will receive input into revising the Science Strategy.

2. In this scenario we will have concurrent sessions by themes; SEA, pink salmon, mammals, etc. The synthesis reports will precede the technical sessions and will be presented by selected people to review research projects by the same themes. This will allow for presentation of information in a much shorter time, probably 1 1/2 to 2 days. The science workshop will follow the technical session.

3. The third scenario would be the shortest with concurrent sessions and no synthesis session. Again, the science workshop will follow the technical session.

4. The 4th scenario I heard about is to have concurrent technical sessions presented by themes. Of course everyone will want to present at the same time as the Archaeology group. The technical session will be followed by synthesis presentations. The synthesis presentation will be prepared by a session chair using the information presented by the PIs. The technical and synthesis sessions will probably take about 2 1/2 days. The science workshop will follow.

In all four scenarios a second science plan workshop will occur with a smaller more select group several weeks after the winter meetings. At this second workshop the Science Strategy will be revised and prepared for distribution.

A public Forum can occur before the technical sessions, right after the technical sessions, after the science workshop, or much later, say, on the oil spill anniversary.

My recommendation is that we do not have a synthesis session before or after the technical session. A synthesis session seems

September 18, 1994

TO: Molly McCammon L.J. Evans

FROM: Andy Gunther

RE: Draft Program for Science Workshop

This memo presents my suggestions for the format of the science workshop scheduled for January 1995. After listening to the discussion in the January 7 meeting, I believe that my original scope for the annual workshop is not appropriate based upon my new understanding of our objectives. Instead of conducting a more standard scientific symposium, it is clear that we need to provide oppotunities for a public forum and for discussions that will influence our thinking for future years rather than just reporting and discussing results from 1994.

Day 1: Progress of Restoration

• The purpose of Day 1 is to provide a public forum for reporting the status of injured resources and services, the strides taken in 1994 toward achieving restoration of injuries, and an overview of the program direction for 1995.

Welcome Statement from the Governor Introductory remarks from Trustee Council

Status of Injured Resources and Services

• these talks, presented by Coordinating Committee members or senior scientists, would review injured resources and the 1994 work effort in the light of the priority research questions listed in the Invitation.

Marine Mammals Birds Fish (including 94320) Nearshore/Intertidal cultural resources other

Restoration Objectives and Program Directions

• the purpose of these talks is to provide some "top-down" direction to the remaining portions of the workshop, while also providing an indication of the future directions of the program to those attending the public forum.

Management Plan for Restoration (presented by Jim Ayers) Scientific tasks for Restoration (presented by Chief Scientist/core reviewers)

Social Hour(s)

Day 2: Status of scientific research and monitoring

• this day will be devoted to concurrent scientific presentations of findings through 1994 for those projects continuing into 1995. The purpose of these presentations is to provide the foundation for discussing outstanding scientific issues, and options for coordination in 1995 and beyond.

presentations grouped by 1995 workplan category.

Each group would end with a panel discussion of all the PI's presenting to underscore key information gaps that must be addressed in 1995. A reporter will need to be assigned to each group, as would a core reviewer. The discussion of information gaps would be framed in the context of addressing the priority research questions.

Day 3: Assessing information gaps to be addressed for achieving restoration

Report from each panel discussion Synthesis of information gaps Review of 1995 workplan in light of the information gaps

FY 95 Project Interim Budget Request Trustee Council Action August 23, 1994

			INTERIM	ANALYSIS	REMAINING	INTERIM	ANALYSIS		
PROJECT			FUNDS	FUNDS	FUNDS	FUNDS	FUNDS	TOTAL	
NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	REQUESTED	REQUESTED	REQUESTED	APPROVED	APPROVED	APPROVED	
Category 1									
95007A	Archaeological Site Restoration - Index Site Monitoring	ADNR		191.7	194.3		191.7	191.7	
95007B	Site SEW-488 Archaeological Site Restoration	USFS		32.2	83.8		32.2	32.2	
95024	Enhancement of PWS Pink Salmon Stocks	ADFG	53.3		131.0	0.0		0.0	
95039	Common Murre Productivity Monitoring	DOI		30.5	123.7		30.5	30.5	
95041	Introduced Predator Removal from Islands	DOI		20.4	46.1		20.4	20.4	
95064	Monitoring, Habitat Use and Trophic Interactions of Harbor Seals in Prince William Sound	ADFG		114.7	232.4		114.7	114.7	
95069	Restoration of Salmon Stocks of Special Importance to Native Cultures	ADFG	14.6		360.4	0.0		0.0	
95074	Herring Reproductive Impairment	NOAA		148.8	258.3		148.8	148.8	
95086C	Herring Bay Monitoring and Experimental Study	ADFG		327.3	576.9		327.3	327.3	(3)
95089	Information Management System	ADFG	304.8		285.9	304.8		304.8	
95090	Mussel Bed Restoration and Monitoring	NOAA		160.4	278.4		160.4	160.4	
95100	Administration, Public Information and Scientific Management	ALL	3,597.2		0.0	3,597.2		3,597.2	
95126	Habitat Protection Acquisition Support	ADNR	626.2		473.3	626.2		626.2	
95131	Nanwalek, Port Graham, Tatilek Clam Restoration	ADFG	82.5		362.5	0.0		0.0	
95137	Prince William Sound Salmon Stock Identification and Monitoring Studies	ADFG		55.8	221.7		55.8	55.8	
95163	Abundance Distribution of Forage Fish their Influence on Recovery of Injured Species	NOAA		194.8	1,135.7		194.8	194.8	(2)
95166	Herring Natal Habitats	ADFG	17.8	220.8	274.2	17.8	220.8	238.6	
95173	Factors Affecting the Recovery of PWS Pigeon Guillemot Recoveries	DOI		55.1	353.7		55.1	55.1	
95191A	Investigating and Monitoring Oil Related Egg and Alevin Mortalities	ADFG		68.4	196.6		68.4	68.4	
95191B	Injury to Salmon Eggs and Pre-emergent Fry Incubated in Oil Gravel (Laboratory Study)	NOAA	45.0	120.4	165.6	45.0	120.4	165.4	
95244	Seal and Sea Otter Cooperative Subsistence Harvest Assistance	ADFG	4.0	48.6	41.3	4.0	48.6	52.6	
95255	Kenai River Sockeye Salmon Stocks	ADFG	29.3	343.1	272.6	29.3	343.1	372.4	
95258	Sockeye Salmon Overescapement	ADFG	140.2	344.9	513.0	140.2	344.9	485.1	
95290	Hydrocarbon Data Analysis, Interpretation, and Database Maintenance for Restoration and NRDA Environmental	NOAA		91.9	71.5		91.9	91.9	

Note (1): All 95320 projects need policy clarification with respect to travel, travel rates, and tuition.

Note (2): Funding for Projects 95163 and 95320N is contingent upon Executive Director approval of cooperative working agreement of these two projects and any other nearshore or forage fish project. Note (3): Future funding for Project 95086C should be dependent on further review and integrated with other intertidal work.

FY 95 Project Interim Budget Request Trustee Council Action August 23, 1994

	An		INTERIM	ANALYSIS	REMAINING	INTERIM	ANALYSIS		
PROJECT			FUNDS	FUNDS	FUNDS	FUNDS	FUNDS	TOTAL	
NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	REQUESTED	REQUESTED	REQUESTED	APPROVED	APPROVED	APPROVED	
95320A	Prince Salmon Growth and Mortality	ADFG		48.7	219.1		48.7	48.7	(1)
95320E	Juvenile Salmon and Herring Integration	ADFG	16.0	98.0	829.1	0.0	98.0	98.0	
95320G	Phytoplankton and Nutrients	ADFG	12.8	75.7	150.8	12.8	75.7	88.5	
95320H	Role of Zooplankton in the PWS Ecosystem	ADFG		51.9	195.5		51.9	51.9	
953201(2)	Isotope Tracers - Food Webs of Fish	ADFG	2.0	28.0	49.4	2.0	28.0	30.0	
95320J	Information Systems and Model Development	ADFG	94.9	170.8	570.5	14.6	170.8	185.4	
95320M	Observational Physical Oceanography in PWS and the Gulf of Alaska	ADFG	34.3	104.4	439.1	34.3	104.4	138.7	
95320N	Nearshore Fish	ADFG	200.0	213.1	222.1	200.0	213.1	413.1	(2)
953200	Avian Predation on Herring Spawn	USFS	23.1		75.9	23.1		23.1	
95424	Restoration Reserve	ALL	12,000.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	
95427	Harlequin Duck Recovery Monitoring	ADFG		17.3	209.6		17.3	17.3	
Category 2									
95279	Subsistence Foods Testing Project	ADFG	14.2	66.9	129.5	14.2	66.9	81.1	
95320D	Prince William Sound Pink Salmon Genetics	ADFG		56.5	170.5		56.5	56.5	
95266	Shoreline Restoration	ADEC		97.9	1,313.2		97.9	97.9	
Category 5									
95102-CLO	Closeout: Murrelet Prey Foraging Habitat PWS	DOI		63.8	0.0		63.8	63.8	1
95110-CLO	Habitat Protection - Data Acquisition Support	ADNR		144.0	0.0		144.0	144.0	
95139B	Salmon Instream Habitat Stock Restoration	USFS	5.2		0.0	5.2		5.2	
95199	Institute of Marine Science and Seward Improvement	ADF&G	46.5		0.0	46.5		46.5	
95285-CLO	Subtidal Sediment Recovery Monitoring	NOAA		121.0	0.0		121.0	121.0	
95422-CLO	Restoration Plan Environmental Impact Statement	USFS		20.0	0.0		20.0	20.0	
95428-CLO	Subsistence Restoration Planning and Implementation	ADFG	23.1	74.8	2.0	23.1	74.8	97.9	
Category 3									
95139D	Salmon Instream Restoration: Pink Creek and Horse Marine Bypass	ADFG	7.9		53.7	0.0		0.0	
95259	Restoration of Coghill Lake Sockeye Salmon Stocks	ADFG	7.8	78.8	246.4	7.8	78.8	86.6	

Note (1): All 95320 projects need policy clarification with respect to travel, travel rates, and tuition.

Note (2): Funding for Projects 95163 and 95320N is contingent upon Executive Director approval of cooperative working agreement of these two projects and any other nearshore or forage fish project.

Note (3): Future funding for Project 95086C should be dependent on further review and integrated with other intertidal work.

FY 95 Project Interim Budget Request Trustee Council Action August 23, 1994

PROJECT		4.0.000	INTERIM FUNDS	ANALYSIS FUNDS	REMAINING FUNDS	INTERIM FUNDS	ANALYSIS FUNDS	TOTAL
NUMBER	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	AGENCY	REQUESTED	REQUESTED	REQUESTED	APPROVED	APPROVED	APPROVED
Category 4								
95320B	Coded Wire Tag Recoveries from Pink Salmon Closeout	ADFG		84.3	0.0		84.3	84.3
95320C	Otolith Thermal Mass Marking of Hatchery Pink Salmon in PWS	ADFG		1.9	640.3		1.9	1.9
Category 6 -	Carry Forward Funding							
95043B	Cutthroat Trout and Dolly Varden Rehabilitation in Western Prince William Sound	USFS	134.8			134.8		134.8
95139A1	Salmon Instream Restoration: Little Waterfall Creek Barrier Bypass	ADFG	90.0			90.0		90.0
95139C2	Small Instream Restoration: Lowe River	ADFG	170.1			170.1		170.1
95417	Waste Oil Disposal Facilities	ADEC	232.2			232.2		232.2
Total			18,029.8	4,187.6	12,169.6	5,775.2	4,187.6	9,962.8

Note (1): All 95320 projects need policy clarification with respect to travel, travel rates, and tuition.

Note (2): Funding for Projects 95163 and 95320N is contingent upon Executive Director approval of cooperative working agreement of these two projects and any other nearshore or forage fish project.

Note (3): Future funding for Project 95086C should be dependent on further review and integrated with other intertidal work.

9/16/94 5:01 PM

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



FAX COVER SHEET

To: Restoration Work Force	
From: Molly Mc Cammon	Date: 9-23-94
Comments:	Total Pages: 4
Here is the final	FY95 Project Interin
Budget Request.	
0 0	

RESTORATION WORK FORCE MEMBERS INCLUDE:

Bartels, Leslie Berg, Catherine Brodersen, Mark Bruce, David Fries, Carol Gibbons, Dave Gilbert, Veronica Loeffler, Bob McCammon, Molly

Montague, Jerome Morris, Byron Myers, Eric Rabinowitch, Sandy Spies, Bob Sullivan, Joe Thompson, Ray Wright, Bruce

Document Sent By: Rebecca

9/9/94

**** *** ****	**************************************	***************************************		
TRANSMISSION OK				
TX/RX NO.	2536			
CONNECTION TEL		7863625		
CONNECTION ID				
START TIME	09/23 11:11			
USAGE TIME	02'10			
PAGES	4			
RESULT	OK			

2001

TX/RX NO.	2535	
INCOMPLETE TX/RX	[20] 7863350	C.BERG
TRANSACTION OK	[09] 19075867589	J.AYERS
	[10] 19075867555	D.GIBBONS
	[11] 19074655375	M. BRODERSEN
	[12] 19074654759	J. MONTAGUE
	[13] 19077896608	MORRIS-WRIGHT
	[14] 2572510	S. RABINOWITCH
	[15] 5624871	C.FRIES
	[17] 2713992	R. THOMPSON
	[18] 5223148	J. SULLIVAN
	[19] 7863636	L. BARTELS
	[35] 15103737834	B.SPIES
	[38] 2715827	G.BELT
ERROR		

Min.

Presentation to Exxon Valdez Oilspill Trustees Institute of Marine Science Infrastructure Improvements Project #94199

October 5, 1994 9AM

÷	Executive Director Introduction & Background J. Ayers	3
•	Purpose and Need	5
	- Mammals	2
	- Fish GeneticsJ. Seeb	* 2
	- EVOS Research NeedsR. Spies (Telecon) C. H. Peterson (Telecon) Vera Alexander	2 2 2
÷	NEPA Compliance	3
٠	Facility Design	10
•	Operating Structure L. Selkregg	3
	- City of SewardT. Jones	2
	- SAAMSD. Schaefermeyer B. Noll	2 2
٠	Integrated Funding Approach L. Selkregg	3
	- Fund RaisingR. Temper	3
٠	Capital and Operating BudgetL. Selkregg	3
	- VisitationD. Fox	3
٠	Project Schedule L. Selkregg	2
٠	Vessel and SubmersibleT. Smith	2
		56
٠	Close/Questions & Answer	20
	Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages > /	
	TO KIM SUNDBENS TOT LEVE	
	Dept. De a art a stat a Phone #	
	FERT 2767178 FORT	

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	23/94 13:22 23	01 210 1110	EV Restoration		
		************ *** MULTI *********	**************************************		
•	TX/RX NO.		2542		
	INCOMPLETE TX/RX				
	TRANSACTION OK	[ 09] 19075867	7589	J.AYERS	
		[ 35] 15103733	7834	<b>B.SPIES</b>	
		2716507			
		91972624	426		
	ERROR				

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



## FAX COVER SHEET

To: <u>See distribution</u> Number: Kim Sundberg Date: 9-23-94 From: Total Pages: Comments: Revised IMS presentation agende m Ayers Mas eterson 919-726-2426 Ney Swanton 271-6507 PUD 919-7262426 twanton Swanton 271-6507 Document Sent By: Rebecca 9/9/94

Trustee Agencies

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Restoration Work Force

- FROM: Molly McCammon Director of Operations
- DATE: September 23, 1994
- RE: Update on activities and issues

Since some people weren't able to attend the Thursday work force meeting, I thought I would provide a re-cap. Please let me know if you need any other information about any of these or if I missed something.

1. September 28 review session.

This meeting will start at 9 a.m. in Anchorage. Plan on all day. Bob Spies will be there, with preliminary project recommendations. A draft agenda will be circulated for review early next week. Some liaisons have requested that agencies identify in advance if possible which projects they have questions about or would like additional information, so that the agency lead can get the answers in advance. If anyone would like to do this, I would be happy to compile and circulate on next Monday. You would have to get me your issues and questions by early Monday morning at the latest.

2. Revised date for ED/Work force review in October

For various scheduling reasons, we would like to change the review date from October 17-18 to **OCTOBER 18-19.** If this is a problem, please let me know as soon as possible.

3. Washington, D.C. trip

Jim Ayers will be in D.C. briefing the federal assistant secretaries on habitat acquisition and the IMS from October 12 - 15.

Trustee Agencies

### 4. Institute of Marine Science

Nancy Swanton is writing the Record of Decision for the IMS Environmental Impact Statement. It will be available for signing on October 28. The revised project description is nearly final and will be circulated next week. A draft report from the executive director responding to the issues and questions that have been identified during the review process will be attached. We are assuming that all potential problems, issues, and questions have been identified by this time and there are no additional issues to add to the list of those being addressed.

### 5. Final Restoration Plan

The preliminary review draft of the Final Restoration Plan will be circulated to agencies on Tuesday, September 27. The review deadline is October 7. Rod Kuhn and Karen Klinge are the only two remaining members of the EIS team. They have prepared an outline of the Record of Decision, and are now working on the draft.

6. Legislative Budget & Audit

The LB&A Committee will meet in Juneau on Monday, September 26 at 11 a.m. to take up the RPLs for the state funding that was approved by the Trustees in August. State agencies need to decide who will be at this meeting to answer any and all questions on their projects. Please let Jim or Traci know. In addition, if you know of potential problems, controversies or questions regarding any of your projects, please let Jim or Traci know to deal with it. You may want other, more technical people available to answer specific detailed questions, and you may want your budget person there to answer any detailed budget questions.

7. Court request

The court request is awaiting Deborah Williams return and signature Monday. It will then be ready to file.

### 8. Stable isotopes

Byron Morris and Catherine Berg had a number of questions about Bob Spies' draft recommendation on stable isotope work. Their analysis indicated that many of the projects he referred to as including stable isotope work may not actually do so. In addition, only 2 projects are ranked category 1, and 3 projects are 2's. In short, this may not be as big a package as it seems. Byron agreed to raise this issue with ADF&G and USFWS, talk to Spies on Monday, and report back with a recommendation on Sept. 28.

### 9. Project and financial report

The financial report to be included in the Trustee Council packet for the October 5 meeting will include: 1) a Sept. 15 financial report from Traci Cramer; 2) the June 30 project financial status report; 3) the June 30 project status report with an analysis of 1992 projects status.

10. Habitat protection and acquisition

Jim Ayers reported on the status of habitat acquisition efforts. The following is a summary of his report.

Appraisals are moving slowly, and there will not be a large number of acquisition proposals before the Trustee Council on November 2. It is clear, that in spite of assurances from the appraisers on July 18 that certain appraisals would be complete, and in spite of an additional \$1.5 million from the Trustees to achieve that, most appraisals will not be complete. The core peer reviewers - Bob Spies, Pete Peterson and Phil Mundy - have made it clear that it is important to have spill-wide, ecosystem-wide protection. Habitat protection throughout the spill area is essential, resulting in the comprehensive balance that is strongly supported by the public. Each negotiator is putting together a restoration benefit report for each package. Details about the individual negotiations will be presented at the October 5 meeting.

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



## FAX COVER SHEET

To: Restoration Work Force

From: <u>Molly</u>	Date: 9-23-94
Comments:	Total Pages:
For thos	e of you in Anchorage, you
have a d	ocument ready for pickup & the
Simpson	Bidg. The document contains
revised a	roject descriptions: 95080, 115,
1244, 127,	129, 131, 133, 134 # 138, Pkap Via
DHL will on	o out today for out of towners.
RESTORATION WC	
Bartels, Leslie Berg, Catherine Brodersen, Mark Bruce, David Fries, Carol Gibbons, Dave	Montague, Jerome Morris, Byron Myers, Eric Rabinowitch, Sandy Spies, Bob Sullivan, Joe

Sullivan, Joe
 Thompson, Ray
 Wright, Bruce

Document Sent By: Rebecca

9/9/94

Gilbert, Veronica

McCammon, Molly

Loeffler, Bob

Trustee Agencies

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

2001

### 

TX/RX NO.	2533	
INCOMPLETE TX/RX	[ 20] 7863350	C.BERG
TRANSACTION OK	[ 09] 19075867589	J. AYERS
	[ 10] 19075867555	D.GIBBONS
	[ 11] 19074655375	M. BRODERSEN
	[ 12] 19074654759	J. MONTAGUE
	[ 13] 19077896608	MORR I S-WRIGHT
	[ 14] 2572510	S.RABINOWITCH
	[ 15] 5624871	C.FRIES
	[ 17] 2713992	R. THOMPSON
	[ 18] 5223148	J. SULLIVAN
	[ 19] 7863636	L.BARTELS
	[ 35] 15103737834	<b>B.SPIES</b>
	[ 38] 2715827	G.BELT
ERROR		

**************************************					
<b>v</b> ²	TRANSMISSION OK				
	TX/RX NO.	2534			
	CONNECTION TEL	7863625			
	CONNECTION ID				
	START TIME	09/23 10:53			
	USAGE TIME	02'13			
	PAGES	4			
	RESULT	ок			

## Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



### **MEMORANDUM**

TO:	Dr. Robert Spies Applied Marine Science				
FROM:	James R. Ayers Executive Director				
		DATE:	September	22,	1994
RE:	Kenai River Sockeye Salmon				

I believe all Kenai River sockeye salmon projects should be reviewed in light of the attached memo from Kenneth Tarbox.

