

Prince William Sound
Recreation Project Work Group
for the EVOS Trustee Council

November 5 and 6, 1993

Attendees:

Steve Hennigh, USFS
Wyn Menefee, ADNR
John Dorio, USFS, Glacier District
Veronica Gilbert, ADNR, EVOS staff
Bob Loeffler, ADEC, EVOS staff
Brooke T. Adkinson, Cordova Historical Marine Park
Mark Stahl, Chugach Alaska Corp.
Walt Wrede, City of Cordova, City Planner
Kimmer Ball, Adventures and Delights
Elaine Gross, USFS, Glacier District
Alison Rein, USFS, Glacier District
Jack Sinclair, Alaska State Parks
Paul Twardock, Alaska Pacific University
Suzanne McCarron, ADFG, Sport Fish
Alan Phipps, Alaska Center for the Environment
Tom VanBrocklin, City of Valdez
Marilynn Heddell, Honey Charters/Whittier Chamber of Commerce
Pete Heddell, Honey Charters
Ron Crenshaw, State Parks
Jim Alamay
Cathy Hart, Alaska Marine Highway System
Nancy Ramey Lethcoe, Alaska Wilderness Recreation & Tourism Assoc.
Karl Becker, PWS Conservation Alliance
Pamela Brodie, Sierra Club and EVOS Public Advisory Group
Karen Kroon, PWS Tourism Coalition
Don Ford, National Outdoor Leadership School
Marcy Baker, Alaska Mountaineering & Hiking
Chad Henderson, National Outdoor Leadership School
Jim Barnett, Attorney, City of Whittier
Scott Walther, Vice Mayor, City of Whittier
Vic Baer, USFS
Jeff Johnson, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation
Chris Titus, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation
John F.C. Johnson, Chugach Alaska Corp.
Chuck Totemoff, Chenega Corp.
Mike O'Leary, Cordova Ski School

Cal Baker, USFS, Cordova
Carl Cox, Gray Line of Alaska
Gary Williams, City of Whittier
Barrie Swanberg, Phillips Cruises
Edward Zeine, Cordova Sporting Club
Eric Meyers, Alaska Center for the Environment
John C. Morris, Chenega Corp.
Mark Parmalee

The following are not exact quotes but an idea of the response given and comments made.

Introduction:

Wyn: Summarized the charge given by the Trustee Council. The group was directed to outline goals and ways to accomplish restoring recreation in Prince William Sound (PWS). The goal here today is to prioritize the projects proposed to restore recreation. The projects are not proposed only by the state and federal agencies, but are also a result of public meetings conducted throughout the summer. There will be a report on special designations at the end of the meeting. At first the Trustee Council said there was no need for an injury statement reflecting injury to recreation. Later the Trustee Council came back and requested an injury statement. Due to the Trustee Council's late request, an injury statement was developed by Wyn and Steve and is before you to be discussed by the group. Even though no formal injury assessment was conducted for recreation, the public continually addressed recreation injuries at public meetings conducted during the summer. The workshop is an accumulation of the ideas put together after discussion with the public to find out their ideas, projects and comments. The group will rank each of the projects according to the criteria. Ranking the projects will serve as a method of prioritizing them for forwarding to the Trustee Council. The prioritized projects have to be prepared for submission to the Trustee Council by November 22nd, after their approval they will go into the 1994 Work Plan. April 15, 1994 is the deadline for the final report which will include all the ideas and projects discussed and approved.

Steve: Gave a brief overview of the agenda, time frame given to discuss each topic and what they hope to accomplish during the two-day meeting.

Wyn: The rules, conditions and definitions of the civil settlement are restore, replace or enhance. The money cannot be spent outside of Prince William Sound. The Trustee Council has to agree unanimously to accept a project. Restore means to bring back to a pre-spill condition, compare it to how it was before the spill. To replace means can something else be done to provide another service in another location. Enhance means to make an existing service or resource better. The Restoration Plan is being prepared. The Restoration Plan says only spend money on certain areas. No spending cap has been determined. All the projects must fall inside the Restoration Plan. The purpose of this meeting is not to try to change the Trustee Council's direction but to let them know your feelings about these projects and their importance

to you. If you have any questions on the progress of the plan, speak with Bob Loeffler or Veronica Gilbert.

There is a Memorandum of Agreement between the State of Alaska and the federal government. Judge Holland has approved the Consent Decree.

Steve: Laid out the ground rules for the meeting:

Honor time limits.

It's okay to disagree.

Respect other ideas.

Do not interrupt; wait to be recognized before speaking.

Listen carefully.

Everyone participates; no one person dominates.

Question ideas; not people.

Injury Statement:

Wyn: An injury statement regarding recreation was requested by the Trustee Council. When the Trustees made their request, there was no time to prepare a formal injury assessment. We took public comments and incorporated them into available data on tourism, sport fishing and other recreational uses. The injury statement has been reviewed by most of you as well as by the various agencies and had peer review. It is broken down into 5 sections: quality, quantity, perception, location, and facilities. The injury statement will be incorporated into the Restoration Plan.

Nancy Lethcoe: Has injury been associated with specific communities? **Wyn:** There is data that shows certain areas were affected. But we were limited by time and space to work. There was some information available regarding cabin use from park service and fishing use from ADFG. **Nancy:** In applying the criteria it would be useful to have information on user groups to aid in the evaluation.

Karl Becker: Has any effort been made to identify how projects fit within the state and federal land management plans? **Wyn:** That is why there is such an assortment of agency representation. Maybe some of them can say yes or no. **Karl:** The displacement of recreational users is identified as an injury. There were a lot of unoiled areas where people could have still participated in their recreation.

Wyn: Let's use Herring Bay on Knight Island as an example. It has good anchorage, good for hiking and wildlife viewing but because the oil came ashore, they didn't want to go there anymore. Forcing someone to do something other than their first choice is an injury. With recovery will they come back to the original site? If they do not come back because of the oil spill, then it is an injury. **Karl:** Did questions ask respondents what their qualifications were? Just because people have to make a choice, doesn't mean injury.

Nancy: Do you have to indicate exactly which part of the Sound they forfeited visiting? **Wyn:** No. Some generalities.

John Ford: We had a number of courses that could not operate in the oil-spill area. We feared overusing the areas of our second choice. We completely moved out of the Sound into Tongass National Forest.

Paul Twardock: We are concerned. Is area B (where people are displaced to) going to be restored?

Wyn: Through the restoration projects, you may create additional impacts in other areas. A repercussive effect. How far will the Trustee Council go? They have not defined and addressed that specifically. There is no definite yes or no. We will have to work with the injury statement as it is. We do not have enough baseline data to determine whether additional impacts are really occurring, or does it indicate an injury.

Nancy: Regarding displacement: How far did they go? Which user groups were displaced? Where did they go?

Wyn: Without a formal assessment, there is no way to determine the answers. Do the participants of the workshop agree that there is more that needs to be done? I don't know what we can do.

Steve: Yesterday was the deadline for this information. We know there needs to be more data. The Forest Service has some customer surveys. There is some displacement information, but it is not 100%. It is helpful though.

Wyn: A memo can be used as a follow up to the Trustee Council from the recreation workshop outlining your concerns.

Karl Becker: Are there other legal implications in the injury statement other than having been directed by the Trustee Council? **Wyn:** The legal implication is that recreation has some basis of injury. In order to do any restoration there needs to be an established injury. **Karl:** Are the projects to meet criteria or from a matrix? **Wyn:** We could create an addendum to indicate your concerns/questions.

Alan Phipps: Will there be an opportunity to review the Restoration Plan? I had not reviewed this material with such a weight in mind. When reviewing management goals and projects, will they be evaluated by this criteria?

