

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL RESTORATION PLAN

Summary of Alternatives for Public Comment

What is in this Brochure?

In 1989, the Exxon Valdez oil spill contaminated thousands of miles of Alaska's coastline. It killed birds, mammals, and fish, and damaged other resources. In 1991, Exxon agreed to pay the United States and the State of Alaska \$900 million over a period of ten years to restore resources and human uses injured by the spill. This brochure describes alternative ways to help the animals, plants, and people injured by the spill. We are distributing this brochure by mail, by newspaper, and at public meetings. Please take a moment to fill out and return the response form on Page 8 of this brochure, or present your views at a public meeting in your community. The information you provide will help us prepare a Final Restoration Plan that will be presented to the public this fall. We would appreciate receiving your comments as soon as possible, but we will use all comments received by **August 6, 1993**.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires that an Environmental Impact Statement be part of any significant federal action such as the restoration program. In addition to including information found here, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will analyze the impacts of these alternatives on the physical, biological, social, and economic aspects of the environment. It will help the Trustee Council and the public understand the consequences of alternative ways of restoring injuries caused by the spill.



Photo by ED KLINKHART

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the full text of the Draft Restoration Plan will be ready in June 1993. Because many people are busy during the summer, this summary is being released now to gather your ideas. If you prefer, you may wait to see the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Restoration Plan this June before you respond.

The information you provide will be used to prepare a Final Restoration Plan that will be presented to the public this fall. The final plan may contain parts of several of the alternatives presented here plus new information you provide.

inside
LOOK

INDEX

- 2 Introduction**
 - What is the Restoration Plan?
 - Who are the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustees?
 - The Spill and the Court Settlements
 - Rules for Spending the Civil Settlement Funds
 - Funding
 - The Planning Process
- 3 Information to Understand the Alternatives**
 - Summary of Injury
 - Issues and Policy Questions
 - Categories of Restoration Actions
- 4 Description of Alternatives**
- 5 Comparison of Alternatives**
- 6 What Was Injured by the Spill and Is It Recovering?**
- 7 Natural Recovery**
- 8 Tell Us What You Think!**
- 9 General Restoration**
- 10 Map of the Oil Spill Area**

Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Public Information Center
645 "G" Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 278-8008
Inside Alaska (800) 478-7795 • Outside Alaska (800) 283-7745

Photo by ROB SCHAEFER

Carl L. Rosier
Commissioner
Alaska Department of Fish
and Game

John A. Sandoz
Commissioner
Alaska Department of
Environmental Conservation


Steven Pennoyer
Director, Alaska Region
U.S. Department of the Interior
Environmental Officer-Alaska

Paul Gates
Regional
Environmental Officer-Alaska

Michael A. Barton
Regional Forester
Alaska Region -
USDA Forest Service

Charles E. Cole
Attorney General
State of Alaska

inside
LOOK



April 12 • 2:00 p.m.	Chignik Lagoon	School Cafeteria
April 12 • 7:00 p.m.	Chignik Lake	School Cafeteria
April 19 • 11:00 a.m.	Chenega Bay	Community Building
April 19 • 7:00 p.m.	Kodiak	Kodiak Borough Assembly Chambers
April 20 • 1:00 p.m.	Port Graham	Community Center
April 20 • 7:00 p.m.	Ouzinkie	Community Center
April 20 • 7:00 p.m.	Port Lions	Community Hall
April 21 • 7:00 p.m.	Seldovia	Multi-purpose Room, City Building
April 21 • 7:00 p.m.	Larsen Bay	Tribal Council Office
April 22 • 7:00 p.m.	Homer	City Council Chambers
April 22 • 2:00 p.m.	Akiak	City Offices
April 22 • 7:00 p.m.	Old Harbor	City Hall
April 23 • 2:00 p.m.	Nanwalek	IRA Village Office
April 26 • 7:00 p.m.	Anchorage	Simpson Building, 645 G Street
April 26 • 7:00 p.m.	Valdez	City Council Chambers
April 27 • 7:00 p.m.	Seward	City Council Chambers
April 27 • 3:00 p.m.	Tatitlek	Community Center
April 28 • 7:00 p.m.	Juneau	Centennial Hall, Hickel Room
April 28 • 7:00 p.m.	Cordova	Council Chambers, Cordova Library
April 29 • 7:00 p.m.	Fairbanks	Wood Center, Univ. of AK, Fairbanks
April 30 • 5:00 p.m.	Whittier	Fire Hall

Public Meetings

Summary of Alternatives for Public Comment
EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL
TRUSTEE COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

BULK RATE
US POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT #1013
ANCHORAGE,

**Exxon Valdez
Oil Spill Restoration Office**
645 "G" Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

POSTAL CUSTOMER

Introduction

What is the Restoration Plan?

The Exxon Valdez Restoration Plan will provide long-term guidance for restoring resources and human uses injured by the oil spill. Each year the Restoration Plan will be implemented through an Annual Work Plan. The Annual Work Plan is a mix of restoration activities to be funded that year based on the policies and spending guidelines of the plan, future public comments, and changing restoration needs. Once the Restoration Plan is adopted, it may be changed in response to new information about the injuries and recovery, new technologies, or other changing conditions.

Who are the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustees?

A council of six federal and state trustees was established to administer the \$900-million civil settlement to restore resources and services injured by the oil spill.

State of Alaska Trustees

- ☐ Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation
- ☐ Commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game
- ☐ Alaska Attorney General

Federal Trustees

- ☐ Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior
- ☐ Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture
- ☐ Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce

The Federal Trustees have appointed their lead representative in Alaska to serve on the Trustee Council.

The Trustee Council uses funds from the civil settlement for activities to restore injured resources and services. It does not manage fish and wildlife resources or make land-use decisions. Fish and game management decisions or land-use decisions are made by fish and game boards, or by appropriate federal or state agencies. The Trustee Council may make recommendations to state and federal agencies, provide funds for state and federal management, or fund research to provide information to those agencies or other groups. The Trustee Council may also purchase private land or private property rights.

The Spill and the Court Settlements

Shortly after midnight on March 24, 1989, the T/V Exxon Valdez ran aground on Bligh Reef in Prince William Sound spilling 11 million gallons of North Slope crude oil. This was the largest oil spill in United States history. All through the spring, the oil moved along the coastline of Alaska contaminating the shoreline of Prince William Sound, the Kenai Peninsula, lower Cook Inlet, the Kodiak Archipelago, and the Alaska Peninsula. Portions of 1,200 miles of coastline were oiled, including part of one National Forest, four National Wildlife Refuges, three National Parks, five State Parks, four State Critical Habitat Areas, and one State Game Sanctuary. Oil eventually reached shorelines nearly 600 miles southwest of Bligh Reef.

On October 8, 1991, the U.S. District Court approved an agreement that settled the claims of the United States and the State of Alaska against Exxon for various criminal violations and for recovery of civil damages resulting from the oil spill.

In the civil settlement, Exxon agreed to pay the United States and the State of Alaska \$900 million over a period of 10 years. The use of the civil settlement funds is the subject of this plan.

CIVIL SETTLEMENT AND RESTORATION FUND

As part of the criminal plea agreement, the court fined Exxon \$250 million — the largest fine ever imposed for an environmental crime. Of this amount, \$125 million were forgiven due to their cooperation with the governments during the cleanup, timely payment of many private claims, and environmental precautions taken since the oil spill. Of the remaining \$125 million, \$50 million each were paid to the United States and the State of Alaska. The state and federal governments separately manage these \$50 million payments. The remaining \$25 million were paid into the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund, and into the Victims of Crime Act Account.

Funds from the criminal plea agreement are not under the authority of the Trustee Council and are not considered by this plan. However, they must be used exclusively for restoration activities, within the State of Alaska, relating to the Exxon Valdez oil spill.



Photo courtesy of NATIONAL PARKS SERVICE

Rules for Spending the Civil Settlement Funds

- 1.** The Trustee Council must use the settlement funds "...for the purposes of restoring, replacing, enhancing, or acquiring the equivalent of natural resources injured as a result of the Oil Spill and the reduced or lost services provided by such resources..." (except for reimbursements to the state and federal governments in settlement of past costs).
- 2.** The settlement funds must be spent on restoration of natural resources in Alaska unless the Trustees unanimously agree that spending funds outside of the state is necessary for effective restoration.
- 3.** All decisions made by the Trustee Council (such as spending settlement funds) must be made by unanimous consent.

The settlement defines **NATURAL RESOURCES** as the land, fish, wildlife, biota, air, water, ground water, drinking water supplies, and other such resources belonging to or managed by the state or federal governments. Examples of natural resources are birds, fish, mammals, subtidal plants and animals, and archaeological resources.

In addition to restoring natural resources, funds may be used to restore reduced or lost **SERVICES (human uses)** provided by injured natural resources. For example, subsistence, commercial fishing, and recreation including sport fishing, sport hunting, camping, and boating are services that were damaged by injuries to fish and wildlife. Other injured services include commercial tourism, and the enjoyment that people receive from undisturbed wild areas.

Funding

The Civil Settlement Funds as of March 1993

The civil settlement requires Exxon to deposit funds each year beginning December 1991 and ending September 2001. The table below shows uses and commitments of that money. It shows that of the \$900 million civil settlement, approximately \$610 to \$630 million remain for funding restoration activities.

PAYMENTS

Past Exxon Payments

\$240 million

- ☐ \$210.1 million in 1991 and 1992
- ☐ \$39.9 million credited to Exxon for cleanup costs after January 1, 1991

Future Exxon Payments

\$660 million by 201

TOTAL EXXON PAYMENTS
\$900 million

EXPENSES

Past Reimbursements, Deductions, Withdrawals & Commitments

\$200.2 million

- ☐ \$107.5 to reimburse the federal and state governments for past damage assessment, clean-up, litigation, response, and restoration expenses;
- ☐ \$19.5 for the 1992 work plan;
- ☐ \$33.3 for the 1993 work plan (including \$7.5 for Kachemak Bay purchase); and
- ☐ \$39.9 credited to Exxon for cleanup costs after January 1, 1991.

Future Commitments

An unknown amount probably between \$70 - \$90 million

To reimburse the governments for past expenditures

Total Remaining
Approximately \$610-\$630 million

TOTAL EXPENDITURES
\$900 million

The Planning Process

The restoration planning process has used the results of many scientific studies, meetings, and symposia conducted during the four years that have elapsed since the oil spill.

Information presented here will be developed further and presented for public review and comment in the Draft Restoration Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement to be published in June 1993. A Final Restoration Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement will be released in late Fall 1993.

Restoration Planning Process has used results derived from:

- ☐ Natural Resource Damage Assessment Studies: 1989-1992
- ☐ Restoration Science Studies: 1990-1992
- ☐ Technical Workshop 1990
- ☐ Public Symposium 1990
- ☐ Restoration Planning Progress Report 1990
- ☐ Public meetings 1990-1993
- ☐ Restoration Framework and Supplement 1992
- ☐ Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Symposium 1993

Information to understand the alternatives

Summary of Injury

The Exxon Valdez oil spill occurred in March, just before the most biologically active season of the year. It affected the migration of birds, and the primary breeding season for most species of birds, mammals, fish, and marine invertebrates in the spill's path. Much of southcentral Alaska's intricate coastline was oiled, frequently with devastating impact to intertidal and shallow subtidal resources. It also affected human use of the spill area, including subsistence, recreation, commercial fishing, and other uses. Some resources and services remain exposed to oil persisting below high tide.