JRA/mir

Attachment

C:\WPDOCS\SPIES3.JRA



To: Distribution

Date: 8-17-94

File/Disk: .

Phone: (907) 262-9368

From: Kenneth E. Tarbox KEN Research Project Leader Commercial Fisheries Division Soldotna Subject: Kenai River 1994 sockeye salmon return.

The sockeye salmon run to Upper Cook Inlet (UCI). currently estimated to be about 5.0 million salmon, was much greater than our preseason forecast of 3.3 million salmon. This has led to speculation, both within and outside ADF&G. that Kenai River system sockeye salmon production may not have been severely depressed by very large escapements obtained in 1987, 1988 and 1989. Effects of these escapements on subsequent adult returns have been predicted from estimates of rearing juveniles and migrating smolt. Kenai River adult returns in 1995 and 1996 were projected to be severely depressed, while the 1994 run was predicted to be weak. The purpose of this memo is to review 1994 run information to determine whether it supports our hypothesis of production depression from large escapements into this system.

#### 1994 Adult Sockeye Salmon Run:

The Kenai River contribution to the total 1994 UCI sockeye salmon run was estimated, based on age composition analysis, to be about 2.5 million salmon - about half of the total run. This is approximately 1.0 million salmon greater than the preseason forecast. The difference between the forecasted and actual run was primarily due to a much greater than expected return of age-1.3 sockeye salmon: 1.8 million actual run versus 0.7 million forecasted run. It appears that the Russian River run will account for 10% to 15% of the total Kenai River run.

Production of adults from the 1989 brood year, currently estimated to be about 1.7 returning adults per spawner, is the lowest on record (see attached table). Although age-2.3 sockeye salmon returning next year will increase this estimate slightly, total production from this brood year is still expected to be less than 2.0 returning adults per spawner. The 1988 brood year return per spawner ratio is 2.0, which is the lowest on record except for the 1989 brood year. In contrast, the 1987 brood year, with an escapement level similar to that obtained in 1989, produced 6.8 returns per spawner. Therefore, two out of the three large consecutive escapement years have produced Kenai River sockeye salmon at significantly reduced levels. Furthermore, there seems to be a trend of

decreasing production as consecutive large escapements are put into the system.

#### Fry to Adult Survival:

Fry to adult survival data, as was mentioned earlier, also suggested that decreased adult production would be obtained from the large escapements obtained during 1988 and 1989:

Brood Year	Fall Fry Estimate ¹ (millions)	Adult Return ² (millions)	Fry Survival (percent)
1986	10.2	1.744	17.0
1987	37.0	9.5 <del>9</del> 0	25.9
1988	14.0	1.832	13.1
1989	24.6	2.341	9.5 ³
1990	7.1		
1991	9.5		

¹Estimates only include juveniles rearing in Kenai and Skilak lakes. ²Returns include Russian, Hidden, and Moose River drainages. ³Survival may reach 10.0% after addition of 1995 age-2.3 return.

A trend of decreasing fry to adult survival is evident for the 1988 and 1989 brood years. This is similar to the trend mentioned earlier in return per spawner values.

#### Smolt to Adult Survival:

The 2.3 million sockeye salmon adults produced by the 1989 brood year is almost equal to the total smolt production of 3.0 million estimated for that brood year. A smolt to adult survival of 77% appears to be unreasonably high. suggesting that smolt estimates, particularly at low abundance levels, may not be very accurate. Based on adult return and marine survival estimates, smolt production for the 1989 brood year was probably 8-10 million for the Kenai mainstem lake system. This still means that overwinter survival of juveniles was only 30-40%, much less than the more "normal" range of 50-70% estimated for numerous lakes studied by the ADF&G Limnology Laboratory (Gary Kyle, personal communication). In contrast, 1987 brood year juveniles probably had an overwinter survival in the Kenai mainstem lake system of 80%, while 1992 brood year juveniles probably had a survival of 60-70%.
- Adult production from the 1990 brood year also appears to be greater than what was expected from smolt data. The return of age-1.2 adults to the Kenai River in 1994 is estimated to be 0.117 million, although Hidden Lake, Russian River, and Moose River sockeye salmon have not yet been subtracted from this number to estimate mainstem production.

We were concerned with our ability to estimate smolt numbers even prior to examining data from the 1994 adult return because of 1) our inability to capture sufficient numbers of smolt during small runs for mark and recapture estimates of trap efficiency: and 2) our inability to capture large smolt. Smolt catches in our traps first decline markedly in 1991, and we were only able to estimate trap efficiency once for 1989 brood year age-1. smolt. Smolt catches in 1992 and 1993 were even lower, and we were unable to estimate trap efficiency at all during both these field seasons. We based estimates of smolt abundance for these years on previous estimates of trap efficiencies which, apparently, were too high. Smolt traps always appeared to be size selective, and were never effective at capturing large smolt, which comprise most production from Russian River, Hidden Lake, and Moose River.

All the above issues have been discussed in various project status reports as well as in documentation for the 1994 forecast (Geiger, H.J. and E. Simpson. 1994. Preliminary forecasts and harvest projections for 1994 Alaska salmon fisheries and review of the 1993 season. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Management and Development Division, Regional Information Report 5J94-08, Juneau). In fact, the 1994 forecast document stated the following: "Unfortunately, the number of smolt caught in the smolt traps was insufficient to make a precise estimate. In addition, there is a strong possibility that the traps cannot be used to estimate the number of age-2. smolt. Therefore, we have the potential for significant error in the Kenai River forecast."

Smolt estimates have been more reasonable for years with relatively high smolt migrations such as those obtained from the 1987 and 1992 brood year.

#### Summary and Recommendations

We do not yet understand the effects of large escapements into the Kenai River system. However, production, as measured by return per spawner values and fry to adult survival estimates, has been relatively poor for two out of three years with consecutive large escapements (1987-1989). Furthermore, even though escapements in 1990 and 1991 were within the range of the existing escapement goal, smolt estimates suggest that production will continue to decline until 1997. This indicates the consecutive large escapements may depress production in future years with reduced escapements.

Available data do not appear to support the hypothesis that large escapements produce large returns on a consistent basis. Although the 1994 Kenai River run was larger than expected, adult production was still the lowest on record and overwinter fry mortality still appears to have been greater than average. To determine adult production for the 1990 and 1991 brood years, for which smolt estimates predict a drastic decline, will require assessment of adult runs in 1995 and 1996. It is premature at this time to draw conclusions concerning Kenai River biological escapement goals. Adult returns over the next year or two - should greatly assist us in evaluating future goals.

Distribution: Brannian, Clasby, , Delaney, Eggers, Fox, Fried, Hilsinger, King, Koenings, Larson, Nelson, McBride, Reusch, Rosier, Waltemyer

Attachments

KENAI RIVER SOCKEYE TOTAL RUN FROM BROOD YEAR INCLUDING ESTIMATES OF INTERCEPTION CATCHES

Handrad California

s_at ⊡ 59⁹⁷

ь

Sam

.

*****		- + -			+			· F	LETURN BY	AGE CLASS	+			+	*	+	+	
BROOD	YEAR	:	0.2 :	1.1 :	0.3 :	1.2 :	2.1 ::	0.4 :	1.3 :	2.2 :	3.1 :	1.4 :	2.3	3.2	2.4 :	3.3 :	3.4 :	TOTAL :
: 60	1		0:	0;	0:	0:	0:	۵.	0:	Q :	0:	0:	0:	0 :	0:	0:	0.	0 7
: 61		:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0;	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:
: 62		:	0 :	۵.	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	σ:	792:	22088:	320 :	159:	265:	292:	23916:
: 63		;	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	0:	33264 :	9184:	0:	848 :	6943:	5:	292:	0:	0:	50536;
: 64		;	0:	0:	ີ ປະ	21824:	528 :	0:	19133:	19234 :	159:	292:	11023:	2920:	0:	0:	0:	75113:
: 65		:	0:	0:	- 0:	4558:	1537:	0:	12629:	18250:	657:	3900:	33900:	107:	2391:	29:	0:	77958;
: 66		:	0:	159:	Ø:	7446 :	18907:	Ö.	116100:	112393:	0:	2356:	163425:	3165:	2457:	9:	1299:	427716:
: 67	•	:	0:	292:	0:	24900:	8700:	0:	318338:	148526:	0:	7621:	114167:	36 :	0:	0:	6975:	629555:
: 68		:	0;	0:	0:	159584:	1590:	0:	628356:	58021:	Ω:	492;	68402:	0:	0:	0:	9171:	925616:
: 69	ł	:	α:	647:	0:	26064:	4037:	0:	223052:	76559:	0:	3597:	74662:	863:	0:	0:	2096:	411577:
: 70		:	0:	1101:	0:	55509:	5083:	0:	202006:	132228:	0;	0:	130287:	0:	0:	0:	0:	526214:
: 71		:	0:	2787:	0:	32518:	6187:	Q:	455242:	237802:	0:	7844:	250926:	σ:	0:	0:	0:	993306:
: 72		:	0:	3454:	0:	443153:	7697:	0:	1496332:	147373:	0:	816 :	100256:	0:	0:	54:	0:	2199135:
: 73		:	0:	3849:	6246:	103999:	0:	Q:	1739017:	87649:	0:	0:	48668:	242 :	0;	0:	0:	1989670:
: 74		2	0:	0:	0:	46435:	1224:	0 :	403748:	94466:	0 :	0:	140393:	0:	0:	0:	0:	686266:
: 75		:	0:	0:	631:	122562 :	107:	0:	505302:	185687:	0:	0:	44971:	119:	0:	C :	0:	859379:
: 76		1	0:	521:	0:	344841:	4252:	Q 1	639949:	82748:	838:	2612:	106030:	56:	921:	G :	0;	1182768:
: 77		:	٥.	29563:	0:	172247:	2425:	0:	2148629:	49389:	0:	17803:	281181:	84 :	0:	409:	0:	2700730:
: 78		ĩ	0:	0:	0:	97641:	0:	0:	2873798:	39806:	0:	35410:	183437;	5454 :	0:	0:	0:	3235546:
: 79		÷	0:	761:	50399:	170405:	3474;	0:	474186:	107784:	0;	11575:	212193:	4267:	2022 :	0:	Ö:	1037065:
: 80		2	0:	2182:	18185:	148358:	1843:	622:	1452313:	201617:	0:	14282:	519437;	161:	0:	0:	0:	2359000:
: 81		:	541:	0:	7579:	220914:	725;	α;	1283816:	250562:	Q :	6728:	445169:	0:	0;	0:	0:	2216034:
: 82		:	3593:	596:	40651:	726762:	1705:	2286:	7507667:	236800:	0:	21494:	738882:	0:	741:	0;	0:	9281177:
: 63		:	1127:	0:	30154:	674325:	260:	0:	4616735:	210059:	0:	16081;	599012:	0:	10490:	0:	۵:	6178243:
: 84		:	0:	0:	6861:	450967:	4712:	Q :	4130073:	240032:	0:	16559:	815817:	5406:	791:	0;	0:	5671218:
: 85		-	0:	3460:	4424 :	530805;	14224:	0:	1359451:	232657:	0:	5070:	318297:	626:	0:	0;	0:	2469014:
: 86		:	2305:	3793:	13226:	312058:	2444 :	2062:	721304:	139689:	0:	10835:	531823:	0:	4598:	0:	0;	1744137:
: 87		-	0;	4456:	36974 :	564831:	4563 :	0:	6857921:	211346:	0:	101165:	1801434:	1043:	6863:	0;	0*	9590596*
. 88			186 :	830:	0:	84869:	5442:	0:	1205565:	18108Z:	439:	13683:	338740:	1390:	0*	0+	0*	1832226*
: 89		:	1403:	0:	9896:	218007:	55930:	0:	1794244:	261346:	1095:	0:	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	2341921*
90		:	597:	2555:	2204:	117640:	7481:	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	130477*
: 91		:	1007:	0:	0*	0*	<b>a</b> +	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	g*	0+	0*	0*	0+	1007*
92			0*	0*	0*	.0*	0*	0+	0*	0*	0*	0*	0+	0*	0*	0*	0*	.0*
· 93			ó*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0+	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0+	Q*
94		;	0+	0+	0*	0*	0+	0*	G*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0+
		***			******	+												********

	KENAI	RIVER	SOCK	(EAE :	SAL	MON	I AD	WLT R	BTUR	N B	Y AGE	CLASS	FROM	BROOD	YEAP	R E	escapemen	TTS	(1)	I THOUS	ANDS)					
					- 4 -		***			<b>.</b>					TT.T S		TTON							- + P*	TN DRD	
BROOD	YEAR	SCAPEM	ENT :	1.2	:	ł	: 1		1	:1.	3 /1.3	2 :1.3	/1FW	2.2	: 1	<b>t</b> :	2.3 :	ŧ	: 2	3 /2.2	2.3	/2EW:	TOTAL	: 51	PAWNER	i.
:	60	: 0			0:	Q	:	0:	0	:	.000	:	.000	: .	0: 0		0;	0	:	.000	:	.000 :	٥	:	.00	÷
	61	: 0	;	1	0:	G	:	0:	٥	;	.000	:	.000	: '	D: 0	) :	: 0;	0	:	.000	:	.000 :	0	:	.00	:
;	62	: 0	:	1	0:	0	:	۵;	۵	:	.000	:	.000	: 1	0: 0	) :	: 22;	92	:	.000	: 1	.000 :	23	:	.00	:
	63	: 0	:	1	0:	٥	:	33:	65	:	.000	: 1	.000		9: 18	3:	. 6:	13	:	.756	:	.431 ;	50	:	.00	:
:	64	: 0	:	2	1:	29	:	19:	25	:	.877	:	.467	: 1	9: 25	5:	: 11:	14	:	.573	:	.364 :	75	:	.00	:
:	65	: 0	:		4:	5	2	12:	16	\$	2.771	:	.735	: 13	€: 23	3:	: 33:	43	:	1.858	:	.650 z	77	;	.00	:
:	66	: 0	:		7:	1	÷	116:	27	: 1	5.592	:	.940	: 11	2: 26	5 :	: 163:	38	1	1,454	:	.593 :	427	2	.00	;
:	67	: 0	:	2.	4:	3	3	318:	50	: 1.	2.785	:	.927	: 14	3: 23	3:	: 114:	18	:	.769	:	.435 :	629	÷	.00	:
:	68	: 82	:	15:	9:	17	;	628:	67	:	3.937	:	.797	: 5	3: 6	5:	: 68:	7	:	1,179	:	.541 :	925	: 3	11.26	:
:	69	: 51	:	2	6:	б	:	223:	54	:	8.558	:	.895	: 7	5: 18	3:	: 74:	18	:	.975	:	.494 :	411	:	7.94	\$
;	70	: 72	:	5	5:	10	;	202:	38	;	3.639	:	.784	: 13:	2: 25	5:	: 130:	24	;	.985	:	.496 :	526	1	7.27	4
:	71	: 289	:	3:	2:	3	:	455 :	45	: 1	4.000	3	.933	: 23	7: 23	3:	250:	25	:	1.055	4	.513 :	993	:	3.43	2
;	72	: 301	:	44)	3:	20	:	1496:	68	:	3.377	•	.772	: 14	7: 6	5:	100:	4	:	.680	:	.405 :	2199	:	7.28	:
;	73	: 358	2	10	3:	5	:	1739:	87	: 1	5.721	:	.944	: 3'	7:4	1 :	: 48:	2	;	. 555	:	.357 :	1989	:	5.56	:
:	74	: 144	:	4	6:	6	:	403:	58	: 3	8.695	:	.897	: 94	1: 13	3 :	140:	20	1	1.486	:	.598 :	686	:	4.75	;
4	75	: 128	:	12	2 :	14	:	505:	58	: .	4.123	:	.805	18	5:21	L :	: 44:	5	:	.242	:	.195 :	859	7	6.69	:
;	76	: 353	ť	34-	4:	29	:	639:	54	;	1,856	7	.650	: 8:	2: €	5 :	: 106:	8	:	1.281	2	.562 :	1182	:	3.35	;
:	77	: 663	:	17	2:	6	2	2148:	79	: 1.	2.474	:	.926	: 4	8: 3	L :	281:	10	:	5.811	:	.853 :	2700	:	4.07	\$
:	78	: 349	:	9'	7:	3	:	2873:	88	: 2	9.432	* :	.967	3	9: 1	L :	: 183:	5	4	4.608	:	.822 :	3235	:	9.25	:
:	79	: 245	;	17	0:	16	:	474:	45	:	2.783	:	,736	: 10'	7: 10	):	212:	20	4	1.969	:	.663 :	1037	:	4.22	1
:	80	: 411	:	14	8:	6	;	1452:	61	1	9.789	:	.907	: 20)	1: 8	3:	519:	22	1	2.576	:	.720 :	2359	ş	5.73	\$
:	81	: 369	:	221	0 :	9	:	1283:	57	:	5.811	:	.853	25	): 11	L :	445;	20	2	1.777	:	.640 :	2216	:	6.00	:
:	82	: 571	:	72	6:	7	:	7507:	80	: 1	0.330	2	.912	: 23	5: 2	2 :	738:	7	:	3.120	:	.757 :	9281	: 3	16.25	:
:	83	: 566	:	67-	4:	10	;	4616:	74	;	6.846	:	.873	: 21(	3: 3	1 :	: 599 :	9	:	2.852	:	.740 :	6178	: 1	10.92	:
:	84	: 311	:	45	0:	7	:	4130:	72	: :	9.158	:	.902	24	); 4	٤ :	: 815:	14	:	3.399.	:	.773 :	5671	: 2	18.21	:
;	85	: 403	:	53	0:	21	;	1359:	55	: 3	2.561	3	.719	: 233	2: 9	3:	: 318:	12	:	1.368	:	.578 :	2469	2	6.11	:
:	86	: 422	;	31:	2:	17	:	721:	41	: 3	2.311	:	.698	13	9: 8	3:	531:	30	:	3.807	:	.792 :	1744	:	4.13	:
:	87	: 1407	:	564	4:	5	:	6857:	71	: 1	2.142	:	.924	21:	1: 2	2 :	1801:	18	;	8.524	:	.895 :	9590	7	6.81	\$
:	88	: 910	;	84	4:	4	:	1205:	65	: 1	4.205	:	.934	: 1.80	1: 9	• •	338:	13	:	1.871	:	.652 :	1832	:	2.01	:
:	89	: 1379	:	21	8:	9	:	1794:	76	: .	8.230	:	.892	26	l: 13	Li	: 0*	0	*	.000	*	.000 *	2341	*	1.70	٠
:	90	: 515	:	11	7:	90	:	0:	0	*	.000	*	.000 1	• 1	3* C	) *	• 0*	٥	٠	.000	*	.000 *	130	*	.25	*
5	91	: 430	:		0*	0	*	0*	0	*	.000	*	.000 .	• •	3* C	) *	• 0+	0	*	.000	*	.000 *	1	*	.00	*
:	92	: 798	:		Q*	0	٠	0*	0	*	.000	+	.000 •	<del>ا</del> ۲	3* C	3 *	r 0*	ø	*	.000	*	.000 *	0	٠	.00	٠
:	93	: 665	:		0*	٥	•	0*	0	*	.000	+	.000 1	r i	o+ c	• (	• 0•	0	*	.000	٠	.000 *	0	٠	. 30	٠
:	94	: 781	:		6+	¢	*	0*	0	*	.000	*	.000 *	• 1	3* C	3 *	• 0*	0	٠	.000		.000 *	0	*	. 00	٠
******		*			-+-		+			* * *		+				+					+	+				+

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



September 22, 1994

Mr. A.W. Palmisano Director Alaska Science Center 1011 East Tudor Road Anchorage, AK 99503-6199 Dear Mr. Palmisano:

Thank you for your letter of August 19, 1994, regarding ecosystem based management.