Wyn: The evaluation criteria was put together to try to meet the civil settlement requirements set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement. The evaluation criteria will not change. The management goals can change. He doesn't think it will change the criteria. Criteria came from the results of the public comments received this summer. They meet the rules of settlement.

Alan: If goals or management are not going to change criteria, then what is the point of what we are doing? He feels there are discrepancies in each.

Wyn: I will go forward until the discrepancies can be identified. Should we create a memo to address the points brought out in the meeting? 10 yes, 9 no. Such an equal split. No separate memo will be created. The points will be brought to the Trustees' attention in a report.

Mark Stahl: The Trustee Council knows the parameters. Can't our uncertainty be reflected in the reports?

Jack Sinclair: In reading the first paragraph, are we stuck with this from here on out?

Wyn: We could do a PWS injury statement, but let's do what we can. We do have some use data.

Jack: We can keep it general enough to be utilized in the spill area and still keep in mind specific needs. This has far reaching ramifications, even out of the spill area.

Kimmer: Are they indicating new facilities are potential injury?

Wyn: We don't have data that specific. We don't know that people who have experienced injury have come to a second choice area. If a facility is put in, it could change use patterns. What would be the impact then?

Management Goals and Objectives:

Steve: We were asked by the Trustee Council to come up with management goals and objectives specific to PWS. We started with only the written State Area Plan for PWS and Forest Area Plan. Our paraphrased version is on the wall. Some are not appropriate to the Restoration Plan, but may be okay for agency use. They are good basic guidelines. If you feel there are any missing, or misstated goals or objectives, please respond. They can be reviewed in greater depth.

Nancy: What is the relationship of goals to the rules and definitions set forth in the civil settlement? **Steve:** Some are not as strict as set forth in the settlement. They will be forwarded to the Trustee Council.

Alison: The first goal contradicts the injury statement. There is a conflict with management goal number one with respect to objectives one and three; to preserve pristine vs. avoid new uses vs. facilities. Objective number one is not specific to a facility; it could be anything.

Nancy: Reads it to say just the opposite; that projects proposed could cause more damage than the spill itself.

Chad Henderson: Many protection and management projections imply monitoring. Include an objective that includes monitoring under goal number three--monitoring different uses, such as: displaced uses, number of resources, cultural resources, etc.

Ron Crenshaw: We could change goal number six by inserting monitor and include it as an objective.

Nancy: Goal number four we could change increase to restore, enhance and replace.

Pamela Brodie: What are you trying to identify here? Would you harm something in trying to preserve something else?

Wyn: We have tried to reflect ideas from public comment. They may have been more specific than reflected here.

Tom VanBrocklin: If the idea is to reduce impact on shoreline, we still need to stay away from areas that are sensitive and direct recreational users away from identified sensitive areas.

Alan: I reviewed the projects and criteria and whether they fell under the settlement requirements. If we aren't keeping those in mind, it changes my view of the projects.

Karl: Is it within the Trustee Council's purview to provide long-term economic viability? What is the point of meeting if the goals are not within the scope of the settlement?

Pamela: It doesn't help the Trustee Council; it makes it more difficult, if the recreation workshop puts forth goals that are not in keeping with the settlement.

Paul Twardock: How are the goals and objectives to be used?

John Dorio: They would be used in an impact statement of environmental issues on the federal side.

Nancy: That is the point; these are issues not objectives.

Suzanne McCarron: Are we trying to use these as our management goals, or are they what the public asked? Do we adopt them or set aside?

Walt Wrede: These are goals and objectives from the public, not what this group is going to use. We will use the criteria.

Karl: I propose we strike the goals not within restoration.

Steve: They are supposed to be used as an umbrella. They were developed from what we heard from the public comments.

Scott Walther: Are we operating under the assumption that the net number of users is not going to change? Are they going to increase?

Steve: Data from the past five years shows a continued increase. We don't know if it will continue at the same rate? It depends on the restoration area. Whether upland, water column or shoreline, recreation is the only one looking at it as human use.

Kimmer: Thinks it would be a negative to start deleting certain aspects. We need to identify what the people support.

Steve: The objectives were the result of the interpretation of the public comments, not a specific statement, but compiled from all the comments.

Marcy Baker: We should not change the public comments; we are only a handful of participants.

Pamela: If the goals are supposed to be an inclusive report of the public comment, they should be forwarded to the Trustee Council. If they are supposed to be a consensus of this group then that should be how it is given to the Trustees.

Gary Williams: We are not empowered to change the goals or objectives.

Wyn: We could add a caveat, a disclaimer that they are not a consensus of the workshop, but of what the public wants. They are not direct restoration goals. They do not affect the priority of projects.

Scott: When the information came from the public, were they labeled goals? **Steve:** When they went to the public, they didn't look like this. This is an interpreted distillation of what we understood them to want.

Nancy: Change goals to issues. Agencies have no problem with goal number seven, but the public would. This is a strong issue, look at the long-term effect.

Steve: Is there a consensus developing?

Chuck Totemoff: What is the difference between goals and issues?

Steve: Goals override principles in undertaking a task. Goals/objectives vs issues. They do not relate to restoration. Cross out those that do not relate.

Carl Cox: Perhaps considerations would be a better term. Issues are open ended

Jack: The Trustee Council would be happy to hear from the recreation group. Goals should be the common ground of where our needs overlap a majority consensus. Do they fit a common ground, some don't fit completely.

Karl: The common ground is the letter of the EVOS settlement, goals and objectives that meet settlement.

Carl Cox: Is this the final word or a small part?

Steve: It is only a small part.

Don Ford: There are goals that apply and criteria that fall out of those goals. Feels discomfort with giving a title if it doesn't fulfill restoration or recreation. It should tie directly to recreation/restoration goals.

Cal Baker: Agrees with Don. Keep focused.

Cathy Hart: This group needs to have goals, but which are based on the public comments? Can we establish goals in a short time or a year?

Pamela: Agree, but if the Trustees are expecting a consensus, then the goals should have additions.

Walt Wrede: Are the goals/objectives dependant on the public comments or settlement? Which carried more weight? Leave them as response from public and used as general framework for criteria. We should not change public comments. Tell the Trustees it is input from the public.

Chad: As you compare criteria as they relate to goals, some coincide.

Kimmer: How strong is public feeling, is it reflected in the criteria?

Wyn: Do we want to attack the goals and break them down or amend them?

Ron: Is there a direct linkage from criteria, injury statement and settlement? Is the list of projects based on settlement language, injury statements and criteria? The Trustees needs to see how we got to the end result. Perhaps we should delete those that do not relate to restoration?

Nancy: Is that the history of the operation? The criteria were developed prior to the goals, the goals before the comments?

Steve: Goals are continually evolving, through public input.

Alan: It all needs to spring from the settlement language. **Wyn:** The criteria came from the settlement language and language has had public review and comment.

Ron: It is a shame to disconnect the goals from the evaluation. Do not consider them if you are uncomfortable with them.

John: What is the difference from what is available and what the group wants?

Nancy: Given the rules, these are excellent for recreation management, but not for restoration. Set aside those that are not pertinent.

Gary: Restoration, enhancement, acquiring--aren't we here to evaluate projects?

Afternoon

Agreement was reached to move on to evaluating projects, management goals and whether they are called will not be presented as a product of this workshop in the final report.