Oil affected each resource and use differently. For some

resources, the population measurably declined. By measurably declined, we mean a measurable decline in abundance that will persist for more than one generation. For example, an estimated 3,500 to 5,000 sea otters were killed by the spill, and the population will not recover for many generations. Other species were killed or otherwise injured by the spill, but the injury did not measurably lower the overall population. Deaths of individual animals or sublethal injuries, which do not result in death, may not be reflected in a lower population because the natural variability of the species may mask the injury, or the resource may have some mechanism to compensate for the injury.

Some species, such as marbled murrelets, pigeon guillemots, and harbor seals were declining before the spill. Their rate of decline was accelerated by the spill, but other factors such as variations in climatic conditions, habitat loss, or increased competition for food may also influence long-term trends in the health and populations of these and other species.

The spill also directly affected human uses of the spill area including commercial fishing, commercial tourism, recreation, passive use, and subsistence. The nature and extent of the injury varied by user group and by area

More information about injury and recovery
See p.6

Issues and Policy Questions

The planning process raised five significant issues. Different answers to these questions will influence which restoration actions are conducted.

Injuries Addressed by Restoration Actions:
Should restoration actions address all injured resources & services or all except those biological resources whose populations did not measurably decline because of the spill?

Some injured resources declined in population. For example, the loss of 35-70% of the breeding common murre in the Gulf of Alaska resulted in a decline that will persist through future generations. Other injuries, such as reduced growth rates, may not have resulted in a lower population. However, over

time these injuries might also cause populations to decline.

If an injury was not severe enough to produce a detectable change in population, then perhaps settlement funds should not be spent to address it. On the other hand, if something can be done to address less serious injuries that might eventually cause populations to decline, perhaps it should be done before more serious effects occur.

Restoration Actions for Recovered Resources:
Should restoration actions cease when an injured resource has recovered, or continue in order to enhance the resource?

None of the injured resources has recovered from a population decline. If a goal of the settlement is to restore injured resources, then perhaps restoration actions should cease once the resource has recovered to where it would have been

had no spill occurred. On the other hand, if restoration actions were to continue after a resource has recovered, they may offset other disturbances or improve its condition. As resources recover, this issue will become more important.

Effectiveness of Restoration Actions:
Should the plan include only those restoration actions that produce substantial improvement over natural recovery or also those that produce at least some improvement?

One strategy is to consider only those restoration actions likely to produce substantial improvement over natural recovery. However, if the Trustee Council were to consider all restoration activities that offer at least some promise

of helping injured resources and services, the cumulative effect may produce greater improvement overall.

Location of Restoration Actions:
Should restoration actions take place in the spill area only or anywhere there is a link to injured resources or services?

If restoration actions were limited to the spill area, they could focus on the populations and uses directly affected. On the other hand, restoration actions outside the spill

area may be more effective than those within the spill area. For example, increasing common murre populations at colonies outside the spill area may do more to increase the numbers of that species than would comparable projects within the spill area. The map of the oil spill area is on page 10.

Opportunities for Human Use:
To what extent should restoration actions create opportunities for human use of the spill area?

Certain restoration actions may create opportunities for human use of the spill area. Some of these actions would protect existing use. Examples include constructing outhouses in


over-used areas and improving trails where hiking is damaging wetlands. Other activities would increase existing use. Examples include installing a new mooring buoy in an anchorage or constructing new public-use cabins in a recreation area. Still other activities would encourage new uses in appropriate locations. Examples include providing a new visitor center or attracting new commercial facilities onto public land.

One view is that restoration actions should not create any opportunity for human use of the spill area. However, if restoration actions that create opportunities for human use were to be limited to those that would protect existing use, then restoration could proceed without changing the character of the area or impeding recovery of injured resources and services. On the other hand, increasing opportunities for human use through either increasing existing use or encouraging new use, would make the area more usable for more people and improve the quality of the experience for some users.

Any facilities built on public land would comply with existing land-use plans, and agency procedures such as those requiring public notice.

Injured by the Oil Spill

The table below summarizes injuries caused by the spill. It does not include resources, such as sea lions and brown bears, that were studied but for which clear injuries were not determined.

RESOURCES		
Population Decline	Injured, but No Population Decline	Other
Black oystercatcher	Bald eagle	Air, water, and sediments Archaeological resources Designated wilderness areas
Common murre	Cutthroat trout ♦	
Harbor seal	Dolly Varden ♦	
Harlequin duck	Killer whale ♦	
Intertidal organisms	Pacific herring	
Marbled murrelet	Pink salmon ♦	
Pigeon guillemot	River otter	
Sea otter	Rockfish	
Sockeye salmon		
Subtidal organisms		

♦ For these species, the Trustee Council's scientists have considerable disagreement over the conclusions to be drawn from the results of the damage assessment studies.

NOTE: The table may change if sublethal injuries result in population declines, or as new information about other resources is obtained.

SERVICES (Human use)
Commercial fishing Commercial tourism Passive use Recreation including sport fishing, sport hunting, and other recreation use Subsistence



Photo by ROBERT SCHAEFER

Categories of Restoration Actions

Restoration actions fall into four categories. The alternatives place different emphases on these categories. Not all categories are included in every alternative.

HABITAT PROTECTION and ACQUISITION

This category includes protection and acquisition of habitat on private land as well as protection of habitat on public land.

▼ Habitat protection and acquisition on private land.

Resource development on private land, such as harvesting timber or building subdivisions, can sometimes harm already injured resources or services that rely on the land. The object of protecting and acquiring land is to prevent further injury to resources and services and allow recovery to occur at its natural rate. For example, the recovery of harlequin ducks may be helped by protecting nesting habitat from future changes that may hamper recovery.

The Trustee Council may purchase private land or partial interests such as conservation easements, mineral rights, or timber rights as methods of restoration. These lands would be managed to protect injured resources and services. The Council's recent decision to purchase inholdings in Kachemak Bay State Park is an example of habitat protection and acquisition on private land. However, the settlement requires that any purchases must benefit resources or services injured by the spill.

The following injured resources and services might benefit from the purchase of private land or property rights: salmon, trout, bald eagle, black oystercatcher, common murre, harbor seal, harlequin duck, marbled murrelet, pigeon guillemot, river otter, sea otter, areas adjacent to particularly productive intertidal areas, recreation and commercial tourism, archaeological resources, and subsistence. Types of habitat that might be protected or acquired include:

- Habitats important to injured species
- Scenic areas such as those viewed from important recreation and tourist routes
- Areas important for recreation, including sport fishing and hunting
- Important subsistence harvest areas

Since there will not be enough money in any alternative to buy or protect all habitat important to recovery, it is necessary to prioritize available land. Some of the most important criteria are the degree of importance of the land to the recovery of injured resources or services and the number of resources or services that rely on a given parcel. Costs will vary depending on the land, and the private rights being purchased. For example, timbered land will often be more expensive than similar land without marketable timber. Also, purchase of partial interests such as easements or mineral rights may be less expensive and could increase the number of acres that can be protected.

▼ Habitat protection on public land

Changes in management practices on public land and water may protect injured resources and services from further injury. Examples of these changes include amending agency management plans, changing regulations, and designating public land and water as special areas. Examples of special areas include scientific research reserves, recreation areas, parks, critical habitat areas, and marine sanctuaries. Any management changes must be approved and implemented by

the appropriate government agency, or in some cases by the Alaska State Legislature or the U.S. Congress. Since land and water management actions could extend to any public upland, intertidal area, or marine waters, the actions could potentially benefit most injured resources and services. Management changes necessitated by spill injuries may be funded with settlement monies, but the costs are not expected to be a significant portion of the total settlement funds.

GENERAL RESTORATION

Since 1989, agencies and the public have proposed hundreds of ideas for restoration. Some ideas restore injured resources and services by directly manipulating resources. Examples include building fish passes and public-use cabins or replanting seaweed in the intertidal areas. Other ideas focus on managing human use to aid restoration. Examples include redirecting hunting and fishing harvest, or reducing human disturbance around sensitive bird colonies. General Restoration does not include Monitoring and Research or Habitat Protection and Acquisition.

In each alternative, enough money is potentially allocated to General Restoration to fund all activities that have been identified and that meet the policies of that alternative. Each alternative also identifies enough additional funds to provide a reserve for General Restoration activities that may be identified in the future.

MONITORING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

A monitoring and research program will help the Trustee Council decide how resources and services are recovering, and whether restoration activities are effective. It could also be used to monitor the general health of affected ecosystems, or provide basic and applied scientific research about how to protect, manage, or restore resources or services injured by the spill. The program could include one or more of the following, although its components vary among alternatives.

▼ Recovery Monitoring would assess the rate of recovery of injured resources and services, and determine when recovery has occurred.

▼ Restoration Monitoring would evaluate the effectiveness of specific restoration activities, identify where additional restoration activities may be appropriate, and determine if delayed injury occurs.

▼ Ecosystem Monitoring would follow long-term trends in the distribution and abundance of injured resources and the quality and quantity of services. Monitoring could also detect residual spill effects and provide ecological baseline information to assess the impacts of future disturbances.

▼ Restoration Research would focus on the design, development and implementation of new technologies and approaches to restore resources not recovering or recovering at lower than expected rates.

ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

Funding is required to manage the restoration program and to provide the public with information about recovery and restoration. As the number of restoration projects increases and the complexity of management duties grows, the percentage of funds needed for Administration and Public Information increases.

Issues and Policy Questions Addressed in the Alternatives

ISSUE	POLICY QUESTION
INJURIES ADDRESSED BY RESTORATION ACTIONS	? Should restoration actions address all injured resources and services or all <i>except</i> those biological resources whose populations did not measurably decline because of the spill?
RESTORATION ACTIONS FOR RECOVERED RESOURCES	? Should restoration actions cease when a resource has recovered or continue in order to enhance the resource?
EFFECTIVENESS OF RESTORATION ACTIONS	? Should the plan include only those restoration actions that produce substantial improvement over natural recovery or also those that produce at least some improvement?
LOCATION OF RESTORATION ACTIONS	? Should restoration activities take place in the spill area only or anywhere there is a link to injured resources or services?
OPPORTUNITIES FOR HUMAN USE	? To what extent should restoration actions create opportunities for human use of the spill area?

description of alternatives

FIVE ALTERNATIVES have been developed for your review. Each alternative presents a different way of approaching restoration. Each uses different policies and emphasizes different categories of restoration activities to restore resources

and human uses injured by the spill. No single alternative is likely to match your vision of the ideal plan. The questionnaire on page 8 asks which policies you prefer and how you would combine categories of restoration activities.

ALTERNATIVE 1

NATURAL RECOVERY (No Action)

What would happen to resources and services injured by the oil spill if no restoration actions were taken? The table on page 7 describes expected times for natural recovery of injured resources and services, if expected patterns of use continue. They range from a few years to 120 years and are unknown for six resources. However, because recovery would not be monitored

under this alternative, it would not be possible to confirm when recovery has occurred. Archaeological resources will not recover.