Please advise me of any scheduled interagency discussions or meetings. I would appreciate an opportunity to attend.

Sincerety

James R. Ayers Executive Director

JRA/mir

C:\WPDOCS\PALMISAN.LTR

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



## **MEMORANDUM**

то:	Rich Goossens, Appraiser V.S. Forest Service		
FROM:	James R. Ayers Executive Director	DATE:	September 22, 1994
RE:	Appraisal Timeline		

It is very important that we receive weekly updates on the expected completion of tasks and appraisal for each respective authorized EVOS appraisal. I am concerned that dates continue to get extended. Please, give me a call if there are problems with providing weekly updates. I realize this takes some assistance from the other agencies. By way of this memo I am requesting their full support in developing and maintaining timelines for our habitat protection/acquisition effort. As you know it is a critical feature of our comprehensive restoration plan.

Let me know if I can be of assistance.

#### JRA/mir

cc: Glenn Elison, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Alex Swiderski, Department of Law

C:\WPDOCS\GOOSSENS.MEM

#### Trustee Agencies

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



September 22, 1994

Bill Brighton U.S. Department of Justice Environmental & Natural Resources Division 1425 New York Avenue NW, Room 13073 Washington, D.C. 20005-2106

Enclosed are nine revised project descriptions for your review and consideration. You should consider the original project descriptionss in your packets as obsolete, and replace them with these revised versions.

Revised projects include:

- 95080 Fleming Spit Recreation Area
- 95115 Sound Waste Management Plan
- 95124A Tatitlek Mariculture Development Project
- 95127 Tatitlek Coho Salmon Release Program
- 95129 Tatitlek Fish and Game Storage and Processing Center
- 95131 Nanwalek/Port Graham/Tatitlek Clam Restoration Project
- 95133 English Bay River Sockeye Salmon Subsistence Project
- 95134 Chenega Bay Mariculture Development Project
- 95138 Elders/Youth Conference on Subsistence and the Oil Spill

As mentioned in an earlier letter from Jim Ayers, it would be greatly appreciated if your review analysis could be available no later than October 1 in order to assist us in the review process. The Public Advisory Group will be reviewing all the proposed projects at their meeting on October 12-13, the Executive Director will be finalizing his recommendation on October 18-19 with the assistance of the Restoration Work Force, and the Trustee Council will be meeting in Anchorage on November 2-3 to take action on the FY95 Work Plan.

Sincerely,

Molly Melen

Molly McCammon Director of Operations

Trustee Agencies

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior Gina Belt, DOJ Louise Milkman, DOJ Barry Roth, DOI Kathy Chorostecki, NOAA Maria Lisowski, DOA Alex Swiderski, ADOL

CC:

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



Dear Reviewer:

Enclosed are nine revised project descriptions for your review and consideration. You should consider the original project descriptionss in your packets as obsolete, and replace them with these revised versions.

Revised projects include:

95080	Fleming Spit Recreation Area
95115	Sound Waste Management Plan
95124A	Tatitlek Mariculture Development Project
95127	Tatitlek Coho Salmon Release Program

- 95129 Tatitlek Fish and Game Storage and Processing Center
- 95131 Nanwalek/Port Graham/Tatitlek Clam Restoration Project
- 95133 English Bay River Sockeye Salmon Subsistence Project
- 95134 Chenega Bay Mariculture Development Project
- 95138 Elders/Youth Conference on Subsistence and the Oil Spill

The Trustee Council will be meeting in Anchorage on November 2-3 to take action on the FY95 Work Plan. A public hearing will be held on the work plan on Wednesday, September 28 at 7 p.m. This hearing will be teleconferenced to Anchorage, Juneau, Fairbanks and to communities throughout the spill area. The Trustees will also have a public comment period on November 2, although the exact time has not yet been set.

If you have any questions on these or any other projects in the Draft FY95 Work Plan, please don't hesitate to contact the Anchorage Restoration Office at 278-8012.

Sincerely,

Molly McCamm

Molly McCarnmon Director of Operations

## **Fleming Spit Recreation Area**

Project Number:	95080 (Revised, 9/13/94)
<b>Restoration Category:</b>	General Restoration
Proposed By:	The Cordova Sporting Club
Lead Trustee Agency:	Alaska Department of Natural Resources
<b>Cooperating Agencies:</b>	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Cost FY 95:	\$815,800
Cost FY 96:	\$0
Total Cost:	\$815,800
Duration:	2-3 years
Geographic Area:	Prince William Sound
Injured Resource/Service:	Recreation and pink salmon

## INTRODUCTION

Fleming Spit is located on Orca Inlet within the city limits of Cordova. It is at the mouth of Fleming Creek, which has small native runs of coho, pink, and chum salmon. Fleming Spit is also the site of a strong terminal coho sport fishery and a fledgling king salmon fishery. The area is accessible when weather prohibits boating.

The proposed project would replace sport fishing opportunities lost due to the oil spill; improve the habitat of native fish stocks in Fleming Creek; and repair damage to Fleming Spit resulting from illegal camping by cleanup workers. It proposes the following improvements:

- acquisition of a parcel of land at the mouth of Fleming Creek;
- enlargement and improvement of smolt release ponds;
- the construction of permanent net pens;
- the construction of a parking area, a fishing boardwalk, public restrooms, and two fishcleaning stations; and
- general cleanup of the area, including the removal of a derelict barge.

Proposed improvements in the Fleming Spit Recreation Area were supported by resolution of the Cordova City Council in July 1991. It also has strong support from recreation users in Prince William Sound. Initially proposed as part of the Prince William Sound Recreation

Project (Project #93065 and #94217), it was evaluated at a public participation workshop in November 1993 and ranked eighth among 30 projects.

## NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The proposed project would replace sport fishing opportunities lost due to the oil spill and improve the and habitat of native fish stocks in Fleming Creek. It would also repair damage to Fleming Spit from illegal camping by cleanup workers.

There was a significant decline in sport fishing in the oil spill area following the spill. The loss to sport anglers in 1989 is estimated to be \$31 million. In 1992, cutthroat trout sport fishing in western Prince William Sound was closed due to reduced growth and survival. Many residents of Cordova are hesitant and concerned about sport fishing in oiled areas

By acquiring a parcel of private land at the mouth of Fleming Creek and managing them primarily for conservation, the proposed project would help protect the riparian habitat that supports native stocks, including pink salmon. Pink salmon were injured by the spill and have not yet recovered. The parcel is also needed for facilities such as off-street parking, bathrooms, and fish cleaning stations. However, the placement and design of these facilities will be sensitive to the habitat requirements of the native fish stocks in Fleming Creek. (The parcel is zoned Conservation in the Cordova Coastal Management Plan.)

Two of the proposed improvements — a dredge and fill project and the construction of permanent net pens — would directly benefit the terminal fisheries. Existing smolt release ponds are shallow, exposing smolts to bird predation and causing net pens to ground. Net pens should be kept floating to maintain proper circulation. The dredge and fill project would deepen smolt release ponds and allow net pens to float at all tide stages, thereby decreasing mortality among young salmon. The existing fishery operates with two mobile net pens temporarily on loan from the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation. Continuation of the terminal fisheries requires replacement of the mobile net pens with permanent net pens.

The four facilities proposed in this project would provide for safe access and improve sanitation. At present, cars park on the road; people access the fishing area via a steep, rocky slope; and there are no visitor facilities. Off-street parking and a 1,000-foot fishing boardwalk parallel to the road would make access to the fishing area safer. Public restrooms and two fish-cleaning stations would improve sanitation.

The Fleming Spit camp area was injured in 1989 and 1990 by cleanup workers responding to the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. Sanitation problems and resource degradation resulted from illegal camping (*Draft Restoration Plan*, Nov. 1993, p. B-32.). The project proposes to clean up the trash in the area, especially that left behind by oil spill cleanup workers, and to remove a derelict barge.

## **PROJECT DESIGN**

## A. Objectives

- 1. Replacement of sport fishing opportunities lost because of the oil spill.
- 2. Protection of riparian habitat along Fleming Creek.
- 3. Repair of damage to Fleming Spit from illegal camping by cleanup workers.

## B. Methods

- 1. Acquire parcel of land (USS 252) at the mouth of Fleming Creek.
- 2. Dredge and fill the existing smolt ponds.
- 3. Construct permanent net pens.
- 4. Construct off-street parking, a fishing boardwalk, toilet facilities, and two fish cleaning stations.
- 5. Clean up the area and remove a derelict barge.

## C. Schedule

To be developed.

## D. Technical Support

None.

## E. Location

Fleming Spit is located within the city limits of Cordova. It is adjacent to the ferry dock and 1.5 miles from town.

## **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

The proposed project would be implemented through a contract with the City of Cordova. The city would negotiate acquisition land interests; hold title to the acquired land; obtain required permits; comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); and construct and maintain proposed facilities.

## COORDINATION OF INTEGRATED RESEARCH EFFORT

Not applicable.

# FY 95 BUDGET (\$K)

Personnel	0.0
Travel	0.0
Contractual	790.0*
Commodities	0.0
Equipment	0.0
Subtotal	790.0
Gen. Admin.	25.8
Total	815.8

* Proposed as a grant to the City of Cordova for the following activities

Acquire parcel	150.0
Dredge and fill operations	150.0
Permanent net pens	20.0
Flood plain management	50.0
Surveying	30.0
Off street parking	30.0
Fishing boardwalk	300.0
Toilet facilities	40.0
Fish cleaning stations	10.0
Barge removal	10.0

## Sound Waste Management Plan

Project Number:	95115 (revised) 9/15/94						
<b>Restoration Category:</b>	General Restoration (new)						
Proposed By:	Prince William Sound Economic Development Council						
Lead Trustee Agency:	ADEC						
Cost FY 95:	\$247,100 (This may increase by approximately \$50,000. We will know within a few days. See footnote at the end of the text.)						
Cost FY 96:	\$ 15,600 to complete Phase I. Additional funds may be needed for Phase II, see below for explanation.						
Total Cost:	Unknown						
Duration:	Unknown						
Geographic Area:	Prince William Sound						
Injured Resource/Service:	Intertidal and subtidal organisms, harlequin ducks, black oystercatchers, sea otters, harbor seals, and other seabirds, shorebirds and marine mammals. The services most likely to benefit are subsistence and recreation, both of which are affected by the visual recognition of pollution.						

## **INTRODUCTION and NEED FOR THE PROJECT**

Abstract: The Sound Waste Management Plan (SWMP) is a comprehensive plan to identify and remove the major sources of marine pollution and solid waste in Prince William Sound that may be affecting recovery of resources and services injured by the *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill. The first phase of the plan will identify the major sources of marine pollution and solid waste, identify their significance, and recommend solutions to reduce the effects that can be implemented by municipalities, state and federal governments, private industry, or trustee agencies. The following phases of the plan will be to implement these solutions. Only the first phase is proposed for FY 1995, and will be implemented using funds from the Alaska Department of Commerce and Economic Development as well as from *Exxon Valdez* Trustee Council.

In total, the plan will use funds from a variety of sources to effect a unified regional effort to permanently reduce the incremental damage being done to the environment of Prince William Sound from marine pollution. In this way, it will reduce stresses on recovering resources and

DRAFT

services and protect their habitat.

**Background:** Despite the panoply of state and federal laws that govern the discharge of pollutants into the marine environment, there remain a number of important waste streams that still foul the environment of Prince William Sound. Complete restoration from the oil spill requires permanent protection from on-going chronic pollution sources that may be degrading the quality of marine habitat for injured resource and services, or may be stressing populations or sub-populations of resources and services.

In many cases, there is currently no easy or no feasible method of meeting state and federal laws designed to protect the Sound's environment. The communities of Prince William Sound, the Coast Guard, EPA, and ADEC are working on parts of these problems, but there is no regional approach. Currently, the lack of a coordinated, comprehensive approach may preclude effective, regional solutions, and may result in some important, regional problems not being addressed. The lack of a region approach may also preclude cost-effective solutions that are beyond the capacity of individual agencies or communities. As a result, there may be increased stress on the resources and services injured by the spill, especially on local populations important for communities, recreation, and subsistence use.

The major waste types that appear to have the greatest potential to affect injured resources and services are below.

• Waste Oil. Engine oil and bilge water are sources of waste oil, much of which is discharged into the waters of Prince William Sound.

*Engine Oil.* Vessels and communities in Prince William Sound generate large quantities of used motor oil and other lubricants. Nationwide, regulatory and financial issues have discouraged people from properly disposing of waste oil; more often than not, waste oil was illegally dumped in landfills, sewer systems, or other open sites. In 1992, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimated that 170 million of the 190 million gallons of waste oil generated in the nation found its way into the environment due to improper disposal; this represents approximately 16 times the amount of oil spilled by the *Exxon Valdez.* Most areas of the country have more, or more convenient facilities than does the spill area.

Cordova, Valdez, and Whittier all have at least one waste oil burner. The burners take waste oil and provide heat for community buildings or electricity for the municipality. In some cases, more capacity may be needed. These facilities have made it feasible for vessels and engine owners to conveniently dispose in a safe and non-polluting manner. For example, there are three waste-oil burners in Cordova, which is the site of a large fishing fleet. One burners, operated by Cordova Electric Cooperative, collected and burned 21,000 gallons of waste oil last year and used the heat for two buildings. Homer, though outside of Prince William Sound, typically serves 850 boats in the harbor at any one time, burned approximately 6,000 gallons per year of waste oil to heat two buildings.

DRAFT

Tatitlek and Chenega lack waste oil burners. These two communities are currently installing docks facilities for handling more boat traffic. The increased activity is likely to increase the potential for inappropriate disposal of waste oil near the communities. For that reason, federal law requires that public docks with significant traffic have solid waste and waste oil collection — a requirement that is frequently not met in small, rural communities because of the difficulty in disposing of the collected material.

*Bilge Water.* Bilge water includes grease and oil from engines and machinery. There is currently no feasible and convenient method in the Sound for fishing, commercial, or recreational vessels to legally dispose of bilge water. There is no community with facilities to conveniently accept bilge water, and as a result, much is probably dumped into Prince William Sound. Much of it is probably dumped in or near the small boat harbors.

- Stormwater Runoff. Stormwater runoff contains grease and oil from city streets, chemicals from laws and buildings, and other polluting residues. Cordova, Valdez, and Whittier all have stormwater systems that discharge directly into the bay, in some cases into habitats such as the Valdez Duck Flats that are essential for resources injured by the spill.
- Oily Waste. Oily waste is the residue of materials that contain oil. Oil filters, absorbent pads, and cleaning materials are examples of oily waste. In most communities there is no alternative but to place oily waste in the landfill. Valdez is working to acquire a crusher to press the oil out of old filters and material. This will reduce the amount of oil in other waste materials, but in most communities, the waste becomes part of the landfill. None of the landfills or dumps in Prince William Sound have an impermeable membrane, and some portions of the oil migrates to water sources.
- Sewage. Sources of sewage include the communities, vessels, and land-based and floating remote lodges. There is no feasible or convenient method for the fishing, commercial, or recreational vessels to legally dispose of the sewage. While some of the large vessels have sewage disposal systems on board, most dump the waste overboard with minimal if any treatment. There have been reports that some remote camps are out of compliance and causing local habitat problems due to improper sewage disposal. In some locations, the amount of sewage may be safely dispersed without significant effect on the local environment. In other locations, there is potential for significant effect.
- Solid Waste. Currently each community in Prince William Sound is out of compliance with federal regulations as it relates to permitting of waste sites. Improper solid waste disposal has the potential to affect water sources and upland habitat used by injured resources. Blowing garbage is a problem in the two communities without a sanitary landfill (Chenega and Tatitlek). Cordova's landfill currently includes diked off tideland areas and the lower portion of the landfill is inundated by the tide. As a result, landfill leachate may contaminate Orca Inlet. In addition, leachate from Valdez's landfill probably reaches Port Valdez.

- Household Hazardous Waste. The three incorporated communities have methods of feasibly disposing of household hazardous waste, but collection is infrequent. The two unincorporated communities do not collect household hazardous waste. As a result, much hazardous waste is probably improperly dumped.
- Fish Wastes. Sources of fish waste include, shore-based processors, floating processors, and sports-fish cleaning stations (usually in small boat harbors).

Shore-based Processors. There appears to be problems with accumulation of offal from fish processors in Valdez and Cordova. The accumulation of many year's of processing wastes in the shallow inlet off Cordova appears to have created an anaerobic zone on the inlet's floor — unusable habitat to the fish, subtidal, and marine mammal resources of the area. There have been recent incidents in Valdez where an unusual stench may be traceable to an accumulation of offal near the processors. In both cases, there are activities by the cities, state, EPA, and fish processors to solve the problems, but no solution is as yet apparent.

*Floating Processors.* In some cases, there may be similar problems with floating processors accumulating wastes in one location. In other cases, the floating processors may distribute their fish wastes without significant harm to the local environment.

Sport-fish Cleaning Stations. The largest sports fishery in Prince William Sound is based out of Valdez, though significant fisheries exists from Cordova and Whittier. In each case, cleaning occurs at sports fish stations in the small boat harbor, and the wastes concentrate in the boat harbor beneath the station. This can overburden waters of the small boat harbor and reduce water quality below federal or state minimums.

Two examples show the potential effects of these problems. The first, Valdez Duck Flats, is adjacent to the Valdez Small-boat Harbor. It is an Area Meriting Special Attention in the Valdez Coastal Management Plan because of its important habitat value. It includes 450 acres of mud flats and 460 acres of saltwater marsh. It provides habitat for rearing salmon and has been recognized by state and federal agencies as providing essential waterfowl habitat for species injured by the spill. The habitat of the Duck Flats may be degraded by the storm water runoff which empties into the area, or by discharges from boats outside the harbor, landfill contamination flowing down Valdez Creek, or sewage disposal in the Port.

Orca Inlet, outside Cordova has the largest pupping concentration of sea otters in Prince William Sound, and is also important for sport fishing, hunting, and is seasonally used by large concentrations of seabirds and waterfowl, including many resources injured by the spill. It is a part of the largest contiguous wetland in the western hemisphere which, during migrations, hosts the largest concentration of shorebirds in the world. The Cordova waterfront hosts most of the problems referenced above. The shoreline includes the solid-waste landfill, which is built in part on tidelands and is inundated by the tide twice each day; storm-water and sewer outfalls, and outfalls for fish-processing offal which has created an anaerobic zone on the inlet floor. from each participating community and organization. The regional approach resulted in the development of this project, and is the overall approach of each phase of the project.

With each community independently combating some of the problems of marine pollution, by coming together as a region, ideas are shared and discussed in a manner that leads to more efficient and cost-effective solutions which is the theme of the proposal. The success of this regional approach by the regional committee is the impetus for this project and will be maintained.

- Phase I will use a request for proposals to solicit a contractor to undertake a comprehensive review of pollution sources, their significance, and provide alternative cost-effective solutions.
- Phase II will handle required ADEC/EPA permitting to implement solutions.
- Phase III is the implementation of the Sound Waste Management Plan implementing permanent solutions to the existing chronic problems. These solutions may take the form of a construction, such as a regional solid waste facility or facilities to accommodate bilge water, or they may take the form of programs to prevent pollution such as increased recycling.

*Other Funding Sources.* Many of the solutions proposed as a result of Phase I, are likely to be funded all or in part by municipalities, villages, private industry, the federal government, and the State of Alaska. Some solutions may be appropriate for funding from the civil settlement.

## **PROJECT DESIGN**

**A. Objectives.** The development of the Sound Waste Management Plan originated with Prince William Sound Economic Development Council's regional Solid Waste Management Committee.

The following outlines the objectives to be accomplished as part of Phase I:

## 1. Identifying options.

a. Use existing information and where necessary gather new information to identify the major sources of marine pollution and solid waste, and evaluate which waste streams are priority for reduction.

The table below summarizes problems in the communities of Prince William Sound.

Key

 $\mathbf{E}$  = Some of waste stream likely enters marine waters.

ff = Facilities or community program available (though not necessarily adequate).

Waste Stream:	Cord	lova	Val	dez	Tati	tlek	Chen	ega	Wh	ittier
Waste Oil Engine Oil Bilge Water	Þ	ff	Þ	ff	Þ		Þ		Þ	ff
Stormwater Runoff	Þ		Þ						Þ	
Oily Waste	Þ		Þ		Þ		Þ		Þ	
Sewage Community Vessels	Þ	ff	Þ	ff	Þ		Þ		Þ	ff
Solid Waste	Þ	ff	Þ	ff	Þ	ff	Þ	ff		ff
Household Hazardous Waste	Þ	ff	Þ	ff	Þ		Þ		Þ	
Fish Wastes Processors Sport-fish cleaning	Þ								Þ	

The problems referenced above may be affecting resources and services injured by the spill, including disruption of important habitat. Any decrease in local pollution would have the effect of decreasing the stress on injured resources and services that rely on clean water. Those resources and services likely to benefit the most are those that feed in the intertidal or near-shore waters in the vicinity of community waterfronts and small boat harbors. These resources most likely to benefit include harlequin ducks, black oystercatchers, sea otters, harbor seals, and other seabirds, shorebirds and marine mammals. The services most likely to benefit are subsistence and recreation, both of which are affected by the visual recognition of pollution.