Evaluation Criteria

Wyn: Before going out for comment, we created an evaluation criteria that would be within the criminal settlement boundaries. We received comment from the legal department and various interest groups on how to weigh the differences. This is the result. Wyn presented a summary of the criteria. How the score sheet was developed. Asked the group to keep the criteria in mind as they formed their questions. Keep the generalities to a minimum and be specific with responses. **Steve:** Outlined the time frame allowed for each project: 5 minutes - project overview, 10 minutes - questions/discussion, 5 minutes - evaluate. The projects can be modified to meet the group's concerns. Steve and Wyn are participating in the process, they will not evaluate the projects. It is entirely up to the group. The results will be used to create a detailed report for submission to the Trustee Council on November 29. If a workshop participant will not be able to attend Saturday, please leave the completed evaluation of projects for consideration. Otherwise, it will throw the analysis off. Even though there are several members from a specific interest group, only one evaluation will be considered.

Are there any questions on specific criteria? The goals are not the driving force, the criteria are.

Each presenter will give a short overview of the project itself. There is no need to try to discuss the project's relationship to each criteria; that will come under the evaluation. There is no specific order to the presentation of projects. We tried to break them so if someone had more than one project to present, it would give them a break between presentations. They were numbered as they came in. If you need to leave, your project presentation can be moved up. The projects will still keep the same assigned number, but just move up to another number for presentation purposes.

Alan Phipps: Are we attaching dollar amounts when these are forwarded to the Trustee Council? **Wyn:** They will go to the Trustees in the form of a detailed project description. Steve and Wyn will create the study with realistic numbers for submission. **Alan:** Will the projects be competitively bid? **Steve or Wyn:** This still needs to be addressed by the Trustees and the Restoration Plan. **Alan:** Is there an analysis of whether projects can be funded from state criminal monies? If a project is outside the settlement language? **Wyn:** We are not parring down, but organizing. We will not recommend which project would fit the criminal settlement.

Karl Becker: Feels there is a change in use patterns. The weighing factor should be much higher than given here. It seems to go way below the others. **Wyn:** The reason it is low, there was a change in use patterns since the spill. But the key phrase is "available at the time of the spill?" **Nancy:** Yes it should go up, the victims of the spill will also be victims of restoration. Don Ford and Mike O'Leary also agree. Eighteen voted to raise it. How far? **Nancy:** Up to a 3, reason it is no higher because of counteracting circumstances. It gets to heart of the spill. **Cal Baker:** Is reluctant to raise it higher than 2, because projects were created with this ranking in mind. **Karl Becker:** Were the projects necessary on own merit or because the agencies wanted them. Voted to raise the criteria ranking to 3, 13 yes; raise it to 2, 9 yes. There is no consensus. **Jack Sinclair:** Let's equate it to the people use patterns of other criteria. **Nancy:** That is important, raise it to 3 because it counterbalances user group benefits and displacement of current users. **Karen Kroon:** Her group had prepared their project with the criteria in mind. Maybe we should raise it to 2.5, 11 voted in favor of that ranking. Decision was made by Steve and Wyn to raise it to 2.5 because of the original split vote.

The following includes project presentations and discussions. Each project was rated after the discussion.

Project Number 1, Prince William Sound Mooring Buoys: This was developed representing the public meeting comments. There is a need for more buoys. The public's reasons were: it improves access to injured recreation areas, opens areas not open before and assists in access for cleanup. The costs listed were based on state and federal information regarding the normal cost of putting in buoys (based more on the federal costs) and maintenance of those buoys after placement. The adjacent landowner would have to maintain the buoy. **Wyn:** Would respective land managers like them as they are? **Discussion:** **Nancy:** How many of the mooring buoys authorized in the last land management plan were placed? **Steve:** Five of the 11 have been placed. The remaining buoys still need an EIS and approval from the coastal management council. **John Dorio:** A NEPA is necessary before they can go in. **Wyn:** But NEPA is not necessary prior to submitting the projects to the Trustee Council. This includes costs that would be needed to complete the project. **Kimmer:** Are there numbers associated with a specific site? **Wyn:** No, if a site was mentioned or brought up in the comments, it was added to the list. **John:** If need be, we can amend the forest plan to include the number or through revision it can be done in 1994. **Nancy:** Some of those listed areas there are already buoys. Who is going to maintain the buoys? **Chuck Totemoff:** Chenega would not accept maintenance of the buoy. Chugach AK Corp would not be willing to manage a buoy in the Bay of Isles. Chenega

is now in favor. **John Dorio:** The Forest Service would be willing after undergoing the NEPA process. **Paul:** Feels it creates an opportunity for recreational trespass. There has already been an increased amount going on since the spill. **Chuck:** Agrees, they have seen an increase on the Chenega lands, more each year.

Alan: Has no idea of what the broad public consensus is. **Wyn:** We did get a large amount of support through public comments.

Suzanne: In criteria number 10. What are we trying to get at? **Wyn:** Does the project enhance or replace a lost opportunity. Does it give another opportunity by providing another area for access? Or does it create a new opportunity?

Project Number 29, Solomon Gulch Hatchery Raceways: Tom VanBrocklin gave his background of experience and stated he was there for Dave Cobb. In Valdez the sport fishing for pink salmon was damaged as a result of the '89 spill. There is an inlet near Valdez that has suffered. This project is a one-time only project. Its link with the spill is as a damaged resource. Damage was done to the salmon runs. Sport fishing is a needed public service or amenity. This project helps to enhance resources that were in use and will continue to be in use. Its economic feasibility is that it will be supported by user groups; many people go there to fish. **Nancy:** Where do the coho and king run? If it goes through, will it eliminate fishing in another area? **Karl:** Was the regional planning of Fish and Game reviewed? Is there an issue of sport or commercial fishing in the area? **John:** It fits more under fisheries than recreation. **Tom:** Sport fishing is recreation. **Kimmer:** What about criteria number 2? **Tom:** It will be taking the pressure off other areas, allowing them time to recover.

Project Number 2, Comprehensive Public Recreations Information Brochure for Prince William Sound: **Wyn:** This project is to fund a Prince William Sound land managers planning group. Basically comprised of personnel from those organizations that manage the land in PWS. It is for partial management and partial restoration. They would inform the public of oil spills. They would gather all pertinent information in one source to be distributed in one pamphlet. **Kimmer:** Is this a one time publication? **Wyn:** Yes. **Nancy:** It looks similar to what the Forest Service has. Why? **Jack Sinclair:** We have a list of members, the government has money for maps and other organizations haven't had this capability before. The smaller land managers are requesting this assistance. All the leads of the groups signed a Memorandum of Understanding for more information to go to the public. **Nancy:** What about a watchable wildlife group? **Kimmer:** Has a provision been made for updating this publication once it is out? **Jack:** We felt it would be easy to edit once the initial program was implemented. **Paul:** The link to the spill is increased use of the area. **Alan:** The use would have increased even without the spill. The state and federal agencies should be responsible for that information. **Wyn:** Were agencies really doing this prior to the spill? Maybe they should have been, but had they put it together yet? The Restoration Plan will address it. Public comment states there is a need for the distribution of more information. It has been requested whether through restoration or the agencies. It could help to alleviate recreational trespass, inform the public of public areas and where to get permits if they are needed.

Steve: There has been a request for an added piece of information? In the evaluation should we add a yes/no column for funding--whether by settlement terms or agency taking responsibility. Pamela concurs. **Brooke and Cal Baker:** What will be given to the Trustees, the results or all the ranking? **Wyn:** The criteria, the totals, funding, yes or no for funding, and the prioritized list of top proposed projects. **Alan:** Is the Trustee Council being provided with our individual scoring sheet? **Wyn:** No, that will come at a later date. It cannot be compiled by November 22. **Kimmer:** No matter what the rating, the validity should be highlighted. (The Y, N column.) **Gary:** We are here to rate the projects. All of them will receive some rating, to rate yes or no regarding the funding is not appropriate. Voted Yes - 8, (to include) not enough to carry. Do not add an additional column to be funded by the Trustees. **Nancy:** I thought those projects that fell outside of restoration were supposed to be reflected by zeros across the sheet? **John:** Why go through the process if we could just vote yes or no? **Wyn:** Note your comments or any concerns on your score sheet. **Cal Baker:** How will omitting a project affect results? **Wyn:** Evaluate whether you agree or not. It is better to have straight forward comments on each criteria for each project.