This alternative is the no-action alternative in the draft Environmental Impact Statement that will be released in June 1993. Consequently, none of the civil settlement funds would be spent.


ALTERNATIVE 2

HABITAT PROTECTION

The goal of this alternative is to protect strategic lands and habitats important to resources and services injured by the spill. In this alternative, 91% of the remaining settlement funds would be available for habitat protection. Monitoring and Research and Habitat Protection and Acquisition are the only restoration actions included in this alternative. The Habitat Protection and Acquisition program includes the acquisition of private land interests and changes in public land management. The Monitoring and Research program would evaluate the effectiveness of habitat protection measures undertaken and follow the progress of natural recovery. Restoration activities would be limited to the spill area.

Protect injured resources and services within the spill area from further degradation or disturbance.

ISSUES	POLICIES
Injuries Addressed by Restoration Actions	Address all injured resources and services.
Restoration Actions for Recovered Resources	Continue restoration actions even after a resource has recovered.
Effectiveness of Restoration Actions	Conduct restoration actions that provide substantial improvement over natural recovery.
Location of Restoration Actions	Limit restoration actions to the spill area.
Opportunities for Human Use	Use habitat protection to protect or increase existing human use of the spill area.




ALTERNATIVE 3

LIMITED RESTORATION

The goal of this alternative is to help the most injured resources and services recover as efficiently as possible. As its title implies, this alternative is **limited** in that it addresses only the most severe injuries until the resource or service recovers, includes actions most likely to produce substantial improvement over natural recovery, is limited to the spill area, and does not fund activities intended to increase human use of the spill area. Only a few restoration activities meet these standards. In this alternative, 75% of remaining settlement funds would be available for Habitat Protection and Acquisition. Of the General Restoration options that have been evaluated, only 21 meet the criteria of this alternative. See page 9. The Monitoring and Research program would evaluate the effectiveness of restoration actions and follow the progress of natural recovery.

Take the most effective actions within the spill area to protect and restore all injured services and resources except those biological resources whose populations did not measurably decline. Maintain the existing character of the spill area.

ISSUES	POLICIES
Injuries Addressed by Restoration Actions	Address all resources and services except those biological resources whose populations did not measurably decline.
Restoration Actions for Recovered Resources	Cease restoration actions once a resource has recovered.
Effectiveness of Restoration Actions	Conduct restoration actions that provide substantial improvement over natural recovery.
Location of Restoration Actions	Limit restoration actions to the spill area.
Opportunities for Human Use	Use restoration actions to protect existing human use of the spill area.




ALTERNATIVE 4

MODERATE RESTORATION

The goal of this alternative is to help all injured resources and services recover as efficiently as possible. It is similar to Alternative 3 in limiting restoration actions to resources not yet recovered and setting the same high standard of effectiveness. It differs from Alternative 3 by addressing additional injured species whose populations did not decline, including activities outside the spill area, and increasing opportunities for human use of the area to a limited extent. In this alternative, 50% of remaining settlement funds would be available for Habitat Protection and Acquisition. Of the General Restoration options that have been evaluated, 31 meet the criteria for this alternative. The Monitoring and Research program would include ecosystem monitoring and restoration research in addition to evaluating the effectiveness of restoration actions and following the progress of natural recovery.

Take the most effective actions to protect and restore all injured resources and services. Increase, to a limited extent, opportunities for human use of the spill area.

ISSUES	POLICIES
Injuries Addressed by Restoration Actions	Address all injured resources and services.
Restoration Actions for Recovered Resources	Cease restoration actions once a resource has recovered.
Effectiveness of Restoration Actions	Conduct restoration actions that provide substantial improvement over natural recovery.
Location of Restoration Actions	Undertake restoration actions anywhere there is a link to injured resources or services.
Opportunities for Human Use	Use restoration actions to protect or increase existing human use of the spill area.




ALTERNATIVE 5

COMPREHENSIVE RESTORATION

The goal of this alternative is to help all injured resources and services return to or exceed prespill levels. It is similar to Alternative 4 in addressing **all** injured resources and services and including activities outside the spill area. It is more expansive than Alternative 4 because it allows restoration actions to continue in order to enhance a resource even after it has recovered, includes any action likely to produce at least some improvement over natural recovery, and encourages appropriate new human use of the spill area. In this alternative, 35% of remaining settlement funds would be available for Habitat Protection and Acquisition. Of the General Restoration options that have been evaluated, 47 meet the standards of this alternative. The Monitoring and Research program would include ecosystem monitoring, and restoration research in addition to restoration monitoring and natural recovery monitoring.

Take all effective actions to protect, restore, and enhance all injured resources and services. Increase opportunities for human use of the spill area.

ISSUES	POLICIES
Injuries Addressed by Restoration Actions	Address all injured resources and services.
Restoration Actions for Recovered Resources	Continue restoration actions even after a resource has recovered.
Effectiveness of Restoration Actions	Conduct restoration actions that provide at least some improvement over natural recovery.
Location of Restoration Actions	Undertake restoration actions anywhere there is a link to injured resources and services.
Opportunities for Human Use	Use restoration actions to protect or increase existing use or encourage appropriate new use of the spill area.



Funding Methods: Endowments

Exxon has made deposits into the restoration fund since 1991 and will continue to do so until 2001. The Trustees could spend the entire settlement during that time or they could save some for future use. An endowment is a savings program to fund restoration after Exxon's payments end. It uses part of the settlement funds to create an interest-bearing savings

account, which could fund a constant level of restoration activities indefinitely. An endowment could be used to fund some or all categories of restoration activities.


The size of an endowment determines the amount of income it earns and the amount of restoration activities it can fund. It is possible to place any portion of the remaining

settlement funds into an endowment. For example, 20% of the remaining restoration funds could be placed into a savings account. If so, fewer restoration activities could be accomplished within ten years, but the interest from the account could annually fund approximately \$3 to \$5 million worth of restoration activities indefinitely.

Comparison of alternatives



Courtesy of NATIONAL PARK SERVICE



Courtesy of CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST

In general, how does each alternative benefit recovery?

ALTERNATIVE 1 NATURAL RECOVERY (No Action), would produce no improvement over natural recovery. This alternative includes no restoration activities. It would allow injured resources and services to recover naturally, but would not monitor their recovery.

ALTERNATIVE 2 HABITAT PROTECTION, would improve natural recovery by preventing some habitat disturbances that might otherwise occur. Benefits would accrue primarily to injured resources and services linked to upland habitat. The effectiveness of habitat protection would be monitored, as would the progress of natural recovery of injured resources and services for which no habitat protection measure is undertaken.

ALTERNATIVE 3 LIMITED RESTORATION, might improve recovery of the most injured populations within the spill area. It includes no restoration activities for those species whose populations did not measurably decline because of the spill (see table on page 3). By protecting existing human use, this alternative neither changes the character of the area nor impedes natural recovery of injured resources and services. Because this alternative allocates less to General Restoration actions than do Alternatives 4 and 5, more funds would be available for habitat protection.

ALTERNATIVE 4 MODERATE RESTORATION, might improve recovery of all injured resources and services, reaching outside the spill area, if necessary, to find the most effective restoration actions. This alternative also addresses less severe injuries and prepares for future problems through ecosystem monitoring and restoration research. Finally, this alternative would increase opportunities for existing human use of the spill area, if doing so would improve recovery of an injured service. Because of the expanded scope of restoration actions in this alternative, fewer funds would be available for habitat protection than in Alternatives 2 and 3.



Photo by BOB LOEFFLER

Comparison of Potential Allocations to Restoration Categories by Alternative

The table compares potential allocations within the five alternatives. It also indicates the components of the Monitoring and Research program included in each alternative. Spending for each restoration category gives a sense of the emphasis of the restoration program by alternative. The allocations are illustrative only and are not a commitment of actual expenditures.

In general, as potential allocations to General Restoration increase, funds available for Habitat Protection and Acquisition decline. Furthermore, as the restoration program increases in complexity, so does the cost of Administration and Public Information, and of Monitoring and Research.

RESTORATION CATEGORY	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4	ALTERNATIVE 5
ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION		4%	6%	7%	7%
MONITORING AND RESEARCH		5%	7%	8%	10%
• Recovery Monitoring		X	X	X	X
• Restoration Monitoring		X	X	X	X
• Ecosystem Monitoring				X	X
• Restoration Research				X	X
GENERAL RESTORATION (For examples of general restoration activities within each alternative see page 9)			12%	35%	48%
HABITAT PROTECTION & ACQUISITION		91%	75%	50%	35%
Balance	100%				
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

NOTE: Display of potential allocations is illustrative only and not commitment of actual expenditures. Allocation expressed as a percent of remaining civil settlement fund.

Alternative #1 is the No-Action alternative for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Consequently, it includes a balance that would not be spent on any restoration activity.

X= Component of restoration category included in this alternative.

ALTERNATIVE 5 COMPREHENSIVE RESTORATION, might improve recovery of all injured resources and services and could enhance some of them. In addition to the restoration actions in Alternative 4, this alternative includes actions that are less certain to benefit recovery and encourages appropriate new human use of the spill area. If successful, these additional General Restoration actions could produce greater overall beneficial effects than those in Alternatives 3 and 4, but they would further reduce the availability of funds for habitat protection. Under this alternative, restoration action would be undertaken anywhere there is a link to injured resources and services.

Funding Methods: Endowment

Whether or not funds are placed into an endowment is a decision about the timing of when restoration activities should occur. The alternatives compared above assume that the funds are spent within approximately ten years. Some of the remaining funds could be placed into an endowment to fund restoration activities after Exxon payments end.

Habitat Protection on Private Lands: How Much Land Could Be Protected?

The alternatives indicate that 91% to 35% of the remaining settlement funds could be available for acquiring and protecting habitat. The Trustee Council is looking at many methods of protecting habitat. Some of the factors that would influence the actual amount of habitat protected include:

- land costs, which are highly variable; and
- whether full or partial property rights are acquired.




Photo by ART SOLES

Murres nest in dense colonies on cliff ledges. This behavior helps reduce predation.

Under any alternative, the amount of available land exceeds available funding. Therefore, land parcels must be ranked according to their value in restoring injured resources and services. Acquiring fee title is the most expensive way of protecting private land. Assuming acquisition of fee title and a mix of land costs, approximately 275,000 acres of land could be protected under Alternative 2. This is equivalent to about 14% of the private land within the spill area. Under Alternative 5, this figure drops to 100,000 acres, or approximately 5% of the private land within the spill area. These acreage estimates could be even lower if a larger proportion of high-value land were acquired. The estimates could be higher, if the mix of land acquired included more low cost land or partial property rights.

injury & recovery**MAMMALS**

HARBOR SEALS The oil spill caused population declines and sublethal injuries in harbor seals. Many were directly oiled and an estimated 345 died. Oil residues found in seal bile were 5 to 6 times higher in oiled areas than unoiled areas in 1990. The population was declining prior to the oil spill which makes it difficult to determine the effects of the spill. There are some recent indications that the population may be stabilizing, but there is no indication of any increase.