**Project Description.** A three phase approach is proposed. This project, however, includes funding for only the first phase. The project will be managed by the Prince William Sound Economic Development Council in conjunction with the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation.

In continuing the efforts of the Prince William Sound Economic Development Commission, costs for the project are defrayed by shared transportation, teleconference and meeting costs

- b. Analyze waste management reduction, processing, transportation, and disposal alternatives appropriate for Prince William Sound. Information for some or all alternatives should include regulatory requirements, site information, cost estimates, transportation methods, and funding sources.
- c. Recommend solutions to reduce the effects that can be implemented by municipalities, state and federal governments, private industry, or trustee agencies. Many of these may involve regional coalitions of groups.
- 2. Community choice. This project is not solely technical; rather, communities and agencies must implement the technical solutions. For that reason, the project objectives include establishing a public participation program to understand and address community concerns and needs. The public participation needs not involve public meeting or other mass participation mechanisms. However, it should ensure that communities are involved, and understand the problems and possible solutions in order to build consensus for actions to reduce marine pollution and solid waste that will restore Prince William Sound. Accomplishing this objective requires communities and agencies to choose which options to implement.

## **B.** Methods

- 1. Community Participation Component. As a regional project, local input and coordination is crucial to the long-term success of the SWMP project by creating local ownership. Agreeing on and implementing effective solutions to waste management problems requires the participation of the communities that will implement them. A comprehensive, coordinated, regional approach requires participation by all communities in Prince William Sound. This proposal was developed and intended to be coordinated by Prince William Sound Economic Development Council's Solid Waste Management Committee with representation from all of the Sound's communities. The project will be completed in cooperation with ADEC.
  - a. DEC will do the financial administration of the contract that is the major part of Phase I.
  - b. Prince William Sound Economic Development Council's Solid Waste Management Committee with participation from each of the Prince William Sound communities, DEC, and possibly with EPA and the US Coast Guard will manage the contract. This participation is important for the results of the project — that the recommended solutions will be agreed to and implemented by the appropriate communities and regulatory agencies.
- 2. Technical Component for Phase I. A Request for Proposals will solicit the most qualified firm to accomplish the objectives of Phase I.



9/22/94

## C. Schedule (FY 95 - Plan of Work)

November 15, 1994Begin writing RFPFebruary 1995Advertise RFPApril 15, 1995Award ContractFall 1995Draft Report to the PWS Economic Development Council and ADECFebruary 15, 1996Final Report

## **D.** Technical Support

All technical support will be provided by the Prince William Sound Economic Development Council's regional Solid Waste Management Committee, and by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation.

## E. Location

Prince William Sound

## **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

For the most part, solutions to the identified problems will be implemented by communities and local groups. They must be the major part of the process to identify and choose these solutions. To maintain the direct link from development and implementation of the SWMP, Prince William Sound Economic Development Council's regional Solid Waste Management Committee in cooperation with DEC will implement this regional project in cooperation with ADEC.

The Contractor will be selected by competitive solicitation. PWS Economic Development Council will manage the contract under agreement to ADEC. The Economic Development Council is an Alaska Regional Development Organization (ARDOR) which under AS 36.30.850 may receive funds from the state without competitive solicitation. (The contractor will be selected using normal, State of Alaska competitive procedures.)

## **PUBLIC PROCESS**

This project will be administered, in cooperation with DEC, by representatives of the affected communities. The Prince William Sound Economic Development Council includes representatives of each community, and industry representatives including the fishing, tourism, and petroleum industries. The process will continue with public review at local city council and village council meetings for comment as part of the SWMP. An integral part of the SWMP is community education.

DRAFT

## COORDINATION OF INTEGRATED RESEARCH EFFORT

This project is not research, and integration with other Trustee research activities is unnecessary.

## FY 95 BUDGET (\$K)

Personnel	12.8
Travel	6.0
Contractual ¹	210.6
Commodities	1.0
Equipment	0.0
Capital Outlay	0.0
Subtotal	230.4
Gen. Admin.	16.7
Total ¹	247.1

Note: the contractual cost includes \$175,000 for a consultant to develop the regional waste management plan, and \$29,500 for Prince William Sound Development Council. Both contracts are expected to run through March 1996.

¹ There is still some discussion of the size of the consultant contract required to accomplish the objectives of this study, and the project cost may increase by approximately \$50,000. We are currently seeking some professional review, and will know the answer in the next few days. With or without the additional \$50,000, the amount requested is less than the original request published in the draft work plan.

October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995

Project Description: This project will explore various options for regional management of waste oil, associated toxics and solid waste. This project is intended to reduce the pollutants introduced into the environment injured by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill so that natural recovery may proceed as quickly as possible.

Budget Catego	rv:	1994 Project No.	'94 Report/	Remainina				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			'95 Interim*	Cost**	Total				
		Authorized FFY 94	FFY 95	FFY 95	FFY 95	FFY 96	Comment		
							FFY 96 expenses to comple	te Phase I.	
Personne	Į	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$12.8	\$12.8		\$7.0		
Travel		\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6.0	\$6.0		\$3.8		
Contracti	Jal	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$210.6	\$210.6		\$3.0		
Commodi	ities	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.0		\$0.5		
Equipmer	nt	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0		\$0.0		
Capital O	utlay	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0		
	Subtotal	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$230.4	\$230.4	\$0.0	\$14.3		
General A	Administration	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$16.7	\$16.7	\$0.0	\$1.3		
	Project Total	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$247.1	\$247.1	TBD	\$15.6		
Full-time	Equivalents (FTE)	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2		0.1		
		Dollar ar	nounts are sh	own in thousa	ands of dollar	S.			
Budget Year Proposed Personnel:			Reprt/Intrm	Reprt/Intrm	Remaining	Remaining	FFY 96 activities and costs	for Phase II	
Position Description			Months	Cost	Months	Cost	(primarily permitting and pre	eparation for imple-	
					· · · · ·		mentation in Phase III) can	only be determined	
Restoratio	on Specialist (R-2	3)	0.0	\$0.0	1.0	\$6.9	following substantial completion of Phase I		
Restoratio	on Specialist		0.0	\$0.0	1.0	\$5.9	which will identify regional	and community	
							solutions for marine pollutio	n affecting	
			. *				Prince William Sound.	-	
							NEPA Cost:	\$0.0	
							*Oct 1, 1994 - Dec 31, 19	94	
		Personnel Total	0.0	\$0.0	2.0	\$12.8	**Jan 1, 1995 - Sep 30, 1	995	
06/01/94				· · · · ·			**************************************		
[ ]		Proje	oct Number	95115				EODM 2A	
	Page 1 o	f 3 Decis			N 4				
1995	idye i u	r S Proje	ect intie: 50	bund waste		PROJECT			
		Ager	ncy: AK De	n	DETAIL				
	Printed: 9/20/94	8:36 AM	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						

## 1995 EXXON VALDEZ TRUSTEE COUNCIL PROJECT BUDGET

October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995

Travel:				Reprt/Intrn	Remaining
Juneau	to Anchorage and PWS (\$450/tr	rip + 2 days per diem @ \$150/day x 8 trips)		\$0.0	\$6.0
			Turnel Tradel		40.0
Contractuals			iravei iotai	\$0.0	\$0.0
Long dis	stance phone and fax			\$0.0	\$1.0
Mail and	1 courier			\$0.0	\$0.8
Copving	l and printing			\$0.0	\$2.0
Freight	and cartage			\$0.0	\$0.2
Plane/he	elicopter charter to Prince Williar	n Sound communities		\$0.0	\$2.0
Film pro	cessing			\$0.0	\$0.1
Contrac	t for consultant to develop regio	nal waste Management Plan		\$0.0	\$175.0
RSA wit	th Prince William Sound Develop	ment Council to manage contract through March 1996	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$0.0	\$29.5
Proj	ect Manager 320 hours @ \$47/	hr \$15.0			
Trav	vel	\$12.5			
Tele	conference fees	\$2.0			
L			Contractual Total	\$0.0	\$210.6
07/14/93	• *				
		Project Number: 95115			FORM 2B
1995	Page 2 of 3	Project Title: Sound Waste Management Plan			PROJECT
1000		Agency: AK Dept. of Environmental Conservation			DETAIL
L	Printed: 9/20/94 8:36 AM				

1995 EXXON VALDEZ TRUS FEE COUNCIL PROJECT BUDGET

October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995

Commodities:	Reprt/Intrm	Remaining
Office supplies Computer supplies	\$0.0 \$0.0	\$0.6 \$0.4
Commodities Total	\$0.0	\$1.0
Equipment:		
07/14/93 Project Number: 95115 Page 3 of 3 Project Title: Sound Waste Management Plan	\$0.0	\$0.0 ORM 2B ROJECT
Printed: 9/20/94 8:36 AM		DETAIL

Project # 95124A (revised) 9/15

Project Title: Tatitlek Mariculture Development Project

Project Leader: Gary Kompkoff

Lead Agency: Tatitlek IRA Council

Cost of Project: FY 95 - \$109.5K; FY 96 - \$122.0K; FY 97 - \$156.1

Project Start-up/Completion Dates: October, 1994 to September, 1997

Project Duration: <u>3 years</u>

Geographic Area: Tatitlek, Prince William Sound

Contact Person: David Daisy, 3936 Westwood Drive, Anchorage, AK 99517; phone 243-8544, fax 243-1183

#### Introduction

This project is intended to provide a long term source of subsistence food for the residents of Tatitlek. Although oysters are not indigenous to Alaska and cannot reproduce in these cold waters, they grow well here under cultivation and have become an accepted subsistence food. There are several advantages to developing cultivated oyster operations for subsistence use. First, the operation can be located close to the village, making collecting this food a relatively easy operation. Second, the level of production can be adjusted to any size needed. Third, because it can be well located and adjusted to produce any volume needed, an oyster culture operation is an ideal mechanism for taking subsistence harvest pressure off of injured resources and give them a chance to recover. Fourth, an oyster culture operation has minimal impact on the environment.

The project has already gone through feasibility testing. This funding is being sought to help the mariculture project through the development stage and achieve self sufficiency. Self sufficiency will be achieved by using a portion of the production for cost recovery. The development stage will continue through the next three years and will consist of continued training of local mariculture workers, cost of operations and setting up the project management structure in the village.

#### **Project Need**

This project is needed to replace lost subsistence resources and provide the village with a means to develop a local bivalve resource in a manner that provides some level of protection against future man-made disasters such as EVOS. The oil spill amply

demonstrated how vulnerable the local marine resource is to disasters such as the oil spill. As well as being an efficient way of utilizing the local marine environment, the mariculture techniques that will be utilized in this project will allow steps to be taken to protect the shellfish that are under culture from the effects of disasters such as EVOS.

#### **Project Design**

#### **Objectives:**

By September 30, 1995 a village management structure will be in place that will provide total oversight and accountability for the mariculture project.

By September 30, 1996 the mariculture will be making a substantial contribution to the subsistence needs of the village.

By September 30, 1997 the Tatitlek Mariculture Project will become self sustaining through cost recovery.

#### Methods:

The project will continue under the guidance of a mariculture expert. A business development company will be contracted to set up the project management system in the village.

#### Schedule:

The project will operate year round. Site health certification will take place in early summer, PSP sampling will be on a weekly basis, product will be available for subsistence use and sale year round, activity reports will be submitted quarterly.

#### Technical Support:

Mariculture expert, lab analysis for certification and PSP samples.

#### Location:

The project will take place near the village of Tatitlek.

#### **Project Implementation**

The Tatitlek IRA Council will be primarily responsible for the project with assistance from the Chugach Regional Resources Commission (CRRC).

#### **Coordination of Integrated Research**

This project is related to project 95124B Tatitlek Mariculture Development - Capital Outlay. However, this project will be able to continue even if 95124B is not funded.

#### **Personnel Qualifications**

The Tatitlek IRA Council has been involved with the mariculture project since it began in 1991. CRRC has been providing administrative assistance. Jeff Hetrick of Alaska Aquafarms, Inc. will continue to provide training and technical guidance. Mr. Hetrick has extensive experience in mariculture development in Alaska.

## Budget

This project will fund only a portion of the total mariculture budget. The following are those items from the budget that will be funded by this project,

Item			Estimated Cost	t
		FY 95	FY 96	FY 97
Personnel		\$59.5	\$59.5	81.1
Contractual		\$15.0	\$15.0	\$15.0
Commodities		\$25.0	\$37.5	\$50.0
Administration	_	\$10.0	\$10.0	\$10.0
	Total	\$ 109.5	\$ 122.0	\$ 156.1

Project # 95127 (revised) 9/15

#### EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL SUBSISTENCE RESTORATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Title:Tatitlek Coho Salmon Release ProgramProject Leader:Tatitlek Village IRA CouncilLead Agency:Alaska Department of Fish & GameCost of Project:FY 95 \$39.0Start-Up/ Completion Dates:January, 1995 - June 1997Project Duration:OngoingGeographic Area:Prince William Sound, Tatitlek NarrowsContact Person:Gary P. Kompkoff, PresidentTatitlek Village IRA CouncilP.O. Box 171Tatitlek, AK.99677Phone:(907) 325-2311Fax:(907) 325-2298

#### EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL RESTORATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### Project Title: Tatitlek Coho Salmon Release Program

#### **B. INTRODUCTION**

Subsistence as well as commercial and sport fisheries were severely disrupted by the oil spill. This project is intended to enhance subsistence resources by permitted releases of coho salmon at designated locations near the Native Village of Tatitlek in order to provide a long term subsistence resource for the residents of Tatitlek. Additionally, the coho salmon made available through this project can serve temporarily as a partial replacement for other subsistence resources, such as harbor seals, which were injured by the spill. Valdez Fisheries Development Corporation presently maintains an enhancement project near the Village of Tatitlek, at Boulder Bay. This project would ensure the continuation of that project.

#### C. NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Subsistence harvests of all salmon resources have declined considerably since the oil spill, and continue to be affected by it. This project would enhance the recovery of the salmon resources and provide a means for lessening the impacts of continued harvests on other subsistence resources injured by the spill, such as harbor seals.

#### D. PROJECT DESIGN

#### I. Objectives:

-provide for the continued production of 50,000 coho salmon smolt at the Solomon Gulch Hatchery in Valdez for transport and release near the Native Village of Tatitlek (Boulder Bay). -hold and feed coho salmon smolt at net pens at the release site for two weeks prior to release. -harvest approximately 2,000 coho salmon annually upon their return to imprinting site.

#### II. Methods:

-Coho salmon will be taken from an ADF&G approved site for incubation and care and raised to smolt stage at the Solomon Gulch Hatchery in Valdez

-Smolt will be transported by boat in designated imprinting sites

-Smolt will be held and fed at net pens for approximately two weeks before releasing to improve survival rates and imprinting.

III. Schedule:

January 1995	Plans reviewed by the NEPA Process, salmon hatcheries
June, 1995	Eggs taken from salmon near the Native Village of Tatitlek
June, 1995	First salmon smolt transported, penned, fed and released
June, 1996	First adult salmon returns of coho salmon
June, 1997	First complete complement of all coho salmon age groups.

Each year smolts will he released in late May or early June.

Tatitlek coho Salmon Release Program Page 3

#### IV. Technical Support:

Utilization of experience and technical support of Alaska Department of Fish & Fame is necessary for this project. Valdez Fisheries Development Corporation expertise will also be utilized.

#### V. Location:

The project will occur near the Native Village of Tatitlek. Salmon will be raised to smolt stage at the Solomon Gulch Hatchery at Valdez and released, after imprinting at Boulder Bay.

#### E. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Valdez Fisheries Development Corporation, who have extensive experience in salmon enhancement activities, will continue their present enhancement of coho salmon near the village. ADF&G expertise will also be utilized.

#### F. COORDINATION OF INTEGRATED RESEARCH EFFORT

This project is intended to provide funds for the continuance of a salmon enhancement project presently undertaken by Valdez Fisheries Development Corporation and could be accomplished in conjunction with a Sockeye Salmon Release Project being proposed by the Tatitlek Village IRA Council. Developing this subsistence resource will provide a partial replacement for other injured resources, such as harbor seals, until they recover. This supports the efforts of several other proposed projects, such as 95244 (Seal and Sea Otter Cooperative Harvest Assistance) and 95001 (Condition and Health of Harbor Seals).

#### G. PUBLIC PROCESS

Public meeting in the Native Village of Tatitlek have been held periodically by the Tatitlek Village IRA Council addressing the prioritizing of restoration work.

#### H. PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Valdez Fisheries Development Corporation personnel leave much experience and expertise in this field, they would work in cooperation with ADF&G personnel in accomplishing the goals of this project.

Tatitlek Coho Salmon Release Program Page 4

I. Budget (\$K)

#### ADF&G

Personnel	\$2.5
Travel	0.0
Contractual	21.5
Capital Outlay	10.0
SUB-TOTAL	34.0
Gen. Administration	3.0
NEPA Compliance	2.0
PROJECT TOTAL	\$39.0

# Project # 95129 (revised) 9/15

## A. EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- 1. Project Title: Tatitlek Fish and Game Storage and Processing Center
- 2. Project Leader: Gary Kompkoff, President, Tatitlek I.R.A. Council
- 3. Lead Agency: Alaska Department of Fish & Game
- 4. Total Cost: \$325,000

Requesting: \$310,000 for processing/freezer building

or \$325,000 for processing/freezer building with smokery

- 5. Project Start Up/Completion dates: Spring 1994 2000
- 6. Project Duration: Permanent Facility
- 7. Location: Tatitlek, AK
- 8. Contact Person: Gary Kompkoff, Tatitlek I.R.A. Council, PO BOX 171 Tatitlek, AK 99677 ph. (907) 325-2311

**B.** Introduction: Tatitlek proposes to build a fish and game processing/storage/smokery facility. This facility will increase the amount of subsistence food available to the community by making it possible for residents to store a larger number of fish for winter use. The increased ability to store fish for winter use will lessen the need for residents to harvest seals and sea lions.

There are two pieces to this proposed project. The first and most important piece is the subsistence food processing and storage building. Grant funds will be used to design, build, and equip the processing and freezer facility.

The second piece of this proposal, which is independent from the funding for the processing and freezer facility, involves adding a smokery to the facility. The smokery will be used for both subsistence and commercial uses. The commercial use of this facility will cover operation and maintenance costs.

C. Need for the Project: Tatitlek's traditional subsistence harvests have not yet recovered to the pre-oil spill levels. Subsistence activities take more time than they did before the spill because residents have to travel farther and wait longer to find subsistence resources. The residents have also had to use fish to compensate for the decline in shellfish and other subsistence resources. In 1988 54.2% of the subsistence harvest was fish and before the spill in 1989 52.2% of the harvest was fish. But in 1990, 61.3% of Tatitlek's subsistence harvest was fish.

Currently, residents personally own enough freezer space to store subsistence fish only until January or February. An improved processing and freezer facility will allow the residents to store sufficient amounts of fish and other non-marine subsistence resources to last through the entire winter.

The facility will also serve the purpose of lessening the pressure on the injured resources of seals and the scarce and possibly oiled resource of sea lions. This will be possible because the freezer will make fish and other stored resources available through the winter months when normally villagers harvest less fish and hunt seals and sea lions. According to Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game statistics, the primary time for hunting harbor seals in Tatitlek starts in October when fishing season ends and lasts through April. For sea lions, most are taken between December- February.

#### D. Project Design:

1. Objectives: The community will be able to clean, process, and store their subsistence food more efficiently than they are currently able.

2. Method: The project will be located in Tatitlek. The Tatitlek IRA council will select an architecture and engineering firm to design the facility this fall. Construction will begin in spring of 1995. A contractor will be selected using a bid type process. The council will hire someone to operate the facility. Once a year a technician from a refrigeration service will come to Tatitlek to check the facility and do preventative maintenance.

The facility design will be complete by early spring 1995 and will be submitted for community review. Construction will begin later that season. Local hire will be encouraged. After construction, the council will oversee the operation of the facility.

The major operations cost for the processing and freezer facility will be electricity, which will be donated by the council. Other operation and maintenance costs will be supported by user fees. The council will hire a staff person to operate, maintain and monitor the facility.