Project Number 3, Odiak Camper Park Expansion: **Walt Wrede:** All the projects brought before this group have the support of the Cordova Council through resolution. They were prepared with the criteria in mind. Cordova is a visitor destination. It has been impacted by the spill; there is no data as to why. We have reason to believe they are displaced recreational users. Wildlife viewing, recreational fishing and hiking are available in Cordova. There is only one camper park so visitors are parking where they shouldn't. **Questions:** The park is owned by the City of Cordova. **Marcy:** No one is trying to claim a profit from it? **Walt:** There is not a lot of flat land available for development on private land. It is close to downtown, fishing and the ferry facility. **Alan:** Where are they displaced from? **Walt:** There is no data available. **Nancy:** Will adding more space displace tent campers? **Walt:** No, it is acquiring more land for vehicle camping. The tent camping site will be covered under another proposal.

Project Number 4, Prince William Sound Recreation Education Information Center at Portage Railroad Station: **Carl Cox:** Gave a brief description of the project. This is an excellent opportunity to get information into the hands of people going into PWS. It was formed in 1986 and has a visitor's guide that is in its fifth or sixth edition. Its members consist of large and small businesses, landowners, and state and federal agencies. We currently exist on donations and grants. We received a donation from Exxon in 1989. The space is leased from the owner of the building. We would like to purchase the building and make modifications to it. We have approximately 150 visitors per day, many with misconceptions about the Sound. **Discussion:** **Karl:** Do you display brochures from other than member businesses? No. The members pay \$200 for a corporate membership. **Ron:** Under the Whittier road option, what would you do with the building? **Carl:** The building is built on pilings; it can easily be moved. **Nancy:** What about staffing plans? **Carl:** We have no intention to burden group. Through what Exxon has paid and money from cashflow, it has allowed for employing three people from Whittier. We are in contact with the Forest Service. **Karl:** With funding from the Trustee Council, would you consider displaying other than member brochures? **Karen:** The board may decide to allow it, but probably only from agencies. **Carl:** We are in a unique position in the Whittier

corridor. **Nancy:** Referring to criteria number 3, what did the public want? **Wyn:** There was public support for more information, but it was not specific whether through a visitor or education center.

Project Number 5, Remove Persisting Oil from Beaches: **Wyn:** This project was developed from public comment. It received quite a bit of comment--"The only way to restore recreation is to remove oil from the beaches they recreate on and where the animals feed or can be viewed." A counterpoint was brought up that cleanup would disrupt. There is already a project from ADEC before the Trustee Council dealing with cleanup of persistent oil. Couldn't the cleanup of recreational areas be added to that project? **Tom:** Did ADEC survey only other than recreational beaches? **Wyn:** No. **Nancy:** The problem is that there has been no list of recreational beaches available. **Kimmer:** What type of cleanup will be done? **Wyn:** Break up asphalt, remove mousse and intertidal oil deposits. **Nancy:** I object to mussel bed cleanup as suggested in the proposal. I thought they had determined to leave the mussel beds alone? **Kimmer:** What is the public comment regarding the beaches? **Wyn:** We utilized public concern about oil still on recreational beaches to develop this project. Seems to be strong support.

Project Number 6, Remove Evidence of Clean-up Activities: **Steve:** Again this was a comment from the public. To go into oil spill areas and remove the evidence of cleanup left behind in the spill area. It is an adjunct to the previous project or can stand alone. **Wyn:** This should have been done initially, but wasn't. If the project does not go through, it probably will not get done.

Project Number 7, Restore Smitty's Cove Boat Access Point: **Gary Williams:** Smitty's Cove is a restoration project. During cleanup, landing craft used this area to access the Sound. The launch ramp was extensively damaged, erosion has escalated as a result of the launch ramp being damaged. This is one of two points in PWS to launch a boat. Divers use the ramp area. With the loss of the ramp as a boat launch, it has put undue pressure on the Whittier Small Boat Harbor. There would be no maintenance fees and there would be a charge for using the ramp. There are several groups that use it regularly; it has high use. Adjacent land management is off the parks. **Carl Cox:** What was the nature of the ramp prior to use by the landing craft? **Gary:** During the spill, instead of using tides to access or leave ramp the landing craft started backwashing to get on and off the ramp which caused erosion to accelerate. **Ron:** Who owns land? The City of Whittier. Damage to the ramp was not included in the lawsuit with Exxon. **Alan:** Why not? **Nancy:** Are there pre-1989 or post-1989 photos of the ramp available? I know it was a World War II ramp and saw it in 1969. It was damaged then. **Gary:** It is unusable now due to erosion. **Kimmer:** What about public support? **Gary:** The City Council supports its repair. The public complains about the limited access to the Sound because of its nonuse.

Project Number 8, Prince William Sound Campsite Enhancements: **Wyn:** Increased use is contributing to increased degradation. This project is a result of public comment response and some land managers of state parks. Some groups feel it is not necessary. Cruise ship operators

didn't comment since they don't use the shore. **Karen:** We have had a lot of visitor comment on need for more tent platforms. **Don:** This presupposes there is a strong consensus among the public. He is uncomfortable with the project. **Pete Heddell:** Opposes it. **Nancy Lethcoe:** Opposes it. It needs to be addressed in land management. **Don:** The Chugach Forest Plan starts a revision process this next year. State land management is coming under review also. **Karl:** Opposes it. **Nancy:** These are being addressed under other projects. **Marcy:** Is concerned about the use of settlement money just because it is available. Doesn't think we need to create projects just because of the money. **Alison:** The maintenance would be assumed by the land managers. Who knows with funding in the future what will happen? They are having a problem maintaining what they now have. **Alan:** There is a potential to impact the wilderness quality. This is something the agencies want to do, but they have no money to accomplish it. He doesn't feel it is necessary to take up the agency slack due to their lack of funds.

Wyn: Those who are not returning tomorrow may fax the ranking in by 10:00 a.m. Be sure to sign your paper.

Project Number 9, Valdez Duck Flats Crucial Habitat Area Trails: **Nancy:** This proposal is linked to another proposal. There are three trails in the area. Wildlife viewing was hurt by the spill. Valdez hosts over 200,000 wildlife viewers a year and has support from the City of Valdez and the Alaska Visitors Bureau. There is a plan set up for the maintenance of the trails. The project is to purchase one parcel. There are two owned by the city. The tour buses stop there. There is no displacement. It is in keeping in line with the land management use plan of the City of Valdez. The land would be purchased from the University of Alaska. They indicated a willingness to sell. **Cal Baker:** There is a lease agreement for the Crooked Creek site, separate from this process. The University of Alaska has lands being held for development that cannot be developed. **Karl:** Is the price listed consistent with the boardwalk on the delta? Would it be built by volunteer labor? **Nancy:** No. **Karl:** Feels the costs listed are too low. **Wyn:** We referred to two sources to come up with the costs. There is no upper end for costs. **Nancy:** Would the boardwalk introduce more people into the park? **Susie:** Is there access from more than one location? **Nancy:** No. Crooked Creek access is from the same parking lot that services Forest Service. **Cal:** There was a lot of feedback on Valdez' wants. Valdez needs trails. **Karl:** The boardwalk wouldn't necessarily be 1,500 ft long. **Nancy:** No.