KILLER WHALES Population decline and other injuries have been documented in one of the pods (extended family group) in the oil spill area. There is debate about whether the oil spill caused these injuries. Thirteen whales out of 36 in one whale pod in Prince William Sound are missing and presumed dead. Circumstantial evidence links the whale disappearance to the oil spill. Additionally, several adult males have collapsed dorsal fins and social disruption of family units has been observed. In that pod, no new births were recorded in 1989 or 1990; one birth was recorded in 1991; and two births were recorded in 1992. These births suggest that the pod is beginning to recover.

RIVER OTTERS There are differences in some indicators of health, feeding habits, and other aspects of river otter biology between oiled and unoiled areas. These differences may indicate an effect of the spill. Lacking prespill data and a measure of the population, there is great uncertainty about the nature of the injury. River otters feed in the intertidal and shallow subtidal areas and may still be exposed to oil persisting in the environment.

SEA OTTERS The oil spill caused population declines and sublethal injuries in sea otters. It is estimated that 3,500 to 5,000 otters died. The total sea otter population in the Gulf of Alaska is estimated at around 20,000. Surveys in 1989, 1990 and 1991 showed measurable differences in population and survival rates between oiled and unoiled areas. In 1992, lower juvenile survival rates and higher than normal numbers of dead, prime-age otters indicate that the populations in Prince William Sound continue to be stressed. Sea otters feed in the lower intertidal and subtidal areas and may still be exposed to oil persisting in the environment. Little or no evidence of recovery has been detected.

BIRDS

BALD EAGLES A minimum of 200 to 300 eagles were estimated to have been killed by the spill. However, because population census techniques are not accurate enough to detect population changes this small, no measurable population decline has been recorded. Productivity in Prince William Sound was disrupted in 1989, but returned to normal in 1990. Exposure to oil and some sublethal injuries were found in 1989 and 1990, but no continuing effects were observed on populations. Bald eagles are recovering, and may have recovered, from the effects of the oil spill.



Black Oystercatcher

Courtesy of U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE

BLACK OYSTERCATCHERS The oil spill caused population declines and sublethal injuries in black oystercatchers. In 1989, smaller eggs and lighter weight chicks were found in oiled areas. Black oystercatchers feed in the intertidal areas and may still be exposed to oil persisting in the environment. The population is recovering although evidence of sublethal injuries persisted in 1992.

COMMON MURRES The oil spill caused population declines and sublethal injuries at murre colonies within the oil spill area. In 1989, between 175,000 to 300,000 murres were killed. Measurable impacts on populations were recorded in 1989, 1990 and 1991. Breeding was still inhibited in some colonies in the Gulf of Alaska in 1992. The degree of recovery varies between colonies and some colonies show little evidence of recovery.

HARLEQUIN DUCKS The oil spill caused population declines and sublethal injuries in harlequin ducks. In 1989, approximately 400 birds were killed. In the three years since the oil spill, it appears that harlequin ducks still are not successfully breeding in oiled areas of Prince William Sound. Harlequin ducks feed in the intertidal and shallow subtidal areas and may still be exposed to oil persisting in the environment.

MARBLED MURRELETS The oil spill caused population declines, but it is unknown if there were sublethal injuries. It is estimated that 8,000 to 12,000 birds died. Measurable population effects were recorded in 1989, 1990 and 1991 as a result of the oil spill. In 1989, oil contamination was found in livers of adult birds. Marbled murrelet populations were declining prior to the oil spill. In 1992, recovery was uncertain and no signs of an increasing population have been observed, but the decline may have stabilized.

PIGEON GUILLEMOTS The oil spill caused population declines in pigeon guillemots. In 1989, between 1,500 to 3,000 birds were estimated to have been killed. In 1989, oil contamination was found in birds and on eggs. The recovery status in 1992 is uncertain. There is no evidence of an increase in the population. Pigeon guillemot populations were declining prior to the spill.

What Was Injured By the Spill and Is It Recovering?

This page describes the injury and the status of recovery for each of the resources and services included in the alternatives. The table on page 3 categorizes the biological resource injuries into those that resulted in a measurable population decline and those that did not. These other injuries include higher mortality in early life stages (for example, eggs and very young animals) and sublethal injuries that do not result in death. These injuries have not resulted in measurable effects to the overall adult population.

Injuries to services (human uses) are more difficult to categorize. They depend in part on the injury to the resources as well as on the way people use and perceive areas and resources.

In addition to the resources described below, other species were studied as part of the damage assessment process but are not believed to have suffered notable injuries. These include sea lions, brown bears, Sitka black-tailed deer, black-legged kittiwakes, some sea birds, crab, shrimp, and many others.

FISH

CUTTHROAT TROUT AND DOLLY VARDEN The oil spill caused sublethal injuries and possibly population declines in these two species. Between 1989 and 1991, survival and growth in adult populations in oiled areas differed from those in unoiled areas. This difference persisted even though indications of exposure to oil decreased over these years. The persistence of different rates of survival and growth may have been due to continuing injury to the food base. However, scientists disagree as to whether these differences in survival and growth existed before the spill. It is unknown whether these species are recovering.

PACIFIC HERRING The oil spill caused sublethal injuries to Pacific herring. It is presently unknown whether these injuries will result in a population decline. Measurable differences in egg mortality between oiled and unoiled areas were found in 1989. Eggs and larvae were injured or killed in 1989 and, to a lesser extent, in 1990. In 1991 there were no differences between oiled and unoiled areas. Injuries to the 1989 year class may result in reduced recruitment to the adult population. If so, an adult population decline will not become apparent until 1993. Overall recovery status is unknown.

PINK SALMON The oil spill caused sublethal injuries to wild stock populations, and there is debate on whether the wild stock population has declined. Abnormal fry were observed in 1989 and egg mortality continued to be higher than expected in 1990 and 1991. The debate about population declines focuses on whether the observed injuries will result in reduced adult returns. Reduced growth of juveniles, which correlates with reduced survival, was found in 1989 and 1991. In 1992, there was continued evidence of sublethal injuries. Overall recovery status is unknown.

ROCKFISH The oil spill caused at least sublethal injuries; however, it is unknown whether or not population declines also occurred. Twenty dead fish were found in 1989, but only a few were in condition to be analyzed. Those analyzed showed exposure to oil with some sublethal injuries. Closures to salmon fisheries increased the fishing pressure on rockfish and the increasing catch may be affecting the population. It is unknown if the population has recovered from sublethal injuries or from any population decline.

SOCKEYE SALMON Kenai River and Red Lake sockeye salmon stocks both suffered population declines as well as sublethal injuries. Smolt survival continued to be poor in both systems due to overescapements that occurred at Red Lake in 1989 and in the Kenai system in 1987, 1988 and 1989. In 1992, the estimated number of Kenai River smolt was only 3% of average. As a result of overescapement, adult returns are expected to be low in 1994 and successive years. Overall recovery status is unknown.

COASTAL HABITAT

COASTAL HABITAT - INTERTIDAL ZONE The oil spill caused population declines and sublethal injuries in the populations of plants and animals that live in the area between low and high tide. The lower intertidal and, to some extent, the mid-intertidal zones are recovering. However, in the upper intertidal zone, some species have not recovered, and oil persists in and under mussel beds. Intertidal organisms were

affected by both oiling and clean-up, particularly the high pressure, hot water washing. Recovery varies by species largely based on their position within the intertidal zone.

COASTAL HABITAT - SUBTIDAL ZONE The oil spill caused population declines and sublethal injuries in the populations of plants and animals found below low tide. Eelgrass and some species of algae appear to be recovering. Amphipods in eelgrass beds recovered to prespill densities in 1991. Leather stars and helmet crabs showed little sign of recovery through 1991. Overall recovery is variable by species.

OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Twenty-four archaeological sites are known to have been harmed by oiling, clean-up activities, or looting and vandalism linked to the oil spill. An additional 113 sites are estimated to have been similarly affected. Injuries attributed to increased looting and vandalism linked to the oil spill are still occurring. Archaeological sites and artifacts cannot recover. They are finite, non-renewable resources.

DESIGNATED WILDERNESS AREAS

Many miles of coastlines were oiled in designated wilderness areas and wilderness study areas. Some oil remains embedded in the sediments of these areas. Until oil is completely removed or degrades naturally, injuries to these areas will continue.

SERVICES (HUMAN USES)

COMMERCIAL FISHING During 1989, emergency commercial fishery closures were ordered throughout the spill area. Closures affected salmon, herring, crab, shrimp, rockfish, and sablefish. The 1989 closures resulted in sockeye overescapement in the Kenai River and in the Red Lake system (Kodiak Island). In 1990, a portion of Prince William Sound was closed to shrimp fishing. Spill-related sockeye overescapement is anticipated to result in low adult returns in 1994 and 1995. This may result in closure or harvest restrictions during these and, perhaps, subsequent years. Injuries and recovery status of rockfish, pink salmon, shellfish and herring are uncertain.

COMMERCIAL TOURISM Although the nature and extent of injury varied, approximately 43 percent of the tourism businesses surveyed in 1990 felt they had been significantly affected by the oil spill. Millions of dollars were lost in 1989 due to reduced visitor spending in Southcentral and Southwest Alaska. By 1990, only 12 percent felt that their businesses were affected by the spill.

PASSIVE USE In 1991, over 90% of those surveyed nationwide were aware of the oil spill. Over 50% believed that the oil spill was the largest environmental accident caused by humans anywhere in the world. There was also a perception that the value of wild areas had diminished. Some respondents reported that their perception of lost value was recovering as they sensed some recovery was occurring. The feelings of others have not changed as they did not believe recovery was occurring.

RECREATION The nature and extent of injury varied by user group and by area of use. About one quarter of respondents to a recreation survey in 1992 reported no change in their recreation experience, but others reported avoiding the spill area, reduced wildlife sightings, residual oil and more people. They also reported changes in their perception of recreation opportunities in terms of increased vulnerability to future oil spills, erosion of wilderness, a sense of permanent change, and concern about long-term ecological effects. However, some respondents reported a sense of optimism. There are indications that declines in recreation activities reported in 1989 appear to have reversed in 1990, but there is no evidence that they have returned to prespill levels.

RECREATION - SPORT FISHING AND HUNTING

Between 1989 and 1990, a decline in sport fishing (number of anglers, fishing trips and fishing days) was recorded for Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet, and the Kenai Peninsula. In 1992, an emergency order restricting cutthroat trout fishing was issued for western Prince William Sound due to low adult returns. The closure is expected to continue at least through 1993. Sport hunting of harlequin ducks was reduced by restrictions imposed in 1991 and



Photo by RON STANKE

1992 in response to damage assessment studies. It is likely that these restrictions will continue until the species shows signs of recovery. Kenai River sockeye overescapements may severely affect sport fishing as early as 1994.