If the smokery portion of this proposal is funded, a marketing consultant will assist the council in selling the smoked salmon. Tatitlek already has the benefit of its Alutiiq Pride brand name, recognizable to Alaskan seafood buyers due to Tatitlek's quality oysters. Salmon Exchange in Valdez has expressed interest in selling smoked fish from Tatitlek to tourists. If the state ferry stops at Tatitlek, a strong possibility as an oil spill response/ferry dock is scheduled to be built there by the Dept. of Transportation in Fall 1994, smoked products can be sold to tourists right in the village.

Technical support will be available from the equipment supplier and the council will contract with a local refrigeration specialist to do yearly inspections and preventative maintenance as well as repairs as the need occurs.

**E. Project Implementation:** The village council will manage the construction and operation of the facility. They will hire staff to clean the facility, monitor the freezer temperature and check that sanitation regulations are followed. They will also contract with a refrigeration services specialist for preventative and emergency maintenance.

F. Coordination With Other Proposals: Tatitlek has also requested funds for two remote salmon release projects. This project complements the salmon release projects by making it possible for the residents to process and store the increased number of salmon that may be available to the community

**G.** Public Process: The idea for this facility was presented at a public meeting held June 15, 1994 in Tatitlek. The council will ask for ideas from the community on what amenities they would use in the facility. These suggestions would go to the designer.

**H.** Personnel Qualifications: Gary Kompkoff has been president of the Tatitlek Village IRA council for 15 years and works for the council as supervisor of capital projects. He is chair of the board of directors for the North Pacific Rim Housing Authority and is on the board of directors of the Prince William Sound Economic Development Council. He also fishes commercially and for subsistence.

I. Budget: Cost estimates are as follows:

1.	Design	l:\$	15,000
2.	Const	uction\$	180,000
3.	Equip	nent\$	100,000
		smokery equipment\$	15,000
4.	Grant	Administration\$	15,000
тс	TAL		325,000

Project#95131 (revised)

9/15

Project Title: Nanwalek/Port Graham/Tatitlek Clam Restoration Project

Project Leader: Chugach Regional Resources Commission

Lead Agency: <u>ADF&G in concert with the Chugach Regional Resources Commission and the</u> village councils in Nanwalek, Port Graham and Tatitlek.

Cost of Project: <u>FY 95 - \$208.3; FY 96 - \$244.8; FY 97 - \$252.7; FY 98 - \$261.3; FY 99 -</u> <u>\$269.8</u>

Project Start-up/Completion Dates: November, 1994 to October 1999

Project Duration: <u>5 Years</u>

Geographic Area: Port Graham/Nanwalek area; Tatitlek area

Contact Person: David Daisy, 3936 Westwood Drive, Anchorage, AK 99517; Phone 243-855; Fax 243-1183

#### Introduction

This project will establish the procedures and begin the process of restoring local clam populations for subsistence use in the Nanwalek/Port Graham area and in the Tatitlek area. Clams were once a major subsistence food in these communities, but the local clam populations have been decreasing to very low levels in recent years and their contribution to the subsistence harvest has been greatly reduced.

There are probably several reasons why local clam populations are currently at low levels. These include changes in current patterns and beach configurations resulting from the 1964 earthquake, increasingly heavy sea otter predation and the Exxon Valdez oil spill.

The oil spill impacted the wild clam populations and their importance as a subsistence food in two ways. First, many clam beds suffered from direct oiling. The impact of the oil on the clam beds in Windy Bay, for instance, destroyed one of the most productive clam beds in the lower Kenai Peninsula. Second, even though some shellfish weren't killed from the oil, they have a tendency to accumulate, concentrate and store the toxic contaminants from non-lethal amounts of oil. This has badly eroded the confidence of the villagers in the healthfulness of the remaining wild clam populations as a subsistence food.

One of the main problems with clam enhancement in Alaska has been the availability of a sufficient supply of seedstock. The Qutekcak Native Tribe of Seward is developing a shellfish hatchery that is currently focusing on providing Pacific oyster seed for the Alaskan aquatic farming industry. The hatchery has also been working to develop the technology for producing clam seedstock and is currently working on the Littleneck clam. This clam has never before
Nanwalek/Port Graham/Tatitlek Clam Restoration Project

been produced in a hatchery. However, the hatchery staff has been able to bring small batches of Littleneck clams through the most critical stage of development and it seems certain that the techniques for successfully producing Littleneck clam seedstock in the hatchery can be developed. In addition to Littleneck clams the hatchery will soon will doing seedstock development work on Butter clams. A major part of this project will be enabling the Qutekcak hatchery to provide the needed quantities of seedstock for developing populations of clams near the Native villages.

#### **Project Need**

This project will provide the villages of Nanwalek, Port Graham and Tatitlek with an easily accessible source of clams for subsistence use. These clams will also be afforded some measure of protection against sea otter predation. With the wild clam populations at a low ebb, the questionable safety as a food source of those that remain in addition to the heavy sea otter predation that these clams are now subjected to, the need to develop safe, protected sources of clams for the villages is greater than ever. If this project is successful it will enable the villages to develop their own supplies of this traditional subsistence food.

#### **Project Design**

The goal of this project is to provide the villages of Nanwalek, Port Graham and Tatitlek with a reliable, local source of clams for subsistence use. It is felt that this goal can be achieved if the project objective of placing under cultivation a combined total of approximately two hectares of clams can be met.

There are two aspects to this project. One is producing clam seed in the hatchery and the other is placing the seed in grow-out systems in intertidal areas near the villages. The technology for both these aspects is well understood and can be readily applied to this project. However, in order to get the project up and running, it will be necessary to spend the first year working with state and federal agencies identifying and permitting acceptable grow-out sites and systems. Field crews will be needed from the villages for survey and inventory work on the proposed sites that will likely be required by the permitting agencies. In addition, procedures will need to be developed at the hatchery to produce around 250,000 six millimeter seed annually.

During the second through fifth years of the project village crews will be hired to install growout systems in permitted intertidal areas and seed them in. Grow-out systems will be installed and seeded on approximately 0.5 hectares each year. The following are the annual objectives for the project:

#### Year 1

Work with state and federal agencies to identify and get permitted a combined total of approximately 2 hectares of intertidal area near the villages of Port Graham, Nanwalek and Tatitlek for clam seeding.

Nanwalek/Port Graham/Tatitlek Clam Restoration Project

Expand clam production at the Qutekcak Shellfish Hatchery to 250,000 six millimeter seed annually.

#### Year 2 through 5

۰.

Install grow-out systems on a combined area for the Port Graham, Nanwalek and Tatitlek villages of approximately 0.5 hectares per year with a capacity of approximately 250,000 six millimeter seed.

Determine the growth rates and survival of clams in the grow-out areas.

Determine the efficacy of various types of passive predator control measures such as fabric and wire mesh covers, bird netting and rack and bag culture.

#### Schedule

The hatchery work will run the year round. The field season will run from late April to the end of October. Reports will be done quarterly with the annual report issued in January.

#### Technical Support

Technical assistance will be needed in the hatchery operations, collecting data on growout sites, setting up field trials and in testing clams for contamination.

#### Location

The Qutekcak shellfish hatchery is in Seward. Field work will take place in the Port Graham/Nanwalek area and in the Tatitlek area.

#### **Project Implementation**

This project will be implemented by the Chugach Regional Resources Commission, a Native Consortium made up of the five villages and two Native associations in the Chugach region, concerned with natural resource conservation and development.

#### Coordination

Technical assistance and services will be obtained from private contractors, the Chugach Regional Resources Commission (CRRC), the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G), the Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC).

#### Personnel

۰.,

Technical assistance with project development and implementation will be primarily provided by David Daisy and Jeff Hetrick. Mr. Daisy, formally a program manager with the ADF&G fisheries enhancement program, has many years experience in Alaska with fisheries project development and implementation. Mr. Hetrick also has many years experience with fisheries enhancement projects in Alaska. He has been extensively involved with the development of the Native aquaculture farms in Prince William Sound and has been working with the Qutekcak shellfish hatchery staff in developing the clam culture techniques.

Item		Est	imated	Cost	
	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
Personnel	\$21.5	\$66.4	\$68.7	\$71.1	\$73.6
Travel	\$4.2	\$7.2	\$7.4	\$7.9	\$8.0
Contractual	\$135.0	\$103.0	\$106.5	\$110.3	\$114.2
Commodities	\$5.5	\$27.0	\$28.0	\$28.9	\$30.0
Equipment	\$21.0	\$15.0	\$15.0	\$15.0	\$15.0
Indirect	\$21.1	\$26.2	\$27.1	\$28.1	\$29.0
Totals	\$ 208.3	\$ 244.8	\$ 252.7	\$ 261.3	\$ 269.8
FY 95 Budget Detail					
Personnel					
9 mm @ \$13.80/hr s	alary & ber	nefits			\$21.5
Travel					
Village/CRRC/Hatch	nery staff m	eeting			\$4.2
Contractual					
Enabling hatchery to	produce 2:	50,000	\$	85.0	
clam seed					
Permitting/technical	assistance		\$:	50.0	\$135.0
Commodities					
Field & safety gear f	for 7 crew		1	\$3.5	
Sampling gear				\$1.5	
Misc.			:	\$0.5	\$5.5
Equipment					
2 workboats @ \$10.5	5				\$21.0
Indirect Costs					\$21.1
			Т	otal	\$ 208.3

#### Budget

9/15 Project # 95133 (revised)

Project Title: English Bay River Sockeye Salmon Subsistence Project

Project Leader: Carol Kvasnikoff

Lead Agency: Nanwalek Traditional Council - Sockeye Development Team

Cost of Project: FY 95 - \$128.9; FY 96 - \$126.0; FY 97 - \$168.4

Project Start-up/Completion Dates: March, 1995 to November, 1997

Project Duration: <u>3 Years</u>

Geographic Area: English Bay Lake system

Contact Person: David Daisy; 3936 Westwood Drive, Anchorage, AK 99517; Phone 243-8544; Fax 243-1183

#### Introduction

This project will assist in the effort to build the English Bay sockeye salmon run back to historic levels. The sockeye salmon return to the English Bay River near the villages of Nanwalek and Port Graham was once a primary source of subsistence and cash for the villagers. Over the past 12 years or so the returns have been dropping steadily from the 30,000 range to the current 5,000 range. This has resulted in a complete closure of both the subsistence and the commercial fishery.

The EVOS clean-up effort had a negative impact on the English Bay sockeye. Boom deployment during the early phases of the clean-up trapped a large number of outmigrating sockeye smolt in the boom curtain on the ebbing tides causing high levels of mortality. This, plus the negative impact on other subsistence resources in the area by the spill and the basic health concern that the villagers have with eating fish and marine plants from the spill area, has put emphasis on the need to build the English Bay sockeye return back up to a level that will support heavy subsistence use and a revived commercial fishery.

Studies were undertaken in 1990 by the Chugach Regional Resources Commission (CRRC) in cooperation with ADF&G to determine the best approach to increasing the English Bay sockeye return. In was determined that smolt production in the system was the bottleneck to increasing the returns. A BIA grant was obtained in 1991 to conduct a smolt production pilot project employing lake pen rearing techniques. Eggs were taken from the English Bay sockeye return, incubated to the fry stage at a state facility, returned to the English Bay system for rearing to presmolt in net pens and released into the system in the late fall for outmigration the following spring. The success of this effort lead to a five year grant from the Alaska Science & Technology Foundation to further develop and expand the project.

Around 35 tags were recovered this year from returning adults from the 1991 pilot project. Although there isn't enough information available at this point to determine survival rates, the feasibility of the project has been established. If the project can be made successful over the long run it will be a cost effective method of providing a safe, reliable and badly needed supply of salmon to meet the subsistence and economic needs of the Nanwalek and Port Graham villages.

This project complies with all state policies governing salmon enhancement activities including disease and genetics. It is designed to become self-sustaining beyond the development stage which, if the project remains on schedule, will be completed at the end of the 1997 season. However, additional funds are needed to fully develop the project and keep it on schedule.

#### **Project Need**

This project will provide the villages of Nanwalek and Port Graham with the means to increase the local sockeye run. In the past this run has been a vital part of the economic and social fabric of these communities. With the safety and availability of other fisheries resources in the area in doubt, the need to restore and enhance this sockeye run is more important than ever. This resource has the potential of providing these villages with a safe and reliable supply of a traditional subsistence food.

#### **Project Design**

#### Project Goal:

The goal of this project is to develop a self sustaining enhancement program that will increase the annual English Bay sockeye salmon return to a level that will again support the subsistence and commercial fisheries.

#### Project Objective:

The project objective is the increase the sockeye run to the English Bay River system through a program of producing sockeye smolt from fry reared in pens in the English Bay River system.

#### Annual Objectives:

In 1995, 1996 and 1997 take 1.2 million English Bay sockeye eggs each year for incubation at the Port Graham Hatchery.

Transfer the resultant fry from the Port Graham hatchery to net pens in the English Bay lakes for rearing to at least eight grams and release into the system just before freeze-up.

Count the number of smolt leaving the system each year and the number of adults entering it. Collect pertinent information from any tagged fish.

Do an acoustic survey of the English Bay system, after the annual smolt outmigration is over, to determine the biomass of hold-over smolt.

#### Schedule:

The field season runs from April to the end of November each year. The smolt outmigration takes place from early May through June; the pen rearing operation runs from early June to just before freeze-up; the eggtake occurs in August and the acoustical survey is done in late July. Reports are done quarterly with the annual report issued in January.

#### Technical Support:

Technical assistance is needed in fish culture, tags analysis and the acoustical surveys.

#### Location:

The English Bay Lake system.

#### **Project Implementation**

This project will be implemented by the Nanwalek Sockeye Development Team, an arm of the Nanwalek Traditional Council.

#### Coordination

Technical assistance and services are being provided by the Chugach Regional Resources Commission (CRRC) and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G).

#### Personnel

Assistance with program development and implementation is being provided by David Daisy of CRRC. Mr. Daisy, formerly a program manager with the ADF&G fisheries enhancement program, has many years experience in Alaska with fisheries project development and implementation. Thomas Kohler is under contract to CRRC to provide technical training and general field oversight for the program. Mr. Kohler, formerly a fisheries biologist with the ADF&G fisheries enhancement program, has several years of varied experience in Alaska with fisheries enhancement program. ADF&G fisheries enhancement program, has several years of varied experience in Alaska with fisheries enhancement projects. CRRC is also providing the project with accounting services. ADF&G is providing technical assistance in fish culture, tag analysis and limnology work.

#### Budget

This project will fund only a portion of the total English Bay Sockeye Salmon Enhancement Program budget. The following are those items from the total program budget that will be funded by this project.

Item	Estimated Cost		
	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97
Personnel	\$37.3	\$39.2	\$41.1
Travel	\$4.5	\$4.7	\$5.0
Contractual	\$37.0	\$25.0	\$27.0
Commodities	\$17.0	\$18.0	\$19.0
Equipment	\$7.5	\$11.3	\$47.0
General Administration	\$26.5	\$27.8	\$29.3
Totals	\$ 129.8	\$ 126.0	\$ 168.4

Project # 95134 (ravid) 9/15

Project Title: Chenega Bay Mariculture Development Project

Project Leader: Gail Evanoff

Lead Agency: Chenega Bay IRA Council

Cost of Project: FY 95 - \$184.3; FY 96 - \$77.5; FY 97 - \$75.5

Project Start-up/Completion Dates: October, 1994 to September, 1997

Project Duration: <u>3 years</u>

Geographic Area: Sawmill Bay, Prince William Sound

Contact Person: David Daisy, 3936 Westwood Drive, Anchorage, AK 99517; phone 243-8544, fax 243-1183

#### Introduction

This project is intended to provide a long term source of subsistence food for the residents of Chenega Bay. It will provide a means for the villagers to maintain their traditional lifestyle in the face of increased and sometimes conflicting use of this area of the Chugach region. There are several advantages to developing shellfish culture operations for subsistence use. First, the operation can be located close to the village, making collecting this food a relatively easy operation. Second, the level of production can be adjusted to any size needed. Third, because it can be well located and adjusted to produce any volume needed, a shellfish culture operation is an ideal mechanism for taking subsistence harvest pressure off of injured resources giving them a chance to recover. Fourth, shellfish culture has minimal impact on the environment.

The project was initiated in 1992, has already gone through feasibility testing, and has now reached the point where a capital outlay and market development are needed to enable it to become self sufficient. Continued technical assistance with the project is also needed.

#### **Project Need**

This project is needed to replace lost subsistence resources and economic opportunities and provide the village with a means to develop a local bivalve resource in a manner that provides some level of protection against future man-made disasters such as EVOS. The oil spill amply demonstrated how vulnerable the local marine resource are to disasters such as the oil spill. As well as being an efficient way of utilizing the local marine environment, the mariculture techniques that will be utilized in this project will allow steps to be taken to protect the shellfish that are under culture from the effects of disasters such as EVOS.

#### **Project Design**

#### **Objectives**:

Obtain processing and culture equipment that will make the project more efficient and allow it to become self sustaining. This equipment includes a workboat, an efficient anchoring system, a processing facility and processing equipment.

Make the growing and processing operation more efficient.

Develop a marketing plan for the cultured oysters that will maximize the return so that the number of oysters needed for cost recovery is minimized.

#### Methods:

The shell of the processing facility is already in place. All that is needed is for the interior to be finished to meet health specifications and to be connected to water and electricity. The improved anchoring system design has been developed as have the specs for the processing equipment and workboat.

#### Schedule:

The processing shed will be finished off as soon as funds are available and water and electricity connected as soon as the ground is thawed. The workboat and processing equipment specifications have already been developed and will be ordered as soon as funds are available. Making the project more efficient will continue through 1997 under the guidance of a mariculture expert. A marketing consultant will be contracted in the spring of 1995 to help develop the marketing plan.

#### Technical Support:

Mariculture expert, marketing expert.

#### Location:

The project will take place near the village of Chenega Bay.

#### **Project Implementation**

The Chenega Bay IRA Council will be primarily responsible for the project with assistance from the Chugach Regional Resources Commission (CRRC).

#### **Personnel Qualifications**

The Chenega Bay IRA Council has been involved with the mariculture project since it began in 1992. CRRC has been providing administrative assistance. Jeff Hetrick of Alaska Aquafarms, Inc. will continue to provide training and technical guidance. Mr. Hetrick has extensive experience in mariculture development in Alaska. A marketing expert has yet to be identified.

#### Budget

This project will fund only a portion of the total mariculture budget. The following are those items from the budget that will be funded by this project,

Item	Estimated Cost		
	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97
Personnel	\$37.5	\$37.5	\$37.5
Travel	\$6.0	\$6.0	\$6.0
Contractual	\$23.3	12.0	10.0
Commodities	\$15.0	\$15.0	\$15.0
Equipment	\$85.5	\$0.0	\$0.0
General Administration	\$17.0	\$7.0	\$7.0
_			
Total	\$ 184.3	\$ 77.5	\$ 75.5

Project # 95138 (revued) 9/15

#### **Project Number:** 95138 **Restoration Category:** General Restoration (new) Proposed by: ADFG Cost FY 95: \$0 Cost FY 96: \$85,800 Total Cost: \$85.800 Duration: 1 year Geographic Area: Prince William Sound, Lower Cook Inlet, Kodiak Island Borough, Alaska Peninsula Injured Resource/Service Subsistence

#### Elders/Youth Conference on Subsistence and the Oil Spill

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this project is to promote the recovery of injured natural resources and subsistence uses of natural resources through a conference that would involve elders, youth, and other representatives of spill area communities as well as selected scientists involved in spill area research. Conference goals would focus on the role of traditional knowledge in informing people about the spill's effects on natural resources and subsistence uses, in order to contribute to the recovery of injured natural resources. Through a contract, a facilitator would be responsible for organizing the conference, including designing an agenda and a structure for the conference. The conference would be videotaped. Conference proceedings would be published and a video produced. Both of these products would serve as educational tools to further the recovery of natural resources and subsistence uses through the reintegration of subsistence uses, traditional knowledge, and values into community life.

#### NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Subsistence uses of natural resources are essential to the economies and ways of life of communities of the oil spill area. After the spill, these uses were severely disrupted due to natural resource injuries and concerns about the safety of using subsistence foods that may have been contaminated by oil. Because of these reduced subsistence uses, opportunities to teach subsistence skills and traditional knowledge have also been diminished. As noted in the draft Oil Spill Restoration Plan, "the more time users spend away from subsistence activities, the less likely they will return to it" (p 32). The restoration strategy for subsistence, as presented in the draft plan (pp. 32-33), has four parts, including an objective "to accelerate recovery of subsistence resources and services." One means to achieve this goal is "through increasing availability, reliability, or quality of subsistence resources, or increasing the confidence of subsistence users."