Project Number 10, Backcountry Access Trail Development (Valdez to Shoup and Whittier to Decision): This follows along with mooring buoys and wilderness campsites. Backcountry access trails were brought up by the public. This is a result of their input, Valdez to Shoup Bay. If Whittier had more trails, there would be increased use. Two of the trails come from communities into the Sound. The other two are going from one location in the Sound to another Sound location. Will not limit use. One is an interpretive trail and the other a marine trail. **Nancy:** There is strong support for a trail in Valdez. The City of Valdez is unwilling to maintain the trail. Perhaps something similar to Caines Head Trail in Seward would work. People in Valdez are concerned about the maintenance of any new project. They don't want to see their taxes increase to allow for maintenance. **Nancy:** Valdez is working on a volunteer

group. **Alan:** What is being restored? **Nancy:** Viewing wildlife. There isn't the linkage, but day trips to Shoup Bay. Valdez gets a large influx of cannery workers, students and other visitors squat on any land and leave debris behind. It has a potential for good or bad. **Don:** It would encourage increased use of boats. **Karl:** What was public comment on the Ester Island Trail? **Wyn:** This came from the state during a survey on the marine park. There is a state management plan on state parks. There is only a general wish from many people, that there would be more trail opportunities. **Nancy:** I'm concerned because of the locations. Prince William Sound Aquaculture is opposed to recreational users. **Jack:** The hatchery operates under a permit, they do not have exclusive-use rights. Restrooms and other things would need to be addressed under a marine park. The hatchery is just starting to get somewhere. There is a need for a trail in that area. **Alan:** Isn't this introducing a use that did not exist prior to the spill? So it was not damaged by the spill. This introduction could take restoration away from an area that was damaged. It seems that a lot of agencies would have been developing it prior to the spill. **Mike:** Is afraid of turning the Sound into another Yosemite; it would change from a wilderness experience. **John:** Trails in the wilderness are legitimate, not against a wilderness experience to have trails. **Nancy:** As general policy AWRTA opposes backcountry trail development. Neither trail needs development. **Kimmer:** Let's separate the urban from the backcountry trails. **Nancy:** Is it possible to revise this proposal? Make two separate projects? **Steve or Wyn:** Yes. 1) Valdez to Shoup Bay and Whittier to Decision and 2) Surprise Cove and Ester Island. **Kimmer:** What about the road to Shot Gun Cove? **Marilyn:** The trail could be modified. **Nancy:** The trail in Whittier as opposed to the one at Shot Gun Cove. **Alison:** Linkage is enhancement, it provides access to the Sound for those users without a boat or kayak. **Alan:** Enhancement has to be related to a pre-spill condition. **Mike:** A new opportunity is being provided through increased use each year. **Wyn or Steve:** Project 10 now addresses Valdez to Shoup Bay and Whittier to Decision. We will create Project 30 to address Ester Island and Surprise Cove Trail as described.

Project Number 11, Mor-Pac Hill Campground Improvements: **Walt Wrede:** Read from the proposal. Improving this campground would not displace users. Anyone camping there now is there illegally. It is an excellent area. It will provide a site for backpackers, interested in kayaking, birdwatching and hiking. It is less than .5 mile from Fleming Spit and one mile from downtown. Odiak is available for campers mostly; this area would be for tent camping. It was created because of the oil spill, through the influx of spill workers and those seeking to work on the cleanup. The land was originally owned by Chugach Alaska Corporation. The City worked with Chugach to upgrade the area so it could be used for workers during the spill. They were camping there anyway. **Alan:** Who owns the land? **Walt:** Cannery Row owns it and is a willing seller. It did not exist prior to the spill. **Mike:** It existed in the form of a trespass campground. **Alan:** Is this a proposal for a replacement opportunity? **Walt:** Birding used to exist in the western part of the Sound. There are no definite numbers to reflect this though. Cordova is now being touted as a tourist town. **Nancy:** Linkage, the opportunity is diminished in Cordova. **Kimmer:** What is the size of the parcel? **Walt:** It is nine acres. It is good for tent camping. **Karl:** Is there a road that goes up? **Walt:** Of sorts, there will be a bike path. **Chuck:** I have done a little math on the acreage; 12 into the purchase price turns out to be above \$14,000 an acre. **Walt:** That is in keeping with other acreage in the area. **Susie:** The

fishing was affected in a qualitative and a quantitative) sense, for salmon and trout. There is a reduction in opportunities. **Alan:** Hesitates to approve something with this dollar figure. **Kimmer:** That seems to be the case in many of these other projects. **Alan:** This is a good example of a project that could fall under funding from the state criminal money. **Karen:** Because of the oil spill the City put in this campground. It was a result of the influx, so it is directly linked to the spill. When Chugach owned the parcel, they were willing to have campers; the new owners are not. They don't have the time to police it. They are willing to sell. The City could take it over. It could be supported through user fees.
November 6, 1993

Project Number 12, Prince William Sound Public-Use Cabins: **Wyn:** This project was compiled from public comment gathered during the summer. The relationship would be the increased and improved recreational opportunities. The Green Island cabin was injured. The locations were suggested by the public. The costs vary depending on the type of cabin built. **Cal:** Green Island is being replaced by Forest Service, independent of this process. There was decreased use in cabin use in both PWS and the state parks as a result of the spill. The change in use patterns did not come from damage to the facilities, but due to the spill. There was a detrimental psychological effect of loss of wildlife and lack of pristine beauty left for viewing. **Nancy:** She is wearing two hats at the workshop. This would adversely affect our business. Increased use of anchorage in three of these areas would interfere with our service. Alaska Wilderness Recreation and Tourism Association (AWRTA) would not regard these as consistent with backcountry use. These do not meet Forest Service requirements. Have the total number of cabins have been put in, John? Bass Harbor, Cabin Bay are Forest Service. **Steve:** These are suggested locations. Forest Service and the state have to go through an analysis process. **Paul:** What does Chuck think. **Chuck:** We have been discussing placing a cabin. This is not inconsistent with our land management plan.

Project Number 13, Research on Recreation Impacts in PWS: Displacement of Users and Disturbance of Recreation Areas: **Chad:** This is a research project. The National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS) has been in the Sound since 1971. We have worked closely with Forest Service in the Lower 48. It is a three-phase program: site surveys and assessment; disbursement of use, concentration of use, and reduction of use in others. What were impacts on sites, shore and uplands? What changes in use patterns resulted from the spill, during cleanup and dispersal of users. Site-specific work on resistance and resilience of vegetation. This is a five-year project at \$60,000 per year. There are broad applications for tour operations, the kayaker and trail hikers. **Karl Becker:** What is applied trampling treatment? **Chad:** Actual trampling of an area to determine the resilience and resistance of the vegetation. NOLS conducts a hands-on skill-oriented school. All the research is directly translated into every day applications. **Karl:** Does research go beyond what is already available? Could other sources be used from the Forest Service or the state? **Chad:** No, there is not that much available. The land managers of the agencies are interested in finding the answers in the areas outlined. **Cal:** Forest Service has seen a dramatic increase in RV use in the Sound. **Nancy:** Outfitter guides need permits to operate in the Chugach National Forest. The number of permits will be based on the amount of use. It has a high priority to be done. **Karl:** If this is of such importance,

why aren't land managers doing the studies? Why isn't it being conducted under agency funding? **Chad:** This type of service has never been given very high priority. What are the sensitive areas, NOLS is held to stringent impact requirements. **Chuck:** Chenega has seen increased trespass. Whether it is by the public or outfitters, we don't know but feel it is a direct result of the spill. The public doesn't know land ownership policies or regulations. **Kimmer:** Has NOLS' previous work been forwarded to land managers in the past? **Chad:** Yes, though it has only been done in the last three or four years. **Nancy:** In response to Karl's question, as a result of spill, the impact was not only on upland areas but there is existing damage in the Sound that was a direct result of the clean-up effort. This information is really necessary.