SUBSISTENCE Subsistence harvests of fish and wildlife in 9 of 15 villages surveyed declined from 4 to 78 percent in 1989 when compared to prespill averages. Seven of the 15 villages show continued decline in use in 1990 and 1991. This decline was particularly noticeable in the Prince William Sound villages of Chenega and Tatitlek. In 1989, chemical analysis indicated that most resources tested, including fish, marine mammals, deer, and ducks, were safe to eat, but that shellfish from oiled beaches should not be eaten. However, villagers believe that contamination of subsistence food sources continues to be dangerous to their health and that some subsistence species continue to decline.

Estimated Natural Recovery Rates of Injured Biological Resources

The estimates in the table contain a great deal of uncertainty. For some species there is substantial disagreement within the scientific community. The estimates are likely to change as recovery continues, more information is provided through monitoring, and scientists learn more about the species.

The table presents estimated natural recovery rates for injured biological resources. Predicting the amount of time needed for a species to recover is extremely difficult. Scientists often use models based on factors such as population numbers and growth rates. However, for many of the injured biological resources, the background information was not available to develop these predictive models. For those resources, peer reviewers and agency scientists based their estimates on the best available information.

For example, for black oystercatchers there have been no studies to determine a population growth rate anywhere within the species' range. In this case, the experts are forced to rely on information from a related species, the Eurasian oystercatcher, to estimate a recovery time. Under certain circumstances, a population of Eurasian oystercatchers would be capable of growing at 6.25% annually. If the injured black oystercatcher population grows at the same rate, it could recover to prespill numbers in 15 years. The amount of time could be considerably less if the growth rate is higher, or if animals from adjacent areas move to the oiled area. On the other hand, the recovery time could be considerably longer if the growth rate is less than that of the Eurasian oystercatcher, or if the habitat quality is low. Where oil persists in the environment, habitat quality is likely to be low.

Recovery estimates for services are not provided in the table below. Recovery is linked, in part, to the resources that support the service, and can vary widely between user groups.

	RESOURCES	NATURAL RECOVERY ESTIMATES (Years from 1989)	COMMENTS
POPULATION DECLINE	BLACK OYSTERCATCHER	15 to 30 years	Recovering.
	COMMON MURRE	50 to 120 years	Recovery varies by colony.
	HARBOR SEAL	Unknown	In decline before spill. Population may have stabilized.
	HARLEQUIN DUCK	10 to 50 years	Still no reproduction within oiled areas studied in Prince William Sound.
	INTERTIDAL ORGANISMS	10 to 25 years	Recovery estimates are combined for all organisms in the upper intertidal zone. Recovery in lower and mid-intertidal zones is expected to be faster than that in the upper intertidal zone.
	MARBLED MURRELET	Unknown	In decline before spill. Estimates vary widely on when the population may stabilize. It may be stable now, or may take about 50 years to stabilize at lower population size.
	PIGEON GUILLEMOT	Unknown	In decline before spill. Probably still declining. Should stabilize in less than 50 years.
	SEA OTTER	15 to 40 years	Population stable, but not recovering.
	SOCKEYE SALMON	10 to 50 years	Estimates are for attaining a 10-year average similar to prespill populations for Kenai River and Red Lake sockeye salmon.
	SUBTIDAL ORGANISMS	Less than 10 years	Recovering in most places.
INJURED, BUT NO POPULATION DECLINE	BALD EAGLE	4 to 6 years	Back to prespill population between 1993 and 1995.
	CUTTHROAT TROUT	10 to 20 years	
	DOLLY VARDEN	10 to 20 years	
	KILLER WHALE	10 to 20 years	Estimates are for the injured pod to return to its prespill size. Currently recovering.
	PACIFIC HERRING	Unknown	Population decline may be documented after 1993.
	PINK SALMON	Less than 20 years	Estimates represent recovery of wild stocks to a population level that may be less than 100% of the prespill population.
	RIVER OTTER	Unknown	Injury and actual population size are difficult to assess.
	ROCKFISH	Unknown	

STEP 1. fold on dotted line (top half, away from you)



Courtesy of CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST



Photo by PAT MURPHY

STEP 2. fold on dotted line (left half, away from you)

RETURN ADDRESS:

Tape
or Staple
Here

PLACE
STAMP
HERE

Exxon Valdez
Oil Spill Restoration Office
645 "G" Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

STEP 3 fold on dotted line (bottom half, away from you)

We would like to know your views about the appropriate policies, categories of restoration activities, and possible spending allocations. Please fill out the questions on the next page and let the Trustee Council know which approaches you believe will best restore the resources and services injured by the spill. If you need more information, please come to one of the public meetings. Also, feel free to comment on other parts of the plan alternatives. Attach additional sheets if you need more space.


Thanks for your help!

To be sure that you are on our mailing list and to receive further information when it is available, please put your name and address either here on or as the return address. If you would rather not list your name, please put the community where you live.

☐ If you would like to receive a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Restoration Plan when it is available this June, please check the box.

While we would appreciate your comments as soon as possible, they must be received by August 6, 1993.

TELL
US
WHAT
YOU
THINK



Tell Us What You Think!

please write your views in the space provided beneath each question. For example, if you think that some general restoration activities are appropriate outside the spill area but that habitat protection should concentrate only on the spill area, you would write that information in the comment space.

Comments:**Comments:**

☐ Conduct only those restoration actions that provide substantial improvement over natural recovery.

☐ Conduct restoration actions that provide at least some improvement over natural recovery.

☐ No preference

Comments:

☐ Limit restoration actions to the spill area only.

☐ Undertake restoration actions anywhere in Alaska there is a link to injured resources or services.

☐ Undertake restoration actions anywhere in the United States there is a link to injured resources or services.

☐ No preference

Comments:☐ No preference**Comments:**

☐ NO

☐ YES. Please indicate which monitoring and research activities you believe are appropriate (you may mark more than one answer):

- ☐ Ecological monitoring (monitor general ecosystem health to identify problems and prepare for future spills)
- ☐ Restoration Research (basic and applied research to benefit injured resources and services)
- ☐ Other

Comments:☐ Other

Comment:

☐ NO, I believe the funds should be spent within approximately 10 years.

☐ YES. Please indicate the amount that you believe should be placed into an endowment

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 20%	<input type="checkbox"/> More than 40%
<input type="checkbox"/> 20%	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Amount. If you know the amount please indicate: _____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> 40%	

Comments:

☐ Monitoring and Research

☐ General Restoration

☐ Habitat Protection and Acquisition

☐ No Preference

Comments:

The table shows potential allocations in the five alternatives. If one of the alternatives reflects your view of which activities should be emphasized, please circle the number of that alternative. If not, please put write in your percentages in the box provided under category "YOUR ALTERNATIVE". If you favor categories for restoration that are not listed below, please write your ideas in the space provided. If, in the question above, you marked "YES" to indicate you favor endowment, remember to put in a percentage for endowment. (Make sure your percentages add to 100%).

[illegible]

General restoration

For some resources and services, no known restoration approach is likely to be effective. In these cases, the main agent of recovery is nature. For other resources and services, however, it may be possible to provide some improvement over natural recovery.

The General Restoration category of Alternatives 3 through 5 includes various restoration actions that have been suggested throughout the planning process. The suggestions were evaluated by scientists and peer reviewers. Those that were determined to be effective have been combined into general options and are listed below. Those general options may include a number of specific projects. The evaluation of options considered

how recovery was aided and whether further potential injury could be prevented. Other considerations included potential negative effects and how many species benefit. No options were identified for restoring subtidal resources, air, water, sediment, designated wilderness or wilderness study areas. The list on this page provides examples of restoration options that received favorable evaluations. New options will continue to be evaluated as the restoration plan is implemented.

Specific projects will require legal review to ensure compliance with the civil settlement. The Trustee Council will only fund projects that are consistent with the civil settlement.

Some activities, such as habitat protection and acquisition, would have wide-ranging impacts throughout the spill area. Most options that help resources also help the services that are dependent upon them. An option targeted to improve the recovery of a single resource may greatly benefit other resources that occur in the same area. This is especially true of the activities that protect marine, coastal and upland habitats. In addition, options that benefit the foundation of a food web, such as marine invertebrates, would ultimately benefit top predators such as whales and eagles.

MAMMALS		ALTERNATIVES		
		3	4	5
HARBOR SEAL	Determine the effects of disturbance on harbor seals and implement actions to reduce adverse effects.			X
	◆ Implement cooperative programs between fishermen and agencies to provide voluntary methods to reduce incidental take of harbor seals during fishing.	X	X	X
	◆ Implement cooperative programs between subsistence users and agencies to assess the effects of subsistence harvest.	X	X	X
KILLER WHALE	◆ Determine techniques for changing black cod fishery gear to avoid conflicts with fishermen and implement actions to remove adverse effects.		X	X
SEA OTTER	◆ Determine the effects of disturbance of upland activities on sea otters and implement actions to reduce adverse effects. This would have benefits in local areas only.	X	X	X
	◆ Determine if eliminating oil from mussel beds removes a potential source of continuing contamination to sea otter food and take appropriate action. This would have benefits in local areas only.	X	X	X
	◆ Implement cooperative programs between subsistence users and agencies to assess the effects of subsistence harvest.	X	X	X
RIVER OTTER	Develop sport and trapping harvest guidelines to aid in the recovery of injured populations.			X

FISH		ALTERNATIVES		
		3	4	5
SOCK-EYE SALMON	◆ Intensify management of sockeye salmon on the Kenai River and Red Lake to reduce the risk of overescapement.	X	X	X
	Improve access to salmon streams by building fish passes to increase the area where salmon can successfully spawn and rear. This would have benefits in local areas only.			X
	Fertilize lakes to improve sockeye rearing success within the lake and increase sockeye population.		X	X
PINK SALMON	◆ Improve survival rates of salmon eggs to fry by using egg boxes, net pens or hatchery rearing.	X	X	X
	◆ Intensify management by incorporating coded-wire tagging and stock separation to ensure and accelerate the recovery of the wild stock.		X	X
	Construct salmon spawning channels and other instream improvements to increase spawning production and provide long-term enhancement. This would have benefits in local areas only.			X
	Improve access to salmon streams by building fish passes to increase the area where salmon can successfully spawn and rear. This would have benefits in local areas only.			X
	◆ Relocate hatchery runs of pink salmon to reduce the interception rate of wild stocks of pink salmon.	X	X	
	Improve survival rates of salmon eggs to fry by using egg boxes, net pens, or hatchery rearing. This would have benefits in local areas only.			X
CUT-THROAT TROUT	Update the Alaska Anadromous Streams Catalog to ensure that the necessary protection and regulation is provided for all listed salmon streams in the spill area.			X
	◆ Intensify management of cutthroat trout and its dependent sport fishery by determining local distribution, abundance, and productivity.		X	X
	Update the Alaska Anadromous Streams Catalogue to ensure necessary protection and regulation for all listed anadromous streams in the spill area.			X
DOLLY VARDEN	◆ Intensify management of Dolly Varden and its dependent sport fishery by determining local distribution, abundance and productivity.		X	X
PACIFIC HERRING	◆ Intensify management to improve recovery by allowing increased precision in stock assessment and manipulation of harvest levels.		X	X
ROCK-FISH	◆ Intensify management of the rockfish fishery to modify the harvest to compensate for injury from the spill.		X	X

COASTAL HABITAT		ALTERNATIVES		
		3	4	5
INTERTIDAL ORGANISMS	◆ Accelerate the recovery of the upper intertidal zone to aid intertidal resources in localized areas.	X	X	X
SUBTIDAL ORGANISMS	No restoration options have been identified.			