Increasing the availability of subsistence resources and the confidence of subsistence users may be achieved by a gathering of knowledgeable individuals (including elders) and young people in order to identify the natural resource injuries and other problems raised by the spill and the means to address these issues. They could be joined by a limited number of scientists who are engaged in spill-related research. The conference would draw upon traditional knowledge and the experience of community residents in facing past crises. A goal would be to share observations about natural resources in the spill area and recommend activities that could assist people in understanding the present conditions of these resources and in contributing to their recovery. There has been no similar opportunity for the communities of the spill area which depend upon the natural resources for subsistence to discuss their common experiences, concerns, knowledge, and plans as proposed for this conference.

The Draft *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Restoration Plan (p. 33) states that, regarding subsistence, "one indication that recovery has occurred is when the cultural values provided by gathering, preparing, and sharing food are reintegrated into community life" (p. 33). The conference will contribute to this goal through the discussion and dissemination of traditional knowledge about resource conservation and subsistence uses, and about the common experiences shared by subsistence users since the spill. This would compliment the work done under the Subsistence Foods Testing Projects (93017 and 94279), which has principally involved bringing scientific information to subsistence users. Additionally, this project will assist with the restoration of subsistence exerces through monitoring of the recovery of subsistence uses. The information discussed at the conference will provide a picture of the present status of subsistence and natural resources, which may in turn be used to direct future restoration actions.

#### **PROJECT DESIGN**

#### A. Objectives

Objectives include participation by representatives of communities of the oil spill area in a conference, during which injured natural resources and subsistence uses are identified and discussed. Means to assist in the recovery of these resources and uses will be identified. Written conference proceedings and a video which summarize the conference and its findings and recommendations will also be produced and distributed.

#### 2. Methods

A professional services contract will be awarded to design the conference agenda and serve as the conference moderator. The contractor will consult with spill area communities as appropriate to set the agenda. The contractor will also be responsible for preparing the conference proceedings. A separate contract will be awarded to video tape the conference and produce a video presentation of the conference (see below)

Among the potential topics for discussion are:

1. What has been the common experience of subsistence users of spill-area communities since the oil spill? What has been lost? What has been gained? Are there differences between regions?

2. Is there traditional knowledge available to inform subsistence users and others about the spill's effects on natural resources? How can traditional knowledge and skills be used to assist in the recovery of injured resources? Possible topics include identification of alternative resources, traditional conservation methods, and efficient harvest and processing techniques.

3. Is there traditional knowledge available to inform subsistence users about the spill's effects on the safety of subsistence foods?

4. What actions need to be taken by communities to re-invigorate subsistence uses? Are there particular skills and knowledge which need to be emphasized?

5. How have people of the spill area dealt with disasters in the past? What can we learn from those experiences?

6. Given what we have learned, how can communities prepare for the possibility of future disasters and threats to subsistence?

7. How can the exchange of information about injured resources between communities, agencies, and scientists be facilitated in the future?

The conference will be video-taped and audio-taped. A proceedings volume will be prepared. A summary video, approximately 30 minutes in length, will also be produced to present the conference highlights and recommendations. A full video of the conference could be made available for viewing upon request. It is intended that the proceedings and video be used as educational tools to promote an exchange of information and to strengthen subsistence traditions that have been weakened since the spill.

The conference would last one or two days. Each community of the spill area (approximately 20 communities) would nominate one elder, two students (high school or college aged), and one additional representative. The exact format for the conference would need to be determined by the contractor after consultation with the communities. It would likely entail several formats, including but not limited to formal presentations, panel discussions, round tables, and question/answer periods. Participants will be encouraged to report back to their communities about the conference. This could take form of school papers and oral presentations, and community meetings and contributions to newsletters.

#### C. Schedule

October 1994: November 1994 December - February 1995 March 1995 April- June July - August September 1995 project approval develop contract guidelines, evaluate bids, award contract conference planning conference production of conference proceedings and videos distribution of materials complete project final report

#### **D. Technical Support**

None required

#### E. Location

The proposed conference will take place in Anchorage, primarily because of its centralized location. If feasible in terms of cost and facilities, an alternative location can be considered.

#### **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**

The Division of Subsistence of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game could coordinate the implementation of this project. This would entail preparing contract proposals for competitive bids, evaluating proposals, and monitoring the performance of the contractors. The division would also handle the logistics of the conference, including meeting facilities and participants' travel and accommodations. An alternative is to contract these coordination functions to a regional organization or coalition of communities with appropriate administrative resources. In either case, professional services contracts (or subcontracts) would be awarded to design the conference, prepare the proceedings, video tape the conference, and produce an informational video which summarizes the conference findings.

#### COORDINATION OF INTEGRATED RESEARCH EFFORT

Information about the status of injured natural resources and potential means towards recovery based upon scientific studies should be integrated into the conference. Conference findings, including observations by subsistence harvesters of natural resource populations, will be available for use by other researchers through written conference proceedings and video tapes. Other proposed subsistence restoration projects (e.g. 95244, "Seal and Sea Otter Cooperative Harvest Assistance; 95428, "Subsistence Planning") also have public information components that will benefit from the information which is shared through the conference and its resultant products. This project would compliment the work done under the Subsistence Foods Testing project (93017, 94279, and 95279).

#### FY 95 BUDGET (\$K)

Personnel	\$16.3
Travel	44.4
Contractual	21.0
Commodities	0.2
Equipment	0.0
Subtotal	81.9
Gen. Admin.	3.9
Total	\$85.8

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



FAX COVER SHEET FAX COMPLETE

To: BU ton Number: 202-514-4180 000000 Date: 9-23-94 Moll From: Total Pages: Comments: vard to ich llow lla Document Sent By: Rebecca 9/9/94

Trustee Agencies State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

09/23/94	08:44	<b>276</b> 7178	EV Restoration	Ø 001
		*****	********************** ACTIVITY REPORT *** **********	
•	TR	ANSMISSION OK		
	ТХ	K/RX NO.	2517	
	CO	NNECTION TEL	2025144180	
	co	NNECTION ID		
	ST	TART TIME	09/23 08:25	
	US	AGE TIME	19'22	
	PA	GES	44	
	RE	SULT	ОК	

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



# FAX COVER SHEET

To: Gina Belt Number: 

 From:
 Molly MC Cammon
 Date:
 9-23-94

 Comments:
 Total Pages:
 19

 Project descriptions for 95080 \$ 95115 HI GUNEN. Document Sent By: Rebecca 9/9/94

Trustee Agencies State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

# 

#### TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO.	2515
CONNECTION TEL	2715827
CONNECTION ID	G.BELT
START TIME	09/23 08:05
USAGE TIME	08'45
PAGES	19
RESULT	OK

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



#### MEMORANDUM

To: Restoration Work Force

From: Molly McCammon Director of Operations

Date: September 21, 1994

Subj: September 22 RWF Meeting

The Juneau location for tomorrow's RWF meeting will be the NMFS conference room #413. The Anchorage location as always will be the Simpson Building 4th floor conference room. Items to be discussed will include:

- The September 28 project review session
- The October 5 Trustee Council meeting
- Update on miscellaneous issues

mm/raw

# 

TX/RX NO.	2471	
INCOMPLETE TX/RX	[ 20] 7863350	C.BERG
TRANSACTION OK	[ 09] 19075867589	J. AYERS
	[ 10] 19075867555	D.GIBBONS
	[ 11] 19074655375	M.BRODERSEN
	[ 12] 19074654759	J.MONTAGUE
	[ 13] 19077896608	MORRIS-WRIGHT
	[ 14] 2572510	S. RABINOWITCH
	[ 15] 5624871	C.FRIES
	[ 17] 2713992	R. THOMPSON
	[ 18] 5223148	J. SULLIVAN
	[ 19] 7863636	L.BARTELS
	[ 35] 15103737834	<b>B.SPIES</b>
	[ 38] 2715827	G.BELT
ERROR		

Ø 001

# 

#### TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO.	2472	
CONNECTION TEL		7863625
CONNECTION ID		
START TIME	09/21 16:51	
USAGE TIME	01'00	
PAGES	2	
RESULT	ок	

	9/21/94	16:50 <b>29</b> 907 276 71	78 EV Restoration	Ø 001
	æ	* * *	**************************************	
-		TX FUNCTION WAS	NOT COMPLETED	
		TX/RX NO.	2471	
		CONNECTION TEL	7863350	
		CONNECTION ID	C.BERG	
		START TIME	09/21 16:50	
		USAGE TIME	00'00	
		PAGES	0	
		RESULT	NG 0 #018	

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178

## FAX COVER SHEET

To: Restoration Work Force

From: Molly	Date: 9-21-94
Comments:	Total Pages:
PIS	forward to the
Derson	in your of insted
pelow.	thank you.
	0

## **RESTORATION WORK FORCE MEMBERS INCLUDE:**

Bartels, Leslie Berg, Catherine Montague, Jerome Morris, Byron

Restoration Office

645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



## FAX COVER SHEET

To: Restoration Work Force

From: Molly	Date: 9-21-94
Comments:	Total Pages:
PIS	forward to the
person	in your of listed
pelow.	Thank you.
	$\overline{0}$
<u>A. (* 2010) 2012 B. (* 16. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4.</u>	

## **RESTORATION WORK FORCE MEMBERS INCLUDE:**

Bartels, Leslie Berg, Catherine Brodersen, Mark Bruce, David Fries, Carol Gibbons, Dave Gilbert, Veronica Loeffler, Bob McCammon, Molly

Montague, Jerome Morris, Byron Myers, Eric Rabinowitch, Sandy Spies, Bob Sullivan, Joe Thompson, Ray Wright, Bruce

Document Sent By:

oppose

9/9/94

# Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178 EXX COVER SHEET Comments: Form: _______ Date: ______ Fotal Pages: _______ Total Pages: _______

## **RESTORATION WORK FORCE MEMBERS INCLUDE:**

Bartels, Leslie Berg, Catherine Brodersen, Mark Bruce, David Fries, Carol Gibbons, Dave Gilbert, Veronica Loeffler, Bob McCammon, Molly

Montague, Jerome Morris, Byron Myers, Eric Rabinowitch, Sandy Spies, Bob Sullivan, Joe Thompson, Ray Wright, Bruce

Deen

NO

ermined

**Document Sent By:** 

Rebecca

9/9/94

.

# 

#### TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO.	2443
CONNECTION TEL	2713992
CONNECTION ID	R. THOMPSON
START TIME	09/20 16:59
USAGE TIME	00'34
PAGES	1
RESULT	OK

#### 

#### TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO. CONNECTION TEL CONNECTION ID	2441 7863625
START TIME	09/20 16:43
USAGE TIME	00'37
PAGES	1
RESULT	ОК

001

# 

TX/RX NO.	2440	
INCOMPLETE TX/RX	[ 17] 2713992	R. THOMPSON
	[ 20] 7863350	C. BERG
TRANSACTION OK	[ 09] 19075867589	J.AYERS
	[ 10] 19075867555	D.GIBBONS
	[ 11] 19074655375	M. BRODERSEN
	[ 12] 19074654759	J. MONTAGUE
	[13] 19077896608	MORRIS-WRIGHT
	[ 14] 2572510	S. RABINOWITCH
	[ 15] 5624871	C.FRIES
	[ 18] 5223148	J. SULLIVAN
	[ 19] 7863636	L. BARTELS
	[ 35] 15103737834	<b>B.SPIES</b>
	[ 38] 2715827	G.BELT
ERROR		

**Restoration Office** 

645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



# MEMORANDUM

TO:	Byron Morris
FROM:	Molly McCammon, Director of Operations
DATE:	September 19, 1994
SUBJ:	Humpback Whale Photographic Negatives

The Anchorage Restoration Office was recently contacted by Ms. Jan Straley in regard to certain photographic negatives that she collected as part of a contracted work effort in 1989 to investigate the possibility that humpback whales in PWS may have been displaced to Southeast Alaska by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. It is my understanding that you are at least generally familiar with this issue.

As indicated in the attached correspondence, it is my understanding that the National Marine Mammal Laboratory contracted with Ms. Straley in 1989 (Contract #43ABNFO-01073) and that photographic negatives were collected under her scientific permit. It is my further understanding that while the contract states that the negatives would be forwarded to the National Marine Mammal Laboratory for "necessary archiving," Ms. Straley indicates she was given verbal assurances by both Tom Loughlin and Marilyn Dahlheim that the "necessary archiving" referred to in the contract pertained only to spill related litigation and that after the litigation was concluded that the negatives would be returned to her. To this point, however, Ms. Straley indicates that she has been unable to recover the negatives. She also indicates that she had been advised that a legal concern has been cited as the reason she has not had the negatives returned to her.

I would appreciate your help in obtaining a clear understanding of this matter so that I can know how to accurately respond to Ms. Straley. Was Ms. Straley given verbal assurances that the negatives she collected would be returned to her after the conclusion of the oil spill litigation? What is the legal status of ownership of the negatives? (Is there a formal legal opinion?) Can the negatives be returned to Ms. Straley? Again, your assistance is appreciated.

cc: James R. Ayers

Trustee Agencies

10

J. Straley Investigations PO Box 273 Sitka, Alaska 99835 907-747-5431

April 30, 1994

Dr. Doug DeMaster AFSC-NMML 7600 Sandpoint Way N.E., Bldg. 4 Seattle, WA 98115-0070

#### Dear Doug,

I would like to put in writing the details of our telephone conversation on the afternoon of April 29, 1994. Basically, I am again frustrated with my dealings with Marilyn Dahlheim. After Marilyn received my letter of March 25, 1994, she called me to explain the situation concerning the catalog. I was not convinced, after speaking with her, that my concerns were addressed. We discussed the fact that the text and layout needed to be reviewed by the authors, and she agreed to have everyone review the draft. I have not received this manuscript. We discussed authorship of the catalog only to the extent that Marilyn said that authorship had not been decided yet. Because I was not sure if I was going to participate in the catalog, I did not pursue the discussion of authorship further. What came out of the conversation was that I would reconsider participating in the catalog pending a review of the accompanying text.

I was led to believe, during this conversation and from her letter dated April 4, 1994, that I was the only contributing researcher that had any objections to the catalog. Last week I spoke with Dan McSweeney, and I found out he had similar concerns and also had not agreed to participate in the catalog until he had received answers to his concerns. He had asked Marilyn questions about the catalog and had not heard anything from her, other than that she had decided that she was to be lead author.

I am not comfortable with participating in a document where the lead author is the government contract administrator. This catalog will represent one year of data from long-term studies by independent researchers, and the catalog should reflect that historical contribution even though the historical data will not be included. I agreed to fulfill the 1989 contract based on my long-term research efforts and these efforts should be not be preempted by a government administrator (by Marilyn taking credit as lead author of these studies). I was told that this catalog is a way to disseminate the information from the 1989 'oil spill' contracts, with the addition of other NMML photographs from Alaska. If this is indeed a document where the primary focus is data collected from the 'oil spill'

ιU

contracts, then the catalog authorship should reflect that focus. I feel that authorship should be determined from the number photographs of individual whales contributed by each researcher during 1989, with the NMML contribution as last author, and the researcher with the highest number as first author. To feel comfortable regarding this decision, I would like to be informed of how many individuals were identified by each photographer. I also feel that a clear written agreement (as specified in my letter of March 25, 1994) should be agreed upon by the researchers. This agreement will set out the protocol that determines how matches are handled.

I also was not convinced that the preparation and layout of the catalog had been given adequate thought, because I asked some basic questions that had not been considered, such as what happens when 1) the same whale was seen in two areas, 2) the same whale was seen in different years, and 3) how resigntings among the photographers will be indexed. These are essential questions to be addressed prior to publishing a catalog and should be discussed freely by the authors as to the best way to handle these issues. Decisions such as whether or not a unique photograph of each whale seen in each area should be included in the catalog is an issue that should be discussed by the authors.

These photographs were collected under my scientific permit, as a continuation of my long-term research, and I ultimately have responsibility for how these data are used. I would like to again state that I was told, by both Tom Loughlin and Marilyn, that after the 'oil spill' litigation was finished the negatives would be returned to the researchers. My contract states (#43ABNFO-01073, page 4, item 6) that 'humpback whale negatives will be forward to the National Marine Mammal Laboratory for necessary archiving.' The researchers were led to believe, by verbal agreement, that 'necessary archiving' had to do with purposes of litigation, not with NMML's later use of these data without our consent or even acknowledgment.

The issue of this catalog is far from resolved for me. I am still not convinced that this catalog will have significant scientific merit, especially if details that would make it easier to use, and a worthwhile document, are not discussed by the authors. I hope this letter has clarified my concerns from out telephone conversation. Be sure to call if you wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely

Narine Biologist

cc: Olga von Ziegesar, NGOS, Homer, AK Dan McSweeney, Holualoa, HI Howard Braham, Marilyn Dahlheim, Seattle, WA Linda Shaw, NMFS Alaska Region, Juneau, AK

09/19/94	15:54 2907 5867589 EV D Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK S Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 2	DIRECTOR JNU       →→→ EVOS ANCH       2002/00.         99501       276-7178	3
MEMO	RANDUM		
TO: FROM:	Lead Agency/Negotiators James R. Ayers Executive Director		
RE:	Preparation of Habitat Acquisition Pro	E: September 19, 1994	

This is a reminder that we will meet via teleconference tomorrow, September 20, at 10:30 a.m.

As we discussed during our weekly negotiators meeting last week you should be in the process of working out the details and preparing the outline of the habitat acquisition proposal with the respective seller. We obviously do not have all of the cost information and we are not at a final decision stage. However, the Council has provided specific guidance through various directives and the resolution of the January 31 meeting; as well as the policy statements that were recently adopted regarding the "less than fee simple" acquisitions.

The aspects and issues of the purchase proposal need to be identified and many should be resolved now. For example, the actual scaling of the size of the respective package to accommodate the real conditions should be addressed; alternatives developed as appropriate. In addition, certainly, issues like easement and public access should have already been identified and proposal developed as you find prudent.

The "revised" <u>Restoration Benefits Report</u> is attached. I am confident that the majority of this information can be put together <u>now</u>. It is my intent to utilize this format in briefing the Trustee Council on October 5th. Therefore, I would appreciate it if we would all be prepared to review the information for each respective report during our next negotiators meeting on September 20th. Fee simple opportunities appear to be the most opportune and the Trustee Council has indicated more than just passing interest in pursuing those.

We recently reviewed the rationale, the time, millions of dollars and resources that have been invested in habitat analysis. As you know the public has consistently supported habitat acquisition and complained of our confounded delays in progressing with this as well as other restoration efforts. Given the current lengthy delay in completing the appraisal process, I believe it would be irresponsible and a gross injustice to the public to not proceed. If you have any questions at all, please contact me immediately!

JRA/mir

Attachment c:\wppocs\negotiat.mem

Trustee Agencies

#### Habitat Acquisition (Seller-Parcel package) Restoration Benefits Report

Region of Acquisition and locale: *Prince William Sound, Kenai, Kodiak or Afognak/Shuyak- and the general locale in the Region

Proposed Acquisition Description:

*Brief overview of land to be acquired: (e.g. forestedstreams-rolling hills -grass-etc.)

*Acreage

-number of acres appraised and reviewed

-number of acres proposed for this acquisition

-High-moderate-low ranking-combined and separate

*Maps

-specific maps of the proposed acquisition

*Other

-subsurface, etc.

#### Restoration benefits:

*Specific Injured Resources and Services

*Specific benefits to Restoration: (e.g. Wild Sockeye salmon will beefit from the numerous spawning and feeding areas of the anadromous streams found in the various parcels, including the low and moderate of a, b, and c. Further, commercial fishing services injured by the spill will benefit as a result of the protection of these streams and be restored...)

*Proposed Management Structure: (i.e. Park, Refuge, etc. and how)

Terms and Conditions:

- *Acquisition Price:
- -down payment:
- -term of payments: (years) -interest rate:

*Sources of Revenue: (source/amount) or (related purchase)

<u>Recommendation:</u> (Clear and definitive with discussion of importance of this package to Regional values for decision purposes)

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



#### MEMORANDUM

TO:	Restoration Work Force	
FROM:	Molly McCammon Director of Operations	
DATE:	September 14, 1994	
RE:	Weekly work force meeting	

Just a reminder, the weekly work force meeting is scheduled for 9 am Thursday, September 15. The Juneau location is the USFS conference room.