Project Number 14, Whittier Trail Access Project: **Gary Williams:** Whittier trails seeks to restore by enhancing the area by providing an access that was not originally available. The proposed project was compiled from city and public hikers' input. It offers a large vision of many of the ecosystems. It would have to be built under Forest Service specifications where the trail crosses their lands. There has been a long-standing need for more trails, people would like to see more trails in Whittier. There is no conflict. There are no trails in Whittier. Hiker groups are eager to have the trails. The link is there was an immediate impact following the spill, the number of visitors decreased in PWS. Visitors feel the integrity and beauty of the Sound is lost. The visitorship to western PWS will increase. With road access there will be an increase in visitors. We need to have somewhere for them to go and something for them to do. To have trails already created, would give them a direction to go when they arrive. Established trails would save the ecosystems from damage. The local hikers are eager to help put them in. The adjacent land management is under the Forest Service. The City of Whittier does not own any of the land the trails are proposed to cross. It would enhance the Shot Gun Cove proposal and other proposals in PWS. **Alison:** The Forest Service has no plans to help with maintenance. There is an endowment proposal that would help to alleviate some of the maintenance cost problems.

Project Number 15, Cordova's Mini Imaginarium: **Cal:** The science center and ranger district in Cordova have several Memoranda of Agreement and have a good education outreach program. The opportunity to integrate is easy for a science center. Forest Service is willing to help. **Kimmer:** It would not be integrated into an already existing center but create an extension to it. **Eric:** Is it a recreation project? **Wyn:** The people felt education directly affects recreation. Education is not addressed in the Restoration Plan under any other area. **Cal:** Has anyone been to the Anchorage Imaginarium? **Kimmer:** Briefly described the Anchorage program. It is a good experience for children. **Alison:** Is there a charge? **Answer:** A small fee. **Nancy:** Is Anchorage's supported by private enterprise? **Karen:** It is non-profit.

Project Number 16, Culross Passage Administrative Site: **Alison:** The proposal is to provide visitor and administrative contact. It is designed to provide updates to the public by allowing more Forest Service contact out in the Sound. There has been increased use out in that area and this would be an excellent service. This placement would allow for reaching those people who don't come through Whittier or Valdez. It would be helpful having more people know what is expected and available out there. **Kimmer:** Why would a site in Whittier or Shotgun not be

a better location? **Marilyn Heddell:** It protects the passages. **Karl:** If Forest Service is concerned about the site, why hasn't a boat been initiated? **Alison:** The site would provide needed contact and help keep an account of the number of people using the area. **Kimmer:** Why was this site chosen? If Shotgun is not in the plan, why Culross? Is the Native Village Corporation, offering to man the site. **Chuck:** Is not aware of Chenega giving any administrative help. Chugach is not aware of any either. **Wyn:** People need to know about the Native land. This would provide an option for Native input. **Kimmer:** Would this fit in with your management plans? Chuck and Chugach agree it might be feasible. **Mike:** Trying to visualize this in a wilderness setting. It would increase use. There would be a need for more cleared areas, restrooms and camping spots. This would make it very crowded in the bay. **Paul:** If placed on a nice beach, would it displace others? **Nancy:** It would have a conflict with those areas damaged by the spill. **Eric:** It seems if a recreation user is intent on going into the Sound, they would have made contact with the Forest Service in Whittier or Cordova. **Alison:** It could be a safety net, a point for rescue. **Karl:** Doesn't feel as though most of the recreaters use this passage? **Pete Heddell:** What gave you information to presume there was a need to provide this rescue system? He disagrees. It would be a conflict of interest with towing service, and they have not heard of this problem before. If there is a need, it is usually taken care of in a timely manner. **Mark:** Would modify the project to put it at Neptune Point, near Shotgun Cove. **Steve:** The Forest Service has a 10-acre site at Trinity Point. **Nancy:** Information and enforcement are different areas. It could join with Portage for information. Enforcement could be provided through Whittier. Out in the Sound sites do not have this information. **Pete:** This would displace a large paddleout community. **Eric:** Are land management agencies willing to take over maintenance of this site. **Wyn:** There is no money in the budget at this time. It would have to rely on volunteer efforts. **Alison:** Users could come in out of the weather. **Karl:** Are there going to be bunk sites available? **Kimmer:** Thinks it is a good idea but in another area not Culross. **Wyn:** This could be another project under the endowment to look at the need for this project.

Project Number 17, Science of the Sound Education Center: **Kimmer:** Is it already happening? **Cal:** It operates on a shoestring budget, in cooperation with from the ranger district and the school district. **Kimmer:** Has anyone got children participating in this program? **Brooke Adkinson:** His children have benefitted from the program. He is a lifelong resident of the Sound. He sees it benefiting new arrivals by educating them as to what the Sound is. **Kimmer:** Have other coastal communities participated in the program? **Cal:** Several individuals have come in from Tatitlek, and some teachers have gone out to Chenega and a couple of other areas. It is an existing popular, successful service. **Eric:** Does it fall within the legal definition of restoration? **Steve:** Education and recreation are not mentioned in the settlement. This falls under the recreation information.

Project Number 18, Acquisition of Important Recreation Lands in Prince William Sound: This was originally proposed by state parks and ADNR. They were told to wait. Does not indicate that those listed are interested in selling. The Habitat Protection Work Group (HPWG) has a different way of dealing with recreation and giving acquisition of equivalent resources to the public. **Nancy:** Want to hear comments from Chuck and Mark. **Chuck:** Most of the

recreational lands addressed by this project are represented by the federal government. **Wyn:** This is an older project created before HPWG was formed. **Mark:** If habitat protection goes through, there is no need for this project. **Eric:** Asks for clarification on areas under 160 acres. **Wyn:** They are only looking at those areas larger than 160 acres right now. They will come back later and request a list of those owners under 160 acres at a later time. **Kimmer:** This group is in support of land buy back. **Alison:** Those lands were selected from Native lands. Forest Service has retained easement sites and provide stopping places for kayakers. **Mark:** There are a variety of sites for potential use. This may be a duplication of other proposals. Chugach doesn't sell land, but they exchange. **Mike:** From past experience, the money could get used up in just the negotiations. **Paul:** Could we give a sign to the Trustee Council that recreation is important. **Alison:** It would provide easement but not protection of large land masses. **Nancy:** Does it have to be acquisition or could it be other options such as, conservation easements and recreation easements, where landowners retain management of the land? We are uncomfortable with acquisition. **Jack Morris:** You cannot recreate on ANCSA land. Recreation and 17-B are not compatible. (At this point Mr. Morris went on at great length about the Native lands issue.) **Mike:** Are there easements that were retained during the land transfer? **Jack Morris:** It is illegal. **Karl:** Were easements for access only, not hunting? **Wyn:** Are we intending to change the project to reflect changes in easements? **Eric:** Is concerned about legality of easements. Are we going after something that is not feasible? **Alison:** Easements are available to cross federal land to Native land. It was decided to evaluate the project as written and include comments in the final report.