NOTE: ◆ denotes options that may produce substantial improvement in assuring recovery of a biological resource. Those without an asterisk may produce at least some improvement in recovery.

BIRDS		ALTERNATIVES		
		3	4	5
BLACK OYSTER-CATCHER	Accelerate the recovery of the upper intertidal zone to improve the rate of recovery in site-specific areas.			X
	This would have benefits in local areas only.			
COMMON MURRE	◆ Remove predators from islands that previously supported black oystercatchers. Effectiveness varies by location.		X	X
	Reduce disturbance at breeding colonies to eliminate factors which could slow the recovery of affected murre colonies.			X
	◆ Use artificial stimuli such as decoys or vocalizations to encourage recovery at affected colonies and accelerate recolonization of historic colonies.	X	X	X
HARLEQUIN DUCK	◆ Remove predators at injured colonies or remove predators from islands that previously supported murre.	X	X	X
	Modify sport hunting harvest guidelines in the areas of injured populations to speed the rate of recovery during the recovery phase.			X
	◆ Determine if eliminating oil from mussel beds removes a potential source of continuing contamination in feeding areas and take appropriate action. This would have benefits in local areas only.	X	X	X
MARBLED MURRELET	◆ Minimize the incidental capture of birds in fishing nets by changes in gear or timing of fishing.	X	X	X
PIGEON GUILLEMOT	◆ Control predator access or remove predators from islands that previously supported birds.	X	X	X
BALD EAGLE	No options other than habitat protection have been identified.			

DESIGNATED WILDERNESS AREAS		ALTERNATIVES		
		3	4	5
No options have been identified for Designated Wilderness Areas or Wilderness Study Areas.				

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES		ALTERNATIVES		
		3	4	5
Develop a site stewardship program using local residents to monitor nearby archaeological sites to discourage looting and vandalism.		X	X	X
	Increase law enforcement and agency presence to patrol and monitor archaeological sites within the spill area would protect sites from looting and vandalism.	X	X	X
	Preserve archaeological sites and artifacts within the spill area to provide some measure of permanent protection for select archaeological resources.	X	X	X
Acquire replacements for artifacts from the spill area as a means of preserving and studying artifacts which were taken from the spill area prior to the spill.			X	X

SERVICES		ALTERNATIVES		
		3	4	5
<i>Resource options shown above also benefit many services.</i>				
RECREATION	Develop new backcountry public recreation facilities to protect existing recreation use.	X	X	X
	Develop backcountry public recreation facilities to protect and increase existing resource use.		X	X
	Encourage appropriate new recreation use, such as: <i>Marketing public land for commercial operators and recreationists to use public lands.</i> <i>Creating new visitor centers or building a marine environmental institute to increase public awareness of the nature of injury and recovery and understanding of the ecosystem of that area.</i>			X
	Replace lost harvest opportunities by creating new fisheries for salmon or trout.	X	X	X
	The restoration options, and the alternatives they appear in, are identical to those described above for RECREATION	X	X	X
SUBSISTENCE	Replace lost harvest opportunities by creating new salmon runs.			X
	Test subsistence foods for continued contamination as a means of restoring confidence in the safety of subsistence resources within the spill area.	X	X	X
	Provide new access to traditional foods in areas outside the spill area to restore lost use. This option will undergo legal review.	X	X	X
	Develop subsistence mariculture sites to benefit subsistence users by providing a source of uncontaminated shellfish for their diets.			X
	Develop a shellfish hatchery and technical research center to benefit subsistence users by providing a source of uncontaminated shellfish for their diets.			X
COMMERCIAL FISHING	Replace harvest opportunities by creating new fish runs to replace commercial fishing opportunities lost due to fishing closures or reduced harvest.	X	X	X
PASSIVE USE	No options other than habitat protection have been identified for this resource.			



1994 WORK PLAN

RECEIVED
APR 20 1993

Approach	Schedule
1. Prepare list of potential 1994 Restoration projects based upon restoration options in the draft Restoration Plan, public and agency suggestions to date and the 1994 Work Plan Framework. The latter was a planning document derived by the Restoration Team, the chief scientist, peer reviewers and co-chairs of the the Restoration Planning Work Group.	January 11 - April 15 EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL TRUSTEE COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
2. Seek public comment on list of potential 1994 restoration projects.	April 17 - May 20
3. Prepare Draft 1994 Work Plan.	May 21 - September 15
4. Seek public comments on Draft 1994 Work Plan.	September 22 - October 26
5. Trustee Council Approves 1994 Work Plan.	December 9 - December 10

DRAFT RECEIVED

APR 20 1993

ID	Name	Scheduled Start	Scheduled Finish
1	DEVELOP DRAFT RESTORATION PLAN	2/16/93	8/6/93
2	TC review Alternatives	2/16/93	2/16/93
3	Develop Alt Info Package	2/17/93	3/2/93
4	RT review Alt Info Package	3/2/93	3/11/93
5	Alt Info Package to Public	3/31/93	8/6/93
6	Public Meetings	4/12/93	4/30/93
7	Review Public Mtg Comment	5/3/93	5/21/93
8	Send Draft Plan to TC	5/21/93	5/21/93
9	TC meeting of Draft Plan	6/1/93	6/1/93
10	Release Draft Plan to Public	6/21/93	8/6/93
11	DEVELOP FINAL PLAN	8/9/93	12/27/93
12	Revise Draft Plan	8/9/93	10/30/93
13	Final Plan to TC	11/1/93	11/1/93
14	TC Decision on Plan	11/10/93	11/10/93
15	Final Plan to Public	11/11/93	12/27/93
16	TC MTG to Implement Plan	12/27/93	12/27/93
17	DEVELOP DRAFT EIS	2/22/93	8/6/93
18	EIS Analysis	2/22/93	4/2/93
19	Review DEIS and Rewrite	4/5/93	5/21/93
20	DEIS to TC	5/21/93	5/21/93
21	TC decision on DEIS	6/1/93	6/1/93
22	Public Comment of DEIS	6/21/93	8/6/93
23	DEVELOP FINAL EIS	8/9/93	12/27/93
24	Revise DEIS	8/9/93	10/30/93
25	FEIS to TC	11/1/93	11/1/93
26	TC decision on FEIS	11/10/93	11/10/93
27	Public review of FEIS	11/11/93	12/27/93
28	Record of Decision	12/27/93	12/27/93
29			
30	HABITAT PROTECTION EVALUATION	2/16/93	9/15/93
31	Interim Protection Process	2/16/93	2/16/93
32	Peer review process	2/28/93	4/23/93
33	Comprehensive Eval proc	2/23/93	9/15/93
34	Hab Protect Field Work	5/3/93	9/15/93
35	ID New Data Needs	3/1/93	5/12/93
36	RT Review Data Needs	5/12/93	5/31/93
37	TC Decision on New Data	6/1/93	6/1/93
38	Begin discussions /negotiations	3/15/93	12/31/93
39	Negotiations Progress RPT	8/10/93	8/10/93
40			
41			
42	1993 WORK PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	2/12/93	9/30/93
43	93 Detailed Study Plan Dev	2/12/93	4/1/93
44	RT & Peer Review	3/1/93	5/1/93
45	Implement 93 Projects	5/3/93	9/30/93
46			
47	1992 WORKPLAN REPORTS	2/12/93	8/10/93
48	92 Report writing	2/12/93	5/6/93
49	Spies review Reports	4/1/93	7/15/93
50	Write 92 Summary Report	5/17/93	7/10/93
51	RT Review Summary RPT	7/12/93	8/1/93
52	92 RPT to TC	8/10/93	8/10/93
53			
54	Monitoring Plan WKSHOP	4/13/93	4/15/93

DRAFT

ID	Name	Scheduled Start	Scheduled Finish
55			
56	1994 WORKPLAN DEVELOPMENT	3/31/93	12/10/93
57	TC Meeting	3/31/93	3/31/93
58	RT Develop instructions to WPWG	4/2/93	4/2/93
59	WPWG Dev Project Title List	4/2/93	4/13/93
60	RT Review Chart	4/13/93	4/13/93
61	TC Review Chart	4/14/93	4/15/93
62	WPWG Revise Chart	4/16/93	4/16/93
63	Print Chart	4/19/93	4/20/93
64	Distribute Chart	4/21/93	4/22/93
65	Public Review Period	4/22/93	5/21/93
66	Review Public Comments	5/24/93	6/4/93
67	TC Meeting to Develop Assumptions	6/1/93	6/2/93
68	RT Develop Project List	6/3/93	6/8/93
69	ID Agencies to Write Project Descriptions	6/8/93	6/8/93
70	TC Review of Project List & Lead Agencies	6/9/93	6/11/93
71	Agencies Write Summary Project Descriptions & Budget	6/14/93	7/16/93
72	RT/FC/CS Review	7/19/93	7/30/93
73	Legal Counsel Review as Necessary	7/19/93	7/27/93
74	WPWG Assemble Draft Work plan for TC Review	8/2/93	8/11/93
75	Draft Work Plan to Trustee Council	8/12/93	8/12/93
76	RT WPWG Continue Document Preparation	8/12/93	8/19/93
77	TC Meeting for NEPA Funding	8/20/93	8/20/93
78	Agencies Conduct NEPA Compliance	8/23/93	12/8/93
79	WPWG Compile Final Document	8/23/93	8/26/93
80	Document Printed	8/27/93	9/13/93
81	Public and PAG Comment Period	9/20/93	10/21/93
82	PAG Meeting to Review Draft 1994 WP	10/6/93	10/6/93
83	WPWG Analyze Comments	10/22/93	11/11/93
84	RT Review Analysis	11/5/93	11/11/93
85	RT Develops Work Plan Recommendations	11/12/93	11/18/93
86	WPWG Assembles Final Draft WP	11/19/93	11/24/93
87	RT Reviews Final Draft WP	11/25/93	12/1/93
88	Document to TC	12/2/93	12/2/93
89	TC Meeting Decision on Final Work Plan	12/9/93	12/10/93
90			
91	DEVELOP FIRST QUARTER INTERIM FUNDING	7/29/93	8/20/93
92	RT Develop Interim Funding Recommendations	7/29/93	8/11/93
93	TC Meeting for Interim Funding Oct-Dec.	8/20/93	8/20/93
94			
95	IMPLEMENT 1994 PROGRAM OF WORK	12/13/93	5/30/95
96	TC Requests Funds from Court	12/13/93	12/17/93
97	Funds deposited in Gov't Accounts	12/24/93	12/24/93
98	Federal Gov't Receives Funds from NRDA&R	1/24/94	1/24/94
99	Project Descriptions Developed	12/13/93	3/4/94
100	Peer Review of Project Descriptions	1/24/94	4/15/94
101	Project Start Date	3/7/94	7/22/94
102	Projects Conducted	3/7/94	9/30/94
103	Draft Reports Developed	10/3/94	3/31/95
104	Peer Review of Draft Reports	1/9/95	4/14/95
105	Final Reports Developed	2/13/95	5/30/95
106			
107	CONTINUATION PROJECT INTERIM REPORT DEADLINE	2/6/95	4/1/95

March 8, 1993

RECEIVED
APR 20 1993

Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council
645 G Street
Anchorage, AK 99501

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL
TRUSTEE COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Charles E. Cole
Michael A. Barton
Carl L. Roster
Curtis V. McVee
John A. Sandor
Steven Pennoyer

Gentlemen:

The Exxon Valdez oil spill continues to negatively impact many people and communities in Prince William (PWS). There is a very strong need to provide the public with accurate information on the impact of the spill, the restoration efforts that are underway and have been completed, the existing conditions in PWS along with ongoing education on the environment and natural resources of PWS and the recreational opportunities which are available. To best accomplish these goals we have developed the attached proposal which would utilize Exxon Valdez settlement funds to establish and build a center for PWS oil spill and natural resource education.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this proposal. We shall look forward to further discussing this proposal with you. In the meantime I shall remain...