So far, the only agenda items are:

• recommendation for final restoration plan

stable isotope recommendation

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, Natural Resources, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture, and Interior

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



## FAX COVER SHEET

To: Restoration Work Force

From: Molly -mc Cammon	Date: Sept. 14, 1994
Comments:	Total Pages: 2

HAX COMPLETE

## **RESTORATION WORK FORCE MEMBERS INCLUDE:**

Bartels, Leslie Berg, Catherine Brodersen, Mark Bruce, David Fries, Carol Gibbons, Dave Gilbert, Veronica Loeffler, Bob McCammon, Molly

Montague, Jerome Morris, Byron Myers, Eric Rabinowitch, Sandy Spies, Bob Sullivan, Joe Thompson, Ray Wright, Bruce

Document Sent By:

Same

9/9/94

Trustee Agencies State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

09/14/94	12:50 2907 276 7178	EV Restoration	Ø 001
· ·	*** *** ***	**************************************	
	TRANSMISSION OK		
	TX/RX NO.	2333	
	CONNECTION TEL	2713992	
	CONNECTION ID	R. THOMPSON	
	START TIME	09/14 12:49	
	USAGE TIME	00'48	
	PAGES	2	
	RESULT	ОК	

# 

TX/RX NO.	2333	
INCOMPLETE TX/RX	[ 17] 2713992	R.THOMPSON
TRANSACTION OK	[ 09] 19075867589	J. AYERS
	[ 10] 19075867555	D.GIBBONS
	[ 11] 19074655375	M.BRODERSEN
	[ 12] 19074654759	J. MONTAGUE
	[ 13] 19077896608	MORRIS-WRIGHT
	[ 14] 2572510	S. RABINOWITCH
	[ 15] 5624871	C.FRIES
	[ 18] 5223148	J. SULLIVAN
	[ 19] 7863636	L. BARTELS
	[ 20] 7863350	C.BERG
	[ 35] 15103737834	<b>B.SPIES</b>
	[ 38] 2715827	G.BELT
ERROR		
Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



**News Release - For Immediate Release** 

Date:	September 13, 1994
Subject:	Draft 1995 Work Plan Available for Review
	Public Meeting Scheduled September 28
Contact:	L.J. Evans or Molly McCammon at 278-8012

# **Trustees Release Ambitious 1995 Draft Work Plan**

Anchorage – The Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council has released the Draft Fiscal Year 1995 Work Plan for public review and comment. The deadline for comments is October 3, 1994

The *Draft Work Plan* describes restoration programs being considered by the Trustees for action in federal fiscal year 1995 (October 1, 1994 – September 30, 1995). The Draft 1995 Work Plan includes projects that focus on the restoration objectives developed during a series of workshops with scientists, agency resource specialists, community representatives and members of the public which took place over last winter and spring. The work plan reflects the Trustees' emphasis on taking an integrated approach to restoration and looking at whole ecosystems rather than single species.

A public meeting to present a briefing on the status of restoration activities, including habitat protection and acquisition efforts, and to take public comments on the Draft 1995 Work Plan will take place on:

#### Wednesday, September 28, beginning at 7 p.m. Oil Spill Public Information Center, 645 G Street in Anchorage

This meeting will be available by teleconference to residents of all the communities and villages in the oil spill region. Contact a local Alaska Legislative Information Office or L.J. Evans at the Trustee Council Office at 907/278-8012 for information about participating in the September 28 meeting by teleconference.

More...

Trustee Agencies

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

# Fact Sheet - 1995 Draft Work Plan Highlights:

- 172 Projects with a combined proposed FY95 cost greater than \$71 million were submitted by private organizations, individuals and agencies in response to an "Invitation to Submit Restoration Projects" issued last May. The Trustees are expected to make their decision on funding at a meeting in Anchorage on November 2 and 3, 1994, taking into consideration recommendations from the Executive Director, Chief Scientist, the Public Advisory Group, comments from the public, and state and federal agencies.
- Proposals submitted underwent preliminary review by scientists and Trustee Council staff. All 172 proposals submitted were evaluated and organized into the following preliminary restoration categories:

Research Monitoring General Restoration Habitat Protection and Acquisition Administration, Science Management, and Public Information Restoration Reserve

 The Research proposals submitted which were ranked to have high restoration benefit and strong technical merit total \$13.5 million. These include five groups of projects which comprise a majority of the proposed research program. Together, they would examine many of the possible spill-caused problems as well as major natural forces that may be constraining recovery of the resources injured by the oil spill. These major research questions are:

What is causing the failure of Prince William Sound herring and pink salmon runs? What is causing the long-term decline in some marine mammals and seabirds? Is food limiting recovery of injured resources? What is limiting recovery in the nearshore ecosystem? Are the toxic effects of oil still constraining recovery of some resources?

- Monitoring the recovery of injured resources and services is important in designing restoration activities and determining which activities deserve funding. The 1995 Draft Work Plan includes approximately \$5.5 million in monitoring efforts.
- General restoration projects directly manipulate the environment to facilitate restoration, enhance the production of particular affected resources, provide alternative resources, or protect the recovery of resources that people and

More...

 communities depend on. A total of 65 general restoration proposals with a total cost of over \$28 million were submitted. Nearly half of these projects have important legal or policy issues that must be resolved before they can be considered for funding. They generally fall into five types of projects:

Stock separation projects for fisheries management Fish and shellfish enhancement Archaeological resource protection projects Protecting resources by reducing marine pollution in the region Subsistence and recreation projects

- Habitat protection and acquisition is an essential element of the Trustee Council's restoration efforts. Proposals concerning the acquisition of specific parcels of land are *not* the subject of this work plan, but are being addressed by the Trustee Council through discussions and negotiations with individual landowners in the spill area. Proposals to continue support for these efforts are included.
- Funding for administration, science management and public information is required to prepare work plans, provide for independent scientific review, oversee projects and budgets, ensure public participation and operation of the restoration program. The total proposed for these aspects of the restoration program is \$4.2 million and reflects a significant reduction from previous years' funding. This amount was approved by the Trustee Council at their August 23 meeting.
- The Restoration Reserve was created by the Trustee council as part of the 1994 Work Plan to establish the capability to conduct restoration activities in the years following Exxon's last payment. The Reserve was initiated with a deposit of \$12 million. The 1995 Work Plan would authorize deposit of an additional \$12 million.

# **1995 Draft Work Plan Documents Available**

The *Draft FY 95 Work Plan: Summary* describes each project's cost, objective, and how completion of the project would restore resources and services injured by the spill. The *Summary* has been distributed to the entire Trustee Council mailing list and will also be available for review at libraries and some Legislative Information Offices in the spill region, as will the related documents described below.

Three other documents provide more detailed information about each project:

- Supplement Volume I includes brief descriptions of 93 projects evaluated to have high restoration benefit and strong technical merit.
- Supplement Volume II contains project descriptions for all other projects that were submitted but not included in Supplement Volume I. These include those with lower benefit or technical merit, and those with legal or policy concerns.

Supplement Volume III contains detailed budget information for individual projects.

The *Summary, Supplement Volume I* and individual project descriptions or budgets are available from the Oil Spill Public Information Center upon request. The *Summary* as well as *Supplement Volumes I, II* and *III* are available at libraries and some Legislative Information Offices in Anchorage and the spill area.

Review copies of documents describing the 1995 work plan are available at libraries and some Alaska Legislative Information Offices in the spill region. To obtain documents or information about the location of reference copies in your community, contact the Oil Spill Public Information Center at 645 G St., Anchorage, AK 99501, or by calling 907/278-8008, toll-free within Alaska at 1-800-478-7745, toll-free outside Alaska at 1-800-283-7745.

###

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



#### AGENDA EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATORS MEETING

#### September 13, 1994

- I. Review Status of Appraisals
- I. Restoration Benefits Report
  - A. Description of package and process for maximum benefit @ affordable price
- III. Schedule for Negotiations
- IV. Preparations for October 5th Briefing
- V. Discussion of Overall Acquisition Strategy



DRAFT

Habitat Acquisition (Seller-Parcel package) Restoration Benefits

Regional Description:

Injured Resources of the Region:

Proposed Acquisition Description:

*Brief over view of land to be acquired: (e.g. forestedstreams-rolling hills -grass-etc.)

*Acreage

-number of acres appraised and reviewed

-number of acres proposed for this acquisition

-High-moderate-low combined and separate

Restoration benefits:

*Specific Resources and Services

*Specific benefits to Restoration: (e.g. Wild Sockeye salmon will beefit from the numerous spawning and feeding areas of the anadromous streams found in the various parcels, including the low and moderate of a, b, and c. Further, commercial fishing services injured by the spill will benefit as a result of the protection of these streams and be restored...)

Proposed Management Structure: (i.e. Park, Refuge, etc. and how)

Terms and Conditions:

*Acquisition Price: -down payment: -term of payments: (years) -interest rate: *Sources of Revenue: (source/amount) or (related purchase)

<u>Recommendation:</u> (Clear and definitive)

JRAFT

DRAFT

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



#### MEMORANDUM

TO:	Dr. Michael S. Stekoli			
FROM:	James R. Ayers Executive Director			
1		DATE:	September	12, 1994
RE:	Foreign Travel			

I received your memo of August 25 requesting authorization for travel to Chile to present a paper at the International Seaweed Symposium. It is my understanding that you will not be using Trustee Council funds for your travel costs. In addition, the Trustee Council has endorsed a policy of requiring investigators presenting papers on projects sponsored by the Trustee Council to include the following statement: "The research described in this paper was supported by the *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Trustee Council. However the findings and conclusions presented by the author(s) are their own and do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of the Trustee Council." I have consulted with Dr. Spies and if these understandings are consistent with yours, please, consider this memo my authorization if the need arises.

jra/raw C:\WPDOCS\STEKOLL.MEM

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



September 12, 1994

Ms. Phyllis Rhodes Clerk of the Court U.S. District Court 222 West Seventh Box 4 Anchorage, AK 99513-7564

Dear Ms. Rhodes:

This is to notify you of a replacement for Administrative Officer June Sinclair. Ms. Traci Cramer has replaced Ms. Sinclair as the Trustee Council Administrative Officer. Ms. Cramer will now be responsible for formally requesting copies of the accounting reports (see sample report attached) generated for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill United States/State of Alaska Joint Trust Fund. Please, accept this as our request to make any necessary changes or arrangements.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, I can be reached in Anchorage at 278-8012 or Juneau at 586-7238.

incere James R. Avers

Dames R. Ayers Executive Director

JRA/mir

Enclosure

cc: Traci Cramer, Administrative Officer

rhodes2.jra

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

#### C. 2

#### Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



September 12, 1994

Ms. Phyllis Rhodes Clerk of the Court U.S. District Court 222 West Seventh Box 4 Anchorage, AK 99513-7564

Dear Ms. Rhodes:

This is to notify you of a replacement for Administrative Officer June Sinclair. Ms. Traci Cramer has replaced Ms. Sinclair as the Trustee Council Administrative Officer. Ms. Cramer will now be responsible for formally requesting copies of the accounting reports (see sample report attached) generated for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill United States/State of Alaska Joint Trust Fund. Please, accept this as our request to make any necessary changes or arrangements.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, I can be reached in Anchorage at 278-8012 or Juneau at 586-7238.

ncere James R. Avers

James R. Ayers Executive Director

JRA/mir

Enclosure

cc: Traci Cramer, Administrative Officer

rhodes2.jra

#### **Trustee Agencies**

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

vetail - Single District

#### U.S. Discrict Court

08/12/94

08:33

3907 276 7178

EV Restoration

+++ J.AYERS

			*******************************		
TOTALS THIS DISTRICT	PRICR	CURRENT	END 1 NG		
Principal	161,806,257.78	0.00	161,806,257,78	Number of Cases:	1
Principal Disbursed	(91,069,346,69)	0.00	(91,069,346.69)		
Net Principal	70,736,911.09	0.00	70,736,911.09	Current Fee:	6,638.46
Earnings Deposits	48,807.38	0:00	48,807.387	QID fee:	30,681.48
Earnings Allocated	4,641,842.85	59,746.12	4,701,588.97	YID Fee:	165,740.17
Earnings Disbursed	0.00	0.00	, 0.00		. •
Net Earnings	4,690,650.23	59,746.12	4,750,396.35	QID Earnings:	276, 133, 16
Total Portfolio	75,427,561,32	59,746.12	75,487,307.44	YTD Earnings:	1,491,660.70
	*****	****************	*******		
***************	********				

2004/008

Period_From 7/29/94 To 8/04/94

District of Alaska

DOVAKX

4

	09/13/94	09:05	<b>3</b> 907	5867589
--	----------	-------	--------------	---------

EV DIRECTOR JNU

/

**⊠**001

	************** *** ACTIVITY ***********	********** REPORT
TRANS	MISSION OK	
TX/RX	NO. 1775	
CONNE	CTION TEL	89072715564
CONNE	CTION ID	
START	TIME 09/13	09:04
USAGE	TIME 01'11	
PAGES	2	
RESUL	T OK	

Restoration Office 645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



#### FAX COVER SHEET

то: Phyllis Rhodes	FROM: James R. Ayers
OFFICE: Clerk of the Court-Anchorage	OFFICE: Executive Director's Office
FAX NUMBER: 271-5564	FAX NUMBER: 586-7589
PHONE NUMBER: 271-5581	PHONE NUMBER: 586-7238

COMMENTS: Letter regarding replacement name change for Trustee Council
Administrative Officer.
·

DATE: September 13, 1994

TOTAL PAGES: 2

Trustee Agencies

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



# MEMORANDUM

- TO: Byron Morris Dave Gibbons Sandy Rabinowitch Mark Brodersen Jerome Montague Veronica Gilbert
- FROM: Eric F. Myers Project Coordinator

DATE: 9/12/94

SUBJ: Final Report Procedures

On the basis of several previous reviews, please find attached the "Procedures for Reproducing and Distributing Final Reports" (dated 9/9/94).

The attached procedures are a current, updated and consolidated version of earlier guidance provided by the Restoration Work Force. For clarity and ease of reference, these prior guidance materials have been combined into a single document.

I believe this draft represents a consensus version of all prior comments. I would appreciate it greatly if you could quickly review the attached copy and confirm if you agree. (If at all possible, I would like to get these guidance procedures finalized by the end of the week so that they can be formally distributed.)

If you have questions please let me know.

cc: Bob Spies Molly McCammon

Trustee Agencies

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Law, and Environmental Conservation United States: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Departments of Agriculture and Interior

# DRAFT

#### PROCEDURES FOR REPRODUCING AND DISTRIBUTING NRDA FINAL REPORTS AND FINAL RESTORATION PROJECT REPORTS

These final report preparation procedures update and consolidate earlier guidance issued by the Restoration Team.¹ These guidelines follow conventions recommended by the <u>Journal of Wildlife Management</u> (1988), as adapted for use in preparing *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Trustee Council final reports.

Nature of Final Reports: Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) projects are distinguished by alpha-numeric project numbers (e.g., MM6 for "Marine Mammal 6" or B8 for "Bird 8") except for the "R" series (R for "restoration"). The "R" series projects, together with projects identified by a five-digit identification number (e.g., 93110, 94007), are Restoration Projects. The final report for a project should be a comprehensive report addressing all data collected over the course of the entire study. The final report should address the original objectives of the study and any changes in the objectives. Think of final damage assessment reports as both the *first* and *last* word on the subject for the purpose of damage assessment under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).

- 1. Final Report Preparation: The lead agency prepares a final report that meets the following standards. These standards will ensure proper cataloging of final reports and ability to access them.
  - A. **Title Page:** (See Attachment 1A for an example title page for a NRDA final report and Attachment 1B for an example title page for a Restoration Project final report.)
    - Include on the title page the individual project title, study identification number(s), author(s), lead agency and date of publication.
    - For NRDA final reports, include on the title page the study ID number. An example of the format is:

Study ID Number: Air/Water Study Number 1

• For NRDA final reports, include on the title page the following uniform title:

Exxon Valdez Oil Spill State/Federal Natural Resource Damage Assessment Final Report

- - -

• For Restoration Project final reports, include all project numbers on the title page. If the project number has changed throughout the project, use the following example as a guideline:

> Project number: 95103 Previous Project Numbers: 94002, 93230

• For Restoration Project final reports, include on the title page the following uniform title:

Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration Project Final Report

- B. **Study History/Abstract/Key Words:** Following the title page, before the text of the report, each report should include a page that has: (1) a brief study history; (2) an abstract; and (3) key words for the final report.
  - **Study History**: (See Attachment 2 for examples of study histories for NRDA and Restoration Project final reports.) NRDA and Restoration Project final reports should include a brief history of that specific study, including reference to work plans of which that study was a part, titles of study plans or draft reports which contributed to the final report, all project numbers that contributed to or changed throughout the project and any project title changes.
  - Abstract: An abstract of the final report should be included with a maximum length of 200 words, consistent with National Technical Information Service (NTIS) standards. (See Attachment 3 for an example of an abstract.)
  - Key Words: Provide a short list of key words regarding the final report should be identified. (See Attachment 3 for an example of key words.)
- C. **Report Format**: Principal investigators should follow the format set out below in preparing their final reports. These reports should meet normal scientific standards of completeness and detail that would permit an independent scientific reader to evaluate the reliability and validity of the methods, data and analyses.
  - Title Page (as described above).
  - Study History/Abstract/Key Words (as described above).
  - Table of Contents, Lists of Tables, Figures and Appendices

- Executive Summary
- Introduction

Provide a short introduction to the report, including reference to the injured resource(s) or service(s) being addressed and the general area in which field activities were conducted.

Objectives

These should be the same as the objectives in the damage assessment plan or the detailed project description. If the objectives have changed, this section should describe what has changed and why.

Methods

This should be a clear description of the methods used and the study area. To the extent the methodology differs from that described in the damage assessment plan or the detailed project description, explain the reason for the deviation.

Results

This should be an objective and clear presentation of the data that have been collected. In the case of damage assessment studies, investigators should make the presentation in a manner that will make clear to the reader:

- evidence of injury found; and
- evidence that the injury found was caused by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill.
- Discussion

The discussion should interpret the study results and explore the meaning and significance of the findings. The relevance to restoration should also be discussed here. Where there are unanswered questions, these should be brought out. Where appropriate, the relevant findings from other *Exxon Valdez* spill studies and literature should be cited.

Conclusions

This should be a brief, clear statement of conclusions that are apparent from the discussions; this should include conclusions related to restoration. Where there are **major** unanswered questions, these should be identified.

• Literature Cited

- D. **Report Cover and Color:** (See Attachment 4A and 4B for examples of report covers.) Use quality cover paper stock. The color of the report cover should be gold.
- 2. Word Perfect Conventions: (These conventions were previously issued by the Restoration Team.)² Please use Word Perfect (5.1 or 6.0) to help produce reports with a consistent format.
  - Use Format (shift, F8) to set up the following standard settings:

Line

Line spacing - single for final report Hyphenation - off (i.e., do not hyphenate at right margin) Justification - left (i.e., do not right-justify margins) Margins - 1 inch at top, bottom 1 inch left, right margins (for double sided copy) Tabs - 0", every 0.5" Window Protection - On

Page

Page numbering - yes, bottom center Header - not in final report

Document

Font - Times Roman 12 point

- Use Word Perfect's Table of Contents feature to create the Table of Contents, List of Figures and List of Tables.
- Prevent page breaks from separating headings from the following text. Do not use hard page breaks for this purpose.
- Use italics (rather than underlining) for Latin names and for *T/V Exxon Valdez*. If your printer does not print italics, then use underlining.
- Regularly use the spell check feature to catch typographical errors. Always do a complete spell check.
- Use the space bar, tab key and indent (F4) feature appropriately.
  - Only use spaces to separate words and sentences.
  - Use tabs to place characters at set locations across the page, such as when placing a list in the text.

- Use indents when you want the text to wrap around at a tab point to the right of the left margin. Only use a hard return at the end of the text being indented.
- To make a hanging indent for use in the Literature Cited section, start each citation with indent, shift-tab (F4, shift-tab). Only use a hard return at the end of the complete citation.
  - Example: [F4, shift-tab] Byrd, G. V., D. Gibson, and D. L.
    Johnson. 1974. The birds of Adak Island, Alaska. Condor 76:288-300 [hard return]
- 3. **Other Conventions**: (These conventions were previously issued by the Restoration Team.)
  - Use good-quality white paper 8.5 x 11" (215 x 280mm) or metric size A4.
  - Reports prepared on dot matrix printers are not acceptable.
  - Remove from the pages of the final report all reference(s) to "draft," "interim," or "draft final."

When referring to the tanker vessel *Exxon Valdez* as a ship, use *T/V Exxon Valdez*. [Example: The *T/V Exxon Valdez* ran aground on Bligh Reef.] When referring to the oil spill that occurred because the *T/V Exxon Valdez* ran aground, use *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. After the first mention of the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill in your report, refer to it simply as the spill. Do not use acronyms such as EVOS.