Project Number 19, Chenega Bay Marine Service Center: **Chuck:** Passed out a revision and executive summary. **Jack Morris:** The new pamphlet reflects what is already ongoing. **Chuck:** This is a PWS recreation and tourism project. The history of Chenega is an ongoing community. It has been a continuously inhabited community existing before the 1964 earthquake. We were located in another area that was completely wiped out by the earthquake. The village was reestablished on the island following the destruction. Before the spill, Chenega was subsistence oriented. Following the spill, more tourism and recreation opportunities arose. The spill significantly impacted our plans for improvements. NEPA has weighed heavily in our planning process. Two aircraft will be based permanently in Chenega at the airport should there be a need for search and rescue. This project would allow for the continuation of construction of the Marine Service Center and allow completion of the fuel storage areas. Recreational use has significantly declined since the spill. By centralizing facilities it would limit the impact to other areas of southwestern PWS. **Nancy:** AWRTA has three user groups that would be affected. Power boat members, hunters, and charter boat members would support a fuel stop in that part of the Sound. Power boaters and charter boat people think it is a good idea, and the area is attracting more people. Nothing has been done to address their lost recreational opportunities. More boats cause more wakes, which means more breakwaters are needed to protect the shore. **Chuck:** Our concept is that due to the oil spill there has been an increased unauthorized use of our lands. It would help the visitor to better understand land ownership and lessen impact of use. (We need to know who is out there. Hunters are found out about second hand.) We are not opposed to public use, but the need for knowledge is important. **Nancy:** The dock and fuel stop would attract the public and provide an opportunity to disseminate

information. **Chuck:** We have a license to enter with the wildlife school. They come by and request certain services. This funding would make the facility operational. They have a number of NOLS sites and are currently working on a habitat proposal. If it is struck, how do you control it. Chenega will need control and management help from the state and federal governments. **Kimmer:** There is a conflict. Even though you have experienced impact from spill, providing a longer range or frequency for visitors would create a negative wilderness experience. **Chuck:** We have a concern that we know that the public is coming. This would help us keep a better handle on who is where. **Walt:** Chenega should go ahead with their plans, but I have trouble with using this money as the funding source. I have trouble with linking it to resources. **Jack Morris:** The human element (the village) was injured. They need to be compensated. Chenega has gone ahead with many projects on their own. **Cal:** This increased use will produce a greater impact on various areas throughout the Sound. Knight Island will be affected. **Mike:** It is impossible to separate subsistence and recreation in Chenega. They are both gone at Chenega. The lifestyle was such that the residents there recreated as they utilized subsistence hunting and fishing. The linkage is there. **Karl:** Supports the economic opportunity for Chenega and is pleased to see the corporation has had the foresight to plan ahead. Question. This proposal does not include the ferry dock? If linked to the ferry, then ISTEA money is available. It seems to be a capital investment and that other money is available. **Chuck:** The remaining funding will be come from outside resources. It is not necessary to spend the entire 9 million in settlement money. They have received money from the Alyeska settlement this past winter. **Paul:** Use in this area is increasing. Something has to happen. **Kimmer:** There is a problem with how they are going to deal with displacement from one area and increased use in another. **Chuck:** There is a brochure. Chenega is part of the PWS Land Management Group. There needs to be a way to control. **Eric:** Wants clarification. There is a reference made to facilities management. How do you plan to take care of these facilities? **Chuck:** We currently have a dock, and they charge fees for garbage removal. We have made a request to the ferry system to make regular stops at Chenega. In response to fuel distribution we will enter into an agreement with the fuel company for environmental safety. **Mark:** Chugach has seen damage to the Sound continue following spill, and projects that address control of increased use are important.

Project Number 20, Leave-No-Trace Educational Program: **Don Ford:** This project was developed by the Forest Service in 1970. Restoration focuses on the user to "leave no impact of passage." NOLS ran a Leave-No-Trace for the Forest Service in the Tongass area last year. The costs will help with reproduction of a booklet to pass out to land managers and others, training masters on National Forest land and training rangers on educating users. Spill managers need to educate clean-up responders. We have a video that shows skills developed for a specific area. **Kimmer:** How much of the information is new? **Don:** It contains the state of knowledge as it exists today. Other information can be incorporated as it becomes available from other research projects. We interact with the Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts of America. **Alison:** Supports the project, it would be good for making kayakers more aware. **Nancy:** AWRTA has been concerned about this as well as. **Cal:** Can you make it bilingual? **Don:** It has been translated to Spanish for Mexico. **Kimmer:** Could a brochure on a smaller version be

developed? **Don:** There are three phases: training guide, brochure and video education to be used as a recreation education tool.

Project Number 21, Endowment for Outdoor Recreation Management in Prince William Sound:

Steve: This was compiled from public comments and suggested by Nancy. **Nancy:** Now that I see how it has evolved. I don't support it. There is a need for money for the communities in the Sound for cleanup. **Kimmer:** Asked to support an endowment for maintenance of facilities. **Paul:** Questions whether there should be support for facilities that agencies should be maintaining. **Wyn:** Some facilities that the Trustee Council might implement might create a need for more maintenance to deal with increased use of the Sound. **Paul:** We don't know where things would be without the spill, so how can we use them? **Mike:** The problem with a fee is will it be set aside for more trails or cabins and not cleanup. **Eric:** We don't know what is going to be approved by the Trustee Council. If the money is made available annually, then we will come up with an idea for spending. **Cal:** Public sentiment is to look back and say where is the money? The Trustees are reluctant to put the money in an endowment. **Paul:** The best investment in the qualities of the Sound should be viable now. **Nancy:** Is concerned that the future budget will not have adequate maintenance in the budget for the Sound, Valdez, Whittier, or Cordova. Some of this should be borne by the communities. **Chuck:** The concept of endowments is appealing now, with chairs to think of ways to better our lives, but what about restoration. **Jack Morris:** Buying land is contrary to ANCSA.

Project Number 22, Economic Study of Recreation in Prince William Sound Area:

Nancy: The lack of economic information has prejudiced any economic study. This should have been done four years ago. She doesn't know if this is the right time or place. **Mike:** It is never too late to get baseline data. What process did you propose to find the value of the recreational use? **Nancy:** Retain a consultant. **Paul:** There is a demand for this information. Some information is available. It just needs to be centralized. **Nancy:** A number of EIS will be generated as a result of the spill. **Paul:** This would help address the type of future use. **Cal:** An analysis of the economic impact of the spill, not an analysis of impact of the oil spill. **Nancy:** There is no information available to reflect the impact on tourism and recreation. This would not be another damage assessment study. **Karen:** What is your expected end result? There is currently no study that has that information available. **Nancy:** We need to determine the value of a user day using PWS. The values may vary between charter boats, kayakers, power boaters, hikers, and occasional day users. **Jack Morris:** You would create a database? **Nancy:** Yes, a database broken down by type of recreation. **Kimmer:** Has it been proposed to any other group? **Nancy:** We asked the state tourism department how, and they felt it should be done by the industry itself. We have worked on this for two years. **Eric:** When a study is identified as this project is, is it going to be sent for competitive bids or sole source? **Steve:** The projects with highest ratings will be enlarged upon. The higher costs will be researched out following acceptance by this group.