Yours very truly,

T. F. Plummer

Timothy F. Plummer
Chairperson

Partnership for PWS Oil Spill & Natural Resource Education
P. O. Box 1603
Valdez, AK 99686

March 8, 1993

A CENTER FOR PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND OIL SPILL

AND NATURAL RESOURCE EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The negative impacts of the Exxon Valdez oil spill have effected many people and communities in Prince William Sound (PWS). This impact continues as other spills in the world are immediately compared to the Exxon Valdez spill and with movies such as "Dead Ahead." This attention quickly refers to the enormity of the spill, discusses and normally shows film footage of oil on the water, dead animals and birds and all the other damage done.

The result of this continuing attention is the reinforcement of the perception that oil is still present and the Sound is no longer pristine, is not desirable as a visitor/tourist destination nor a quality place to live.

No community in Prince William Sound has been impacted more than Valdez. Some businesses are still experiencing reductions in summer visitors, our population grew so quickly during and then again after the spill that it has impacted our schools and housing costs have increased dramatically.

Data exists from studies conducted during the spill and on through 1992 which documents the continuing personal impact of adults as well as children as a result of the spill. The studies clearly show that Valdezian's and other PWS community residents still suffer from post traumatic stress in the forms of depression, marital problems, alcohol and drug abuse, domestic violence and from the frustration of knowing that the negative perceptions are not accurate or founded.

Prior to the spill the Terminal was a major attraction. Valdez has a new and different need for an attraction. One that can initially focus on accurate information on the impact of the spill and restoration efforts and then focus on providing education on the myriad of natural resources present in Prince William Sound. This will benefit Valdez, Prince William Sound, the State of Alaska, many other Americans as well as other countries.

WHAT

This project is to build a center for Prince William Sound to provide the public with accurate information on the impact of the spill, restoration efforts, existing conditions in PWS and ongoing education on the environment and natural resources and recreational opportunities in PWS.

The location of the center would be Valdez. As the only community on PWS that is accessible by road it provides the greatest amount of access to the most people.

A center located in Valdez would be enhanced by existing facilities such as Prince William Sound Community College and the Valdez Civic Center, which has an auditorium. This combination would provide an opportunity for hosting conferences, symposiums, seminars and other events to provide the latest information on the effects of the spill, and restoration efforts and ongoing education on the environment and natural resources of the Sound.

Restoration should take place where the damage occurred.

GOAL

Establish a center to:

- Inform and educate the public on the effects and impacts of the Exxon Valdez oil spill, current research and restoration activities.

- Provide the public with an accurate and balanced view of existing conditions in PWS.

- Provide education and understanding to the public of the PWS and Gulf of Alaska environment to enhance their enjoyment and awareness of this area.

- Enhance eco-tourism recreation opportunities and experiences through interpretation of the natural resources and environment.

OBJECTIVES

Build a center to provide initial education to the public on the effects of the spill, restoration efforts, existing conditions in PWS and ongoing education of the environment and natural resources in PWS including marine and land mammals, sea and upland birds, fishes, flora and fauna, intertidal life, cultural resources, history and recreational opportunities.

The center will provide education to the public through changing displays, video's, handout materials and presentations. The educational coverage would be provided to other Alaskan schools in partnership with the PWS Community College by distance delivery via satellite uplink.

To maximize it's utilization the center would also house the Valdez Convention & Visitors Bureau, the Valdez Chamber of Commerce, the PWS Economic Development Council and other appropriate partners involved in the center.

WHY

Because the negative impacts of the Exxon Valdez oil spill has effected many people and communities in Prince William Sound (PWS) a well established center is needed to provide the public with accurate information on the impact of the spill, restoration efforts that have been completed and are underway, existing conditions in PWS, ongoing education of the environment and natural resources of PWS and recreational opportunities.

HOW

Build a center to provide education to the public through partnership with Prince William Sound Community College (A Division of the University of Alaska System), City of Valdez, State of Alaska, City of Cordova, Chugach Alaska Corporation, Tatitlek Corporation, Chenaga Corporation, Eyak Corporation, Valdez Fisheries Development Association, PWS Aquaculture Association, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, U. S. Forest Service, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Alaska Department of Fish & Game and National Marine Fisheries Service.

WHEN

Partnership establishment, curriculum development, design and engineering in 1994.

Construction, staffing and startup in 1995.

BUDGET

Current budget estimate is 1.5 to 2.0 million.

14.2.4A


UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

MERCHANT VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES 1955

(Including Yachts)



January 1, 1955



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C. - Price \$6.00 (Buckram)

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL
TRUSTEE COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

RECEIVED
APR 20 1993

FOREWORD

In compliance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 5, 1884 (46 U. S. C. 4), directing that there shall be prepared and published annually a list of vessels of the United States belonging to the commercial marine, specifying the official number, signal letters, name, rig, tonnage, home port, and place and date of build of every such vessel, there is published herein the name of every American merchant vessel and yacht which had an uncanceled document (register, enrollment and license, or license) on January 1, 1955. Other vessels (including numbered motorboats) are not listed herein, nor is a list of such vessels compiled or published by the Bureau of Customs.

All vessels with digits only as the name of the vessel (1, 213, 500, etc.) are listed before the alphabetical names, beginning on page 1; those whose names contain the prefix "No." or "Number" with one or more digits are listed under number (e. g. No. 1). All vessels with initials precede those in the same letter with full names (e. g. "A. V. Criss" would precede "Acadia"). Words commonly abbreviated have been treated as though spelled out in full. Identical names are arranged in the order of the official numbers assigned to the vessels. All marks of punctuation, including hyphens, apostrophes, periods, dashes, as well as the word "of," the ampersand, and the word "and" forming a part of the vessel's name have been ignored for purposes of alphabetizing. All vessels are listed in this publication in the above order regardless of rig or whether such vessels are used in commercial employment or exclusively for pleasure. The same sequence of listing is used in all sections of this publication.

Signal Letters of the United States Merchant Marine, the last issue of which was that for January 1, 1951, is now incorporated in Merchant Vessels of the United States. The Signal Letter section of this publication lists the signal letters, radio-call letters, or combined signal and radio-call letters assigned as of the date of compilation to all vessels documented as vessels of the United States including yachts.

Vessels which would otherwise be removed from the List of Vessels but whose outstanding documents may not be surrendered under the provisions of section 961 (a), title 46, United States Code, because such vessels are covered by preferred mortgages, are now separately listed showing the reason that such vessel would otherwise be removed from documentation.

The listing of the number in the crew of the vessels has been omitted from the List of Vessels.

The Monthly Supplement to Merchant Vessels of the United States may be obtained directly from the Bureau of Customs without charge upon request.

45. Bought a wagon for \$40 and sold it at a gain of .20 of the cost. Find the selling price.

46. If I wish to gain \$.25 on a dollar, how must I mark an article that cost me \$4.80?

47. Sold a table for \$6 and made a gain of .25 of the purchase price. Find the purchase price.

48. Find the cost of 425 pickles at \$.30 per hundred.

49. Change $\frac{3}{4}$ to a decimal.

50. $\frac{3}{4}$ is what part of .40?

51. Change .25 to a common fraction.

52. A man borrows \$350, and agrees to pay .06 of the sum for its use. How much should he pay the lender?

53. .08 is what part of .16?

54. At \$.12 $\frac{1}{2}$ apiece, how many brushes can be bought for 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ dollars?

55. In selling combs at \$.20, I lost .20 of the cost. What did they cost me?

56. What is .04 of $\frac{3}{4}$?

57. $\frac{3}{4}$ is what part of .80?

58. Find the cost of 10 ounces of meat at \$.12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per pound?

59. A rod 10 feet long is lengthened by .03 of itself. What is its length then?

WRITTEN REVIEW

100. Solve the following:

1. If a furnace consumes a ton of coal in 9 days, in how many weeks will it consume 9 tons?

2. If I pay \$36.40 with wheat worth \$ $\frac{3}{4}$ per bushel, how many bushels must I give?

3. If a train goes 146.54 miles in 3 hours, what is the rate of speed per minute?

4. A contributed \$5800 to the capital of a company; B, \$7800; C, \$9600; and D, \$5500. What part of the whole did each put in?

5. From a tract of 49 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres of land, how many lots of $\frac{1}{4}$ of an acre each can be laid out?

6. A agreed to keep B's horse 14 weeks for \$18. If A keeps the horse 11 days, how much ought B to pay?

7. A field of 29 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres produced 3450 bushels of potatoes. What was the average yield per acre?

8. At \$.87 $\frac{1}{2}$ per bushel of 60 pounds, what will 4780 pounds of wheat cost?

9. If apples lose .70 of their weight in drying, how many pounds of apples must be used to make 300 pounds of dried apples?

10. If a bushel of wheat of 60 pounds will make 44 pounds of flour, and 16 pounds of feed, and the miller takes .10 of the grist for grinding, how many bushels of wheat must a customer take to the mill to get 10 barrels of flour of 195 pounds each? How much feed will he get?

UNITED STATES MONEY

101. Money is a measure of value and a medium of exchange.

A watch is worth 10 dollars. The dollar is the unit of measure.

A piece of cloth is 10 yards long. The yard is the unit of measure.

A butcher wants a hat worth 3 dollars, a ring worth 5 dollars, and a book worth 3 dollars. Can he take 3 dollars' worth of meat to the hatter, 5 dollars' worth to the jeweler, and 3 dollars' worth to the bookseller and exchange for the things he wants? Why? What can he do that he may practically exchange his meat for these things? Why does the butcher exchange his meat for money if they both have the same value? Money is the *medium* by which the butcher makes the exchange.

102. The unit of United States money is the dollar.

The first Congress of the United States made the dollar the unit of value. It determined the value of the dollar by providing for the coinage of silver dollars to contain 371.25 grains of pure silver (with certain alloy) and of gold pieces to contain 24.75 grains of pure gold (with certain alloy) to the dollar.

The *value* of the coins was determined by the amount of metal they contained, and by the value trade and custom gave them. The *coin* determined the value of the dollar, the *dollar* did not determine the value of the coin.