Use the terms "damages" and "injury" as defined by CERCLA regulations (see 43 CFR-11.14).

"Damages" means the amount of money sought by the natural resource trustee as compensation for injury, destruction or loss of natural resources.

"Injury" means a measurable adverse change, either long or short-term, in the chemical or physical quality or the viability of a natural resource resulting either directly or indirectly from exposure to a discharge of oil. Injury encompasses the phrases "destruction" and "loss."

"Destruction" means the total and irreversible loss of a natural resource.

"Loss" means a measurable adverse reduction of a chemical or physical quality or viability of a natural resource.

Avoid reference to interim reports. If it is necessary to cite to information presented in an interim report by another investigator, contact the investigator

to determine if the information will be presented in a final report. Cite to final reports whenever possible.

- 4. **Review Process as to Form**: Upon acceptance of the final report by the Chief Scientist (including the study history, abstract and key words), a copy of the letter of approval will be sent to the Oil Spill Public Information Center (OSPIC).
  - Within 30 days of the date on which the Chief Scientist accepts the final report, the lead agency will submit one camera-ready copy of the final report to OSPIC, attn. Carrie Holba.
  - Written notification of its receipt will be sent immediately by OSPIC to the PI/Author/Project Leader and the lead agency's Restoration Work Force liaison member.
  - Within 15 days of receipt of the final report, OSPIC will review it for compliance with the report format standards and notify the PI/Author/Project Leader and the lead agency's Restoration Work Force member in writing of its findings.
- 5. **Report Reproduction and Submission to OSPIC**: Within 60 days of the date of the letter from OSPIC regarding its review as to form, the lead agency will modify the final report (if necessary) and provide to OSPIC the requisite number of copies. Reproduction standards are presented below:
  - Pages: The body of the report should be printed in two-sided format. This standard will reduce the space needed to store reports.
  - Number of Copies: The lead agency will provide to OSPIC 36 copies of the final report (32 bound copies and 4 camera-ready copies). A camera-ready copy is an unbound copy of the report as it will appear in its final format, that is, two-sided printing with blank pages inserted as appropriate. Bound copies are for libraries; camera-ready copies are for duplication upon request.
  - **Binding**: The 32 bound copies submitted to OSPIC should be bound using PERFECT binding.
  - Electronic Copy: In addition to the 36 hard copies, please provide an electronic copy in Word Perfect of the final report on disk to OSPIC.
- 6. Distribution: OSPIC will distribute copies of reports as shown in Attachment 5.
- 7. **Future Project Proposals**: The schedules and budgets of future project proposals should reflect the time and funding necessary to reproduce 36 copies of the final report that meet the report format standards.

8. Publication of Project Results Supported by the Trustee Council: To preserve the opportunity for investigators to publish results in the peer-reviewed literature, the final report will *not* be published as a series. The reports will be simply reports to a sponsoring agency. Investigators working on projects sponsored by the Trustee Council that are the subject of a journal article or other submission for publication should include the following statement with all such submissions:

"The research described in this paper was supported by the *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Trustee Council. However, the findings and conclusions presented by the author(s) are their own and do not necessarily reflect the views or position of the Trustee Council."

Investigators who do not plan to submit results to peer-reviewed journals but who would like their results to be more widely reported may have other opportunities to publish their results. The Trustee Council may sponsor future *Exxon Valdez* oil spill symposiums and submitted papers may be published in symposium proceedings.

____

² Ibid. The only change is in the font (previously Courier 10, now Times Roman 12).

List of Attachments:

Attachment 1A/B	Example title pages for NRDA and Restoration Project final
Attachment 2	Example study histories for NRDA and Restoration Project
	final reports.
Attachment 3	Example of Abstract and Key Words.
Attachment 4 A/B	Example report covers for NRDA and Restoration Project final reports.
Attachment 5	Distribution list for final reports.

See "Additional Guidance for Preparation of Damage Assessment Final Reports," memo from J. Strand and K. Oakley to P. Bergmann and B. Morris (June 2, 1992).

#### Attachment 1A

[EXAMPLE: Title Page - NRDA Final Report]

#### Title: *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Damage Assessment to Mussel Beds in Prince William Sound

Study ID Number: Fish/Shellfish Number 60 Previous Study ID Number: Fish/Shellfish Number 37

*Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill State/Federal Natural Resource Damage Assessment Final Report

Author: Gretchen Smith

#### Lead Agency: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Publication Date: February 28, 1991

#### Attachment 1B

[EXAMPLE: Title Page - Restoration Project Report]

Title: River Otter Monitoring

Project Number: 95103 Previous Project Numbers: 94002, 93230

#### Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration Project Final Report

Author: Mike Jones

Lead Agency: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Publication Date: January 1, 1995

#### Attachment 2

[EXAMPLE: Study History — NRDA Final Report]

**Study History**: Fish/Shellfish Study Number 60 began as a detailed study plan in 1989 under the title, <u>Injury to Mussel Beds</u>. A draft report was issued in 1990 under the title, <u>Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Damage Assessment to Mussel Beds in Prince</u> <u>William Sound</u>. Subtidal Study Number 45 is connected to the draft report under the same title. A final report was issued in 1991 under the same title.

#### [EXAMPLE: Study History — Restoration Project Report]

**Study History**: Previous project number 93230 was funded in FFY92 as River Otter Monitoring and Recovery. Funding for project number 93230 ended in FFY93. In FFY 94, project number 93230 became project number 94002 under the same title. At the start of FFY95, project number 94002 became project number 95103 under the title River Otter Monitoring.

#### Attachment 3

**Abstract**: The monitoring of river otters in Prince William Sound, Alaska from 1992 through the summer of 1994 is reviewed. Long-term or chronic effects of oil exposure on river otters is discussed. The study focuses on the effects of oil on the breeding ecology and diet of adult and juvenile sea otters.

Key words: river otter, monitoring, oil, diet, breeding, Prince William Sound

#### Attachment 4A

[EXAMPLE: Cover - NRDA Final Report]

#### *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill Damage Assessment to Mussel Beds in Prince William Sound

Fish/Shellfish Number 60

*Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill State/Federal Natural Resource Damage Assessment Final Report

Gretchen Smith

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

February 28, 1991

#### Attachment 4B

[EXAMPLE: Cover — Restoration Project Final Report]

#### River Otter Monitoring

Project Number 95103

#### Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration Project Final Report

Mike Jones

United States Fish and Wildlife Service

February 28, 1991

#### Attachment 5

#### DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR FINAL REPORTS

OSPIC will distribute copies to:

- Alaska State Library (18 bound copies) for distribution to the libraries in the state repository system.
- Oil Spill Public Information Center (5 bound copies and 1 camera-ready copy) - for the Administrative Record, OSPIC Reference Collection, Circulating Collection, and Interlibrary Loan.
- National Technical Information Service (1 camera-ready copy) for reproduction upon request.
- Presto, Gates & Ellis (2 bound copies) for litigation discovery purposes.
- Cordova Public Library (1 bound copy)
- Valdez Consortium Library (1 bound copy)
- Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation Library (1 bound copy)
- ADF&G Habitat Division Library (1 bound copy)
- Auke Bay Fisheries Lab Marine Fisheries Service Library (1 bound copy)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Library (1 bound copy)
- University of Washington Library (1 bound copy)
- TimeFrame (1 camera-ready copy) for reproduction upon request.
- Clay's Printing (1 camera-ready copy) for reproduction upon request.

The Alaska State Library will distribute its copies to the following libraries:

Alaska Historical Library E.E. Rasmuson Library (University of Alaska Fairbanks) University of Alaska Anchorage Consortium Library Library of Congress Z.J. Loussac Library Fairbanks North Star Borough Library Alaska Resources Library Washington State Library Ketchikan Public Library Sheldon Jackson Library Northwest Community College Learning Resources Center A. Holmes Johnson Library (Kodiak) Kenai Community Library Kuskokwim Consortium Library (Bethel) National Library of Canada (Ottawa) Center for Research Libraries (Chicago) University of Alaska, Southeast (Juneau)

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



September 9, 1994

David Salmon Prince William Sound Science Center POB 705 Cordova, Alaska 995574

Dear Mr. Saltion:

When I was in Cordova in July for the EIS public hearing, I mentioned this information to you. Cleaning off my desk this week, I just found it.

Hope it will be of some use.

Sincerely,

Molly McCammon Director of Operations

mm/raw

# MEMORANDUM

TO: Molly McCammon Director of Operations Trustee Council

FROM: Jerome Montague Chief of Restoration Habitat and Restoration Division Department of Fish and Game

# State of Alaska

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DATE: May 3, 1994

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO.: 465-4125

SUBJECT:

 Naval Assistance for Restoration

I am encouraged by the notes you sent me that the Navy is interested in assisting us, in some fashion, in our restoration effort. The materials you attached only suggest sharing equipment which is addressed herein as is sharing sea and air research platforms which are not mentioned in your materials.

In my previous position of administering whale research I had a number of interagency agreements with the Naval Ocean Systems Center and other branches of the Navy. Our primary uses were sonobuoys and for hydrophone arrays for monitoring whale calls and documenting responses to and characteristics of marine industrial sounds. While restoration's marine mammal work does not require this support, the Navy's transducer and hydrophone equipment and experience may be just what we need for improved sonar counting of salmon in the Kenai River for instance. The department is currently using some criminal restitution funds to begin development of a better sonar system for Cook Inlet streams. Assistance by the Navy for this task is desirable.

The AN/PSC-2 Digital Communications Terminal appears to have valuable application in transmitting digital data from ship collectors to shore based processing facilities. I have checked with some subproject leaders in project 94320 and learned that the ability to transmit data with radio would speed processing time and eliminate the risk of loss or damage during handling of hard disks.

Should the Navy be willing to have cooperative use of vessels and aircraft there would be wide application in a number of restoration projects. Use of slow, low flying reconnaissance aircraft would be useful for harbor seal, sea otter and perhaps killer whale projects. While many vessels we use are fishing boats, some Navy vessels would be good for our oceanographic and intertidal projects or general logistic support as is necessary for some river otter and harlequin duck projects. Finally, a submersible would be useful for subtidal and perhaps herring projects.

In summary, there is considerable potential benefit for Trustee Council and Navy cooperation. This cooperation would give us access to technology and equipment that is not available, could provide considerable cost savings to us, and would allow the Navy to keep their equipment and personnel active and field tested. The real question at this point is to what degree the Navy wishes to share equipment and expertise with us. I would be very interested in contacting the appropriate Trustee agency and Navy personnel to set-up a meeting to discuss more specific proposals.

cc w/attach:

Joe Sullivan Dana Schmidt Kathy Frost

w/out attach: Frank Rue



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Oil Spill Damage Assessment and Restoration P.O. Box 210029 Auke Bay, Alaska 99821

May 2, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Molly McCammon Byron I

SUBJECT:

FROM:

Navy Information

There is nothing in the immediate future that we find useful to any of our projects from the information from the Navy you provided. Navy sonobuoys have been very useful in the past for bioacoustics work with cetaceans. We have routinely used them in the Beaufort Sea to detect the presence and migration of bowhead whales, based on the whales' vocalizations. However, we are not anticipating any projects of a similar nature that we would propose to conduct for either humpback or killer whales in the oil spill area, at this time.

One potential use of sonobuoys may develop if anthropogenic factors are considered important in the recovery of certain injured speices. In 1989, we were concerned that the amount of vessel traffic in PWS might be having an adverse impact on the distribution and movements of humpback whales in important feeding areas. We used sonobuoys to measure ambient background noise but detected no effect of increased ship noise. However, the effort was cursory. If noise from boat traffic is still believed to cause an adverse impact to any injured species, sonobuoys will be an important tool for such a study. However, I am not proposing such a study be done.



4.212

Restoration Office 645 G Street, Suite 401, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-3451 Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178



#### MEMORANDUM

- To: Jerome Montague, ADF&G Byron Morris, NMFS/NOAA
- From: Molly McCammon VN Director of Operations

Date: April 20, 1994

Subj: Information From the Navy

Please review the enclosed information. The U.S. Navy, responding to its dual responsibilities of "Detense and Commercial" have offered their assistance in our monitoring efforts. Could you please advise us as to the utility of this effort? Please respond back to me by April 29.



PR-06-1994 12:19

The Naval Avionics Center Past and Present

NAWC INDY

NAC was originally founded to meet the Navy's need for a safe inland naval ordnance plant to produce bombsights and related fire-control equipment. The planning process began in the late 1930s, and ground was broken in Indianapolis in May of 1941. Carl L. Norden, Incorporated, on behalf of the United States Navy, designed, built, organized, and operated the facility under its subsidiary, the Lukas-Harold Corporation.

Workers began producing Norden bombsights in February 1942, while the plant was less than 25% completé. Three years later, the Navy took over management of the plant, employees; were converted to Civil Service, and the primary emphasis moved into the field. of airborne and shipboard fire controldevices.



fort.

Above: NAC workers began producing the Norden Bombeight in 1942.

NAC is now one of several field activities which operate within the authority of the Naval Air Systems Command, or NAVAIR. We receive direct project funding from all major Navy appropriations and function as a Naval Industrial. Fund activity, which gives us the ability to operate in a direct buyer-seller relationship.

On a corporate level, NAC is committed to pursuing innovative philosophies as well as haul and repair. NAC also anticipates future needs, and is committed to supporting next deneration platforms and avionics.

strengthening day-to-day effectiveness. That

corporate commitment reflects the Department

of Defense's Total Quality Management

philosophy, and this same philosophy defines

ideals for NAC's Continuous Improvement ef-

Through direct and indirect liaison with the

NAC serves the fleet, and the DOD community, by providing the most timely, high-quality, costeffective products and services possible, continually striving toward our goal of avionics and manufacturing excellence.

fleet, the Center ensures that its products and services meet the requirements of airborne and shipboard forces. To meet those needs. our engineers are involved in the design, development, technical direction, and support of sophisticated avionio systems. We manufacturë new systems in our stateof-the-art facilities, and support pilot production and emergency labrication as well as over-

P.02

AEPHODIACED AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

AT EXPERIMENT

ACTINOMICE IN AT LEWIE

#### P.03

Т

**D**I

v

SE

tŀ

p:

# Past..

The Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis (NAWC AD Indianapolis) was established in 1942 to meet the Navy's need for a safe, inland naval ordnance plant. On behalf

of the United States Navy, the Lukas-Harold Corporation, a subsidiary of Carl L. Norden, Incorporated, designed, built, organized, and operated the fa-



cility. Three years later, the Navy took over management of the plant and employees were converted to Civil Service. Initially, the main product of the facility was the Norden Bombsight, which was highly effective during World War II.



REPRODUCED AT GOVER

IT EXPENSE

APR-06-1994 12:22 NAWC INDY

Indianapolis

P.04

REPRC

HEPHCOUCED AT LOUVENUMENT EXPENSE

# Present. .

Today, NAWC AD Indianapolis is a leader in the development, production, and acquisition of advanced aviation electronics (avionics) for many of the finest systems in the Navy. Our full-



spectrum, state-ofthe-art facility provides the capability to pursue advanced avionic and electronic concepts for the Navy, as well as the Army, Air Force, Marine

Corps, and other government agencies. Our mission is to provide the most timely, high-quality, cost-effective products and services possible to support the Fleet. We have the technology, the programs, and, most importantly, the highly dedicated and professional workforce required to provide that support.





### Pilot/Emergency Production:

The Tactical Remote Sensor System (TRSS) is an intelligence project that includes various unattended ground sensors capable of transmitting movement detection data to a sensor-monitoring station or portable field monitor. NAWC AD Indianapolis was able to provide for the project capabilities which were unavailable in private industry and which enhanced system producibility. We also performed pilot production, and prepared a reprocurement data package sufficient to permit transition of the project to industry.
## REPRODUCED AT OUVERNMENT EXPENSE

44 0011

P.06

## Sonobuoy Instructional Manual

Sanahuay Arganizhtianal Intermediate Characteristics Instructional Manual

. MU

by Direction of Commander, Noval Air Systems Cammand AIR TASK #A5495490 (1594) 1904000000 Naval Weapons Support Center Crane, Indiana 47522

1110

NAWC INDY

APR-06-1994

12:26

- Supporting the F-18 replacement aircraft for the existing EA-7L and EA-6A aircraft
- Providing study/analysis support on aircraft options to replace the obsolete ERA-3B
- Providing support on other FEWSG mission avionics, including the AN/ALE-43, AN/ALR-75, OE-320, FAEWS Interface Equipment, AN/USQ-113, and AN/ARC-153

## Sonobuoys

NAC was established as the Cognizant Field Activity (CFA) for production Sonobuoys in 1976. As CFA, NAC is responsible for sonobuoy procurement, basic design engineering, and product assurance. NAC has competitively procured well over \$100 million worth of sonobuoys annually. NAC also works closely with the Naval Air Development Center (NADC) to ensure the smooth transition of research and development buoys into production. The Center also manages the acceptance test operation at St. Croix, Virgin Islands. In September 1989, the Island of St. Croix was devastated by Hurricane Hugo. In conjunction with the test contractor and other field activities, NAC was able to resume testing within three weeks and reestablished the land base operation within the year.

NAC works closely with sonobuoy manufacturers in developing sonobuoy performance improvements to counter known and projected threats. Improvements to the Q-36, Q-53, and Q-62 buoys are planned for FY-91. NAC has also completed self-noise evaluation testing in Alaska, and plans to conduct all mechanical noise testing there in the future.

NAC is using Statistical Process Control (SPC) as a tool to complement Total Quality Management (TQM) initiatives on the Sonobuoy program. SPC training has been provided to over 400 sonobuoy manufacturing personnel, enabling them to better control their processes. This effort should allow the Navy to significantly reduce the acceptance testing by controlling critical in-house processes.



Flight: NAC procures over \$100 million worth of sonobuoys annually.





'\$\$Qys.

.IS

≥ 2-2

timin iratu

at iecond

cor, :tronj

mper-

put d

'olta

i which inobud

ad sig

roper

led fo

.catid

ation

NAWC INDY NAVAIR 28-550-500-1





as ar roduc Figure 2-2. Passive Omnidirec-Th tional Sonobuoy Block Diagram. le ad

Figure 2-3. Passive Directional Schobuoy Block Diagram.

UHF MHE ANTENNA



 $\nabla \overline{\nu}$ COMMAND RECEIVER COMMAND VhiF DECODER TRANSMITTER MAGNETIC CABLE COMPASS SONAR MULTIPLEXER TRANSMITTER DIRECTIONAL TRANSDUCER SONAR RECEIVES BATTERY POWER SUPPLY

Sonobucy Block Diagram.

Figure 2-4. Vertical Line Array Figure 2-5. Directional Commandable Sonobuoy Block Diagram

2-5



**AGPRODUCED AF GOWERNMENT EXPENSE** 



Figure 2-66. Sonobuoy AN/SSQ-77A Deployment.

٠.

APR-06-1994 12:30 NAWC INDY

. .

P.11



12:31

delivered to both the Navy and the Air Force. Future requirements are expected to exceed \$50 million over the next five years.

Recently, PMA-209, PMA-234, and NAC have jointly developed an approach to use standard SCADC assemblies for a new signal data converter which will have 80% commonality with SCADC. This unit will replace a less-reliable unit currently being used in the A-6 aircraft. By its commonality with SCADC, the new unit will offer a \$12.4 million cost avoidance in production and support.

## Carrier Aircraft Inertial Navigation System (CAINS)

CAINS is the standard Navy Intertial Navigation System used on carrier-based fixed-wind aircraft for navigation, guidance, and weapon delivery. The Center is responsible for management, maintenance, and Fleet support of the operational flight program for CAINS. NAC



Above: NAC provides decentralized program management for SCADC, which replaces 11 unique central air data computers with one highly

also provides technical integration and management support for the development of CAINS II and the CAINS Reference System.



The AN/PSC-2 Digital Communications Terminal (DCT) is a lightweight hand-held data processor which provides the operator with point-to-point and netted communications when used in conjunction with a wide variety of military radios and wireline systems. The processor allows the operator to transmit and receive both data and graphic messages in digital bursts.

The program is a multi-service effort, and units are being acquired by the Navy, Air Force, Army, and Marine Corps, but the majority user and originator is the Marine Corps, which has retained "lead service" status. NAC's role includes both technical cognizance and total acguisition responsibility for the DCT and its

ancillary devices. NAC has been so successful with the establishment of a build-toprint second source contractor that the Marine Corps has continued to expand NAC's program responsibilities into every phase of the program, including product improvement.

reliable standard family.