Project Number 23, Shotgun Cove Recreation Access: **Jim Barnett:** Legal advisor for the City of Whittier. He offered a copy of a project study conducted in 1987 by U.S. Army Corp of Engineers. Chugach, the City of Whittier and the Corp of Engineers have worked together to

develop this proposal. It has had a feasibility study. The concept is a joint proposal of two major landowners coming to the area, due to spill. It responds to the human requirements and has some funding from the criminal settlement. The current situation of Whittier does not leave any way to respond to its increased needs. Whittier will receive partial funding for the road, and partial funding from tour boat operators and Corp of Engineers. **Kimmer:** Why not try to upgrade in Whittier? **Jim:** We cannot get past the railroad and their land ownership. **Kimmer:** It is possible to increase Whittier's Harbor as opposed to Shotgun Cove? **Jim:** There is debate as to who is the owner of the surrounding area. We are looking into other possibilities in Whittier. Shotgun was given a higher priority than expanding Whittier because of its location further out in the Sound for this type of harbor. **Gary:** A study was done to determine the amount of slips needed in 2000. **Nancy:** Are the private landowners around Whittier willing to sell for hotel development? **Jim:** This would be providing an infrastructure for private development and the displacement of users of Trinity Point and Shotgun Cove. Will it have a negative effect on those who use the Sound? Increased use by power boats will have a negative effect. **Nancy:** Is there any documentation to support the Shotgun Cove access? **Jim:** We have surveyed current boat users and kayakers. **Kimmer:** Whittier needs improvements. Who owns the campground (railroad)? That land is owned by Begich Properties. It is private. **Mark:** The area around the railroad is industrial. Those going for a wilderness experience do not want to put their boats in with fuel storage and rail cars. **Kimmer:** Can this be compared to Anchorage's development of the Ship Creek area? **Jim:** Whittier does not have the economic capability to fund the necessary improvements or changes that will result. **Don:** Has difficulty with the high dollar figure required. **Mark:** Is anyone aware of the specific numbers from the settlement? **Steve:** No area has been given a specific amount from settlement. **Nancy:** This doesn't fund the ferry dock. **Mark:** It is not just for slips. It is for access also. **Gary:** The enormity in terms of visitorship to PWS by the end of this century warrants this project. This project and the Chenega project look ahead to increased use and the ability to provide better beach access. **Chuck:** Who are the private developers? **Jim:** This would be done by RFP. A joint development schedule is needed to sell developers.

Project Number 24, Fleming Spit Recreation Area Enhancements: **Dave O'Brien:** The Fleming Spit area in Cordova will develop in cooperation with ADFG, Prince William Sound Aquaculture and the Cordova Sporting Club. It has taken over all smote releases this year. Our aim is to make it safer for the user and clean it. It existed before spill. Enhancement would make it more attractive. The link to injury is outlined in the proposal. Brought letters from Cordova Trapping Club, Cordova Chamber of Commerce and Prince William Sound Aquaculture. **Walt:** Its link to the spill other than what is in the proposal is it is well known that sport fishing was injured by spill. There is no firm data to support this, just general knowledge. There is a displacement of recreational users coming to Cordova. **Nancy:** Are there watchable wildlife opportunities? **Dave:** Otters and birds. Chugach National Forest is on the backside of Cordova. **Nancy:** Watchable wildlife was injured in spill. How much interference with wetlands and tidelands? **Walt:** Permitting will be necessary because Prince William Sound Aquaculture wants to increase the survival rate of their smote. The smaller pond is shallow making it easy pickings for the birds. Dredging is needed in one pond to deepen it. Floods occasionally occur in Cordova. If one happened following the improvements, there

would need to be some method of reclamation. **Nancy:** Is it possible to do the project without adversely affecting the wetlands? As you know the wetlands were injured in the spill. **Mike:** There is a historic link. It was an old cannery site. Following a fire, it was dozed. Now it is a trash heap. **Walt:** The wetlands were created by building the road. They are a secondary wetland. **Nancy:** Is it compatible with adjacent land owners? Yes.

Project Number 25, Shoreline Trash Clean-up for PWS: **Nancy:** This project is a result of public comment. The shoreline of PWS is still oiled. It is physically impossible and we are not biologically able to remove all the oil. But we could remove garbage from those shorelines most extensively trashed. This was originally proposed as an endowment to encourage volunteer clean-up efforts with transportation being provided by tour boats. It is consistent with land management goals. Each community would be given the necessary materials for cleanup and no beaches would be approached without permission from the landowner. **Jack Morris:** Where did the figure come from for this proposal? It is not enough money. **Nancy:** I agree. Volunteer efforts from boat operators would have to be utilized. Two organizations have already been cooperating in such a program. It is in the conceptual stage. **Kimmer:** Adventure and Delights support it. How does Honey Charters feel about it? **Pete Heddell:** We are already involved in this cleanup by back-hauling garbage from tours. **Chuck:** Is the trash hazardous? **Nancy:** It is not hazardous. **Chuck:** His people feel it would be a slap in the face to pick up after others. **Nancy:** We are all tired of picking up others' garbage, but it needs to be done. **Mark:** What trash is this targeting? **Nancy:** All trash left behind, not just by the clean-up effort. **Kimmer:** This is in direct correlation with NOLS and Forest Service. After cleanup there needs to be education. **Cal:** We would be able to get volunteers. Transporting them to shore would be a problem and getting the trash out and off the shore following its gathering. The Coast Guard has been helpful in picking up bagged garbage. **Wyn:** Nancy initially proposed two million for cleanup. The Restoration Team said the project might have some merit. The Restoration Team put a cap of \$31,000 on it. If you feel it needs more money, say so. **Scott Walther:** Solid waste from Whittier goes to the Eagle River Landfill for disposal at 22 cents per pound. **Jack Morris:** Get information from Chenega Corporation regarding cleanup. **Nancy:** When an actual dollar amount is set, it will limit the number of volunteers able to participate. **Kimmer:** Could our organizations respond to the projects that are written. **Steve:** We had not addressed this. **Wyn:** Lets stick to the criteria. You can respond to the Restoration Plan it when comes out for public comment.

Project Number 26, Alaska Oil Spill Curriculum Rewrite and Reprint: **Cal:** Knows the curriculum is available. **Kimmer:** Has seen it and has used it. It is a good program.

Project Number 27, Mt. Eyak Ski Area Improvements: **Mike:** As a direct result of oil spill, the ski hill was shut down. It is run by volunteers. All the adults that supervise the hill were the first to respond. It was shut down during spring break, leaving the youth with nothing to do. It added to the extreme stress of the community. They were on vacation from school. This is a human issue that has been lost since the spill. It would enhance the community of Cordova. It is a desired public facility and a service warranted by support. It is supported by the city. It is very consistent with land management use for the area. It has a 99-year lease. It is located

inside the city limits, surrounded by state land. There is no conflict. It is non-profit and staffed by a total volunteer effort. The users are the residents of Prince William Sound. Visitors ski free. **Cal:** The ski hill in Cordova is hard to appreciate unless you have been there. It is used extensively by youth and adult alike. There is not a lot in Cordova for the youth to do. It is a valuable resource to the community. There are plans to utilize it in the summer in addition to its winter use. **Walt:** Ditto. The lift now is paid for by user fees, the ski club and the city. **Nancy:** This is a forested area. Are there any marbled murrelets? **Cal:** There are an abundance of murrelets in the Sound. Increasing the ski area would take advantage of already open areas. **Nancy:** We should make a note regarding number of murrelets. **Wyn:** That would be covered in an environmental assessment.

Project Number 28, Cordova Historical Marine Park: **Brooke:** Injury relates heavily with Cordova since they are a fishing community. The boats chosen were built and used in the area. It would be interrelated with the ferry terminal. The vessels will blend in with the dock area. They will be a recreational use for visitors to view from ferry system. The community will benefit from the project as well as visitors. He has letters of support from the historical society and other organizations. **Nancy:** Having written a short history of PWS, this is one of the areas affected by the spill. The boats were a part of the life history. This is a good way to capture that history. Besides the archeological value, there is the historical value. This is an excellent time to pick them up before they leave the area. **Walt:** The link with the spill is Cordova is a fishing community. The visitor wants to see the type of vessels used. As people upgrade their vessels more of the older ones are being sold off. This is a good opportunity to take advantage of their availability. **Mike:** The older boats were built by many people of Cordova or Natives of the area. **Brooke:** We have selected a representation of these.

Special Designations

Wyn: As far as looking at special designations, we have started the process but there is nothing to really report on at this time. This group can offer comment whether they favor special designations or not. The designations were compiled during public comment. The purpose of the document was not to focus on a specific one, but to give the Trustees an overview of what the possible designations are, and the pros and cons. (No one wants to stay to discuss special designations.)

Steve and Wyn will mail the results of the workshop to the participants.