103. Ratio.—By the first coinage law the weight of a silver dollar was 15 times the weight of a gold dollar. The ratio of weight then was 15 to 1. In 1836, Congress passed a bill making the coinage ratio 16 to 1, so that since then a silver dollar weighs 16 times as much as a gold dollar.

104. The denominations and scale of United States money are shown by the following

TABLE

10 mills	= 1 cent (ϕ , c., or ct.).
10 cents	= 1 dime.
10 dimes	= 1 dollar (\$).
10 dollars	= 1 eagle.

United States money is based on the decimal scale. It is expressed as dollars, cents, and mills. The terms dime and eagle are not commonly used. Dollars are written as integers, cents as hundredths, and mills as thousandths.

The sign (\$) is prefixed to expressions of United States money; as, \$7, \$.07, \$.007.

Cents and mills are sometimes written as common fractions; as, \$12.25, \$12 $\frac{25}{100}$, 16 $\frac{1}{4}$ ϕ , \$12 $\frac{1}{4}$, or \$.165.

If the final result of a computation contains five or more mills, they are counted as one cent; if less than five, they are rejected; as, \$3.166, \$3.17; \$4.714, \$4.71.

United States Coins

105. Gold: The double-eagle, eagle, half-eagle, and one-dollar piece.

Silver: The dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the ten-cent piece.

Nickel: The five-cent piece.

Bronze: the one-cent piece.

At various times other pieces have been coined; as, the half-cent and the two-cent piece in bronze, the nickel three-cent piece, the silver half-dime, silver twenty-cent piece, silver trade-dollar, three-dollar gold piece.

106. Alloy.—All coins contain an alloy to toughen them and reduce the loss from abrasion. Gold coins are made of $\frac{9}{10}$ pure gold and $\frac{1}{10}$ silver and copper. Silver coins are made of $\frac{9}{10}$ pure silver and $\frac{1}{10}$ copper. Nickel coins are made of $\frac{3}{4}$ copper and $\frac{1}{4}$ nickel. The bronze coins are made of $\frac{9}{10}$ copper and $\frac{1}{10}$ tin and zinc.

107. Legal Tender.—Money that when offered, or tendered, in payment of a *debt* must be accepted *or lose further interest* is called a Legal Tender. Gold coins and silver dollars are legal tender for all debts; the other silver coins, for debts not exceeding \$10; the other coins, for debts not exceeding 25 ϕ .

United States Paper Money

108. United States paper money consists of notes, gold and silver certificates. A note is a promise to pay. Its value consists in the promise to pay. Notes given by some men are good, notes given by some men are worthless. In what is the difference? The notes of the United States government are good. Why?

United States notes are called Greenbacks and Treasury Notes. Examine one or more of each. Read what is printed on them. Why are they as good as gold?

National Bank Notes, or Bank Bills, are issued by national banks under the supervision of the United States government. These bills are not legal tender, but they are redeemable in lawful money. Examine a bank bill. Why are they received for debts?

Certificates of Deposit are called Gold Certificates and Silver Certificates. Examine one of each. Are they legal tender? Why are they received for debts?

109. Coin is *metallic* money. Currency is any kind of *paper* money.

Copyright © 1992 by Dr. John Coleman

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this book, either in part or in whole, may be reproduced, transmitted or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic, photographic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Publisher, except for brief quotations embodied in literary articles and reviews.

For permissions, or serializations, condensations, adaptations, or for our catalog of other publications, write the Publisher at the address below.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Coleman, Dr. John, 1935-

Conspirators' Hierarchy: The Story of the Committee of 300
by Dr. John Coleman

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-922356-57-2

DEDICATION

*Dedicated to my wife Lena and our son John
who have stood by me throughout years of
dangerous and trying times, bearing depriva-
tion and the slings and arrows of outrageous
fortune with fortitude and courage.*

92-4441
CIP

Published by
AMERICA WEST PUBLISHERS
P.O. Box 2208
Carson City, NV 89702

Printed in the United States of America
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

we must stop the Committee of 300 before it can accomplish its goal of making us prisoners of the "New Dark Age" planned for us. It is not up to God, IT IS UP TO US. We have to take the necessary action.

All information that I provide in this book comes from years of research backed up by impeccable intelligence sources. Nothing is exaggerated. It is factual and precise so do not fall into the trap set by the enemy that this material is "disinformation." For the past two decades I have provided information which has proved to be highly accurate and which has explained a lot of puzzling events. My hope is that through this book, a better, clearer and wider understanding of the conspiratorial forces ranged against this nation will come about. That hope is being realized as more and more young people are beginning to ask questions and seek information about what is REALLY going on.

It is difficult for people to comprehend that these conspirators are real and that they have the power I and many others have attributed to them. Many have written to ask how it is that our government does nothing about the terrible threat to civilization? The problem is that our government is PART of the problem, part of the conspiracy, and nowhere and at no time has this become more clearly evident than during the Bush Presidency. Of course President Bush knows precisely what the Committee of 300 is doing to us. HE WORKS FOR THEM. Others have written to say, "We thought we were fighting the government." Of course we are, but behind government stands a force so powerful and all-encompassing that intelligence agencies are even afraid to mention the name "Olympians."

Proof of the Committee of 300 is found in the vast number of powerful institutions owned and controlled by it. Listed here are some of the more important ones, all of which come under the MOTHER OF ALL THINK TANKS AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS, THE TAVISTOCK INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS with its far-flung network of hundreds of "branches."

ALASKA

STANFORD RESEARCH CENTER

Stanford Research Center (SRC) was founded in 1946 by the Tavistock Institute For Human Relations. Stanford was created to help Robert O. Anderson and his ARCO oil company, who had secured for the Committee of 300 the oil rights on the North Slope of Alaska. Basically, the job was too large for Anderson's Aspen Institute to handle, so a new center had to be founded and funded. That new center was Stanford Research Center. Alaska sold its rights on a downpayment of \$900 million, a relatively small amount for the Committee of 300. The governor of Alaska was steered to SRI for help and advice. This was no accident but the result of judicious planning and a process of long-range conditioning.

Following the governor's call for help, three SRI scientists set up shop in Alaska where they met with the Alaskan Secretary of State and the State Planning Office. Francis Greehan, who headed the SRI team, assured the Governor that his problem of how to handle the rich oil find would be safe in the hands of SRI. Naturally Greehan did not mention the Committee of 300 or the Club of Rome. In less than a month Greehan assembled a team of economists, petroleum scientists and new-science scientists numbering in the hundreds. The report SRI gave to the Governor ran to eighty-eight pages.

The proposal was adopted virtually without change by the Alaska legislature in 1970. Greehan had indeed done a remarkable job for the Committee of 300. From this beginning SRI developed into an institution employing 4000 people with an annual budget of \$160 million plus. Its President, Charles A. Anderson, has seen much of this growth during his tenure, as has Professor William Harmon, director of the SRI Center for the Study of Social Policies, employing hundreds of new-science scientists, many of the top staffers having been transferred from Tavistock's London base. One of those was RCA board chairman and former British intelligence agent, David Sarnoff, who was closely involved with Harmon and his team for twenty-five

years. Sarnoff was something of a "watchdog" for the mother institute in Sussex.

Stanford claims to make no moral judgments on projects it accepts, working for Israel and the Arabs, South Africa and Libya but, as one would imagine, by adopting this attitude it ensures an "inside edge" with foreign governments that the CIA has found most useful. In Jim Ridgeway's book, "THE CLOSED CORPORATION," SRI spokesman Gibson brags about SRI's non-discriminatory stance. Although not on the Federal Contract Research Center lists, SRI is today the largest military think tank, dwarfing Hudson and Rand. Among SRI's speciality departments are chemical and biological warfare experimental centers.

One of Stanford's more dangerous activities is counter-insurgency operations aimed at civilian populations—just the sort of "1984" things government is already using against its own people. The U.S. government pays SRI millions of dollars each year for this kind of highly controversial "research." Following student protests against chemical warfare experiments conducted at Stanford, SRI "sold" itself to a private group for just \$25 million. Of course nothing really changed, SRI was still a Tavistock project and the Committee of 300 still owned it, but the gullible appeared to be satisfied by this meaningless cosmetic change.

In 1958 a startling new development arose. Advanced Research Products Agency (ARPA), a contracting agency for the Defense Department, approached SRI with a top secret proposal. John Foster at the Pentagon told SRI that what was needed was a program to insure the United States against "biological surprise." Foster wanted to perfect a condition where the environment became a weapon; special bombs to trigger volcanoes and/or earthquakes, behavioral research on potential enemies and minerals and metals with potential for new weapons. The project was accepted by SRI and code-named "SHAKY."

The massive electronic brain in SHAKY was capable of

carrying out many commands, its computers having been constructed by IBM for SRI. Twenty-eight scientists worked on what is called "Human Augmentation." The IBM computer even has the capability to solve problems by analogy and recognizes and identifies scientists who work with it. The "special applications" of this tool can be better imagined than described. Brzezinski knew what he was talking about when he wrote "THE TECHNOTRONIC ERA."

Stanford Research Institute works closely with scores of civilian consulting firms, trying to apply military technology to domestic situations. This has not always been a success, but as techniques improve, the prospects for massive all-pervading surveillance, as described by Brzezinski, daily becomes more real. IT ALREADY EXISTS AND IS IN USE, EVEN THOUGH SLIGHT MALFUNCTIONS FROM TIME TO TIME HAVE TO BE IRONED OUT. One such civilian consulting firm was Schriever McKee Associates of McLean, Virginia, run by retired General Bernard A. Schriever, a former chief of the Air Force Systems Command, who developed the Titan, Thor, Atlas and Minuteman rockets.

Schriever put together a consortium of Lockheed, Emerson Electric, Northrop, Control Data, Raytheon and TRW under the name of URBAN SYSTEMS ASSOCIATES, INC. The purpose of the consortium? To solve social and psychological "urban problems" by means of military techniques using advanced electronic systems. It is interesting to note that TRW became the largest credit information collecting company in the credit-reporting business as a result and an outcome of its work with Urban Systems Associates, Inc.

This should tell us a great deal about just how far this nation is already under TOTAL SURVEILLANCE, which is the first requirement of the Committee of 300. No dictatorship, especially not one on a global scale, can function without total control over each and every individual. SRI was well on its way to becoming a key Committee of 300 research organization.

TO:

Municipality of Anchorage

Notices of Bonded Indebtedness



CLERK'S OFFICE

Apr 13 2 52 AM '93

From: Charles E. McKee
7800 DeBarr Rd E#63
Anch, AK 99504

Daily News Anch
2-27-93

Charles E. McKee



My help comes from the Lord the Maker of heaven and earth. "ZION" means heaven and earth, my copy right gives me the right to amplify ZION not to separate the too.

Title of the work: Millennium

This the year of the Lords Favor Isaiah 60: The Spirit of the Mighty One of Jacob is on me, The Glory of Zion is the everlasting light that shines on me. Our Redeemer the Mighty One of Jacob will Redeem us swiftly. The corpus delicti(s) will swiftly end against me using attrition as one of the many. You will as a pub' body attest to my right to amplify the treasury of the United States Charles McKee in 'wrihting'!

4-13-93