

EIS
C

ID TEAM MEETING
April 5, 1994
1:30 p.m.

ATTENDEES

Rod Kuhn
Karen Klinge
Dave Gibbons
Gerry Sanger
Tim Holder
Fred Clark

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Rod - Dave will give some thoughts from the TC.

Dave - we have met with the TC on the assumptions letter. The primary thing is providing them with flexibility. They want a range of activities within a category. They don't want to be locked in.

Bill - we are not putting constraints on anyone. The information we are using is what they presented.

Karen - did they mind the projects and topics such as intertidal.

Dave - I didn't get any response on that. They want to know the idea under a strategy.

Bill - how do we in our writing address budget? Should we have a section in the EIS that discusses it?

Rod - our economist has to analyze the dollars so it is somewhat parallel with the other alternatives.

Bill - we don't have to worry about the dollars spent for a particular action?

Karen - somewhere in the document, you'll describe the ranges. If the money constrains your action, you should say in your write-up that this action is not likely to be done.

Bill - for fish, I could see how all the money could be spent in one fell swoop on, for example, a hatchery.

Rod - the limitations for fish could be the logistics.

Dave - the decision to do "x" projects is not in this process.

Karen - would it make sense to say things are possible or not possible because of money?

Rod - our other dilemma is the habitat situation. I don't know how near we are to resolution. We need to draft some language.

Karen - I thought the memo to Ayers addressed this.

Rod - the memo that went to Ayers was budget, and the habitat section was taken out.

Dave - the attorneys for the willing sellers want above fair-market value and are in D.C. lobbying.

Fred - for my purposes, the important part is not how many acres there are but where they are.

Rod - what is the cheapest per acre we could get by with?

Dave - \$250.00 an acre.

Bill - the impact on our writing and analysis will not change. Everything comes out vanilla. It just depends on how we approach it. Everything is low to moderate. The other question is what kind of criteria will the habitat group use to determine the size of the list.

Also, we have to have some kind of deadline.

Fred - if the number of acres is so nebulous, why are we dealing with it? Why can't we say we don't know what is going to happen with habitat acquisition?

Rod - we are talking about what groups of parcels you would analyze under each alternative.

Karen - Rod's suggestion, taking the minimum value we could anticipate, seems to be a good one.

Bill - the best way out is to not attach a dollar value. You could use a random number.

Dave - the TC decided to negotiate for all high-ranked parcels.

Karen - under Chapter 2, you would show possible budget ranges?

Rod - I probably can get by without putting in the assumptions.

Fred - is the cost of negotiations in administrative costs?

Dave - that comes out of the \$300 million.

Karen - what is your preference, Dave?

Dave - I will have to bounce this off some other people.

Rod - what was the TC's resolution on January 31st?

Dave - to begin negotiations with all highs and other opportunity lands. In talking with them, they all have different ideas on what this means.

Rod - I will continue to build my table; however, I need a response by Tuesday. Is that possible?

Dave - I can ask.

Karen - we need the information by Monday to fill in the blanks. Can we assume the high parcel things will be looked at?

Dave - they are already negotiating.

Bill - I would like more information about literature cited and creating an administrative record. Also, how do we build in our corrections once they leave our hands? How much detail do we need?

Regarding my introduction to Chapter 4, I had a fairly long paragraph dealing with permitting and the normal review process. I think it is very important.

Rod - I didn't feel it was inappropriate at all. At this point, we are okay.

Fred - I talk about the laws in the back section.

Tim - MMS cites the laws in Chapter 2.

Karen - who is doing introductions in general?

Rod - copies of chapters 1 and 2 were distributed. Chapter 1 has been to the editors. Chapter 2 is in their hands.

Karen - I would recommend putting the tables back in Chapter 2. It is helpful for looking at the differences.

Rod - I took them out because of problems with trying to integrate Chapter 5 similarly.

Fred - recreation and tourism are treated together in some places and separately in others.

Gerry - this gets into assumptions.

Rod - the general priority is to bring information to me to forward to Barbara in order to control the flow. For materials to MMS, we have courier service.

I am now building Chapter 4.

Bill - what is our priority of accomplishing things in the next month?

Rod - John Farrell will be here on Monday to start review.

Bill - so our top priority is plunging into Chapter 4.

In terms of your comments about MMS's revisions, I feel mixed signals. Are their comments final or is there latitude for change, such as for commas in a series?

Rod - not for something like that.

Fred - for Alternative 2, mine is very conceptual.

Karen - once we get the parcels, you can fill in the blanks.

Gerry - the bottom line is to use HPWG's information.

Rod - we have contracted with Walcoff to come up with extra numbers to help Tim out.

The citation and bibliography things can be dealt with next week and the following week.

The administrative record needs to have things that are not generally available. A banker's box is in my office for the administrative record. For personal communications, you would use whatever is needed to support it. For draft reports, those should be cited as unpublished written communications.

We can make corrections while John is reading what we have. John will give changes related to compliance with NEPA.

Rod - Bill, you had a question on how much detail? I thought what you had was a pretty good level of detail.

Karen - should I add more or less to mine?

Rod - there is just a difference in style. It might help if Bill let the others see what he did in Chapter 3.

Everyone is doing a good job. I welcome the opportunity to read everyone's sections. The only thing is John may want us to do some semi-quantifying of our objective terms.

As far as introductions, I will put something in Chapter 4, and I will use some text that Bill and Gerry have provided.

Karen - there are some things regarding definitions of "no action" which need to be included.

Meeting adjourned - 3:00 p.m.