

Tone of the brochure indicates that we can do more for the injured resources than is, in fact, possible. We need to be clearer on the role of man versus the natural processes. We can help where we hunt and fish, or where we can protect from other disturbances, or in limited cases through other means. But this message does not come through. Instead, the brochure -- by its tone -- indicates that there are many projects that can significantly accelerate natural recovery. That is not true.

BS Priority

<u>Location</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Priority</u>
<b>Background Section</b>			
p1	Reorder Trustees to be in alphabetical order.	DG	
p1	The brochure was written when we were going to mail it out to the mailing list only. It may need an additional paragraph of introduction on the masthead (wherever that is in the layout) to introduce it to those who receive it in a newspaper or as an unexpected mailing.	DEC	
p2	Break out in a separate ¶ a section that explains who the Trustee Council is and what they do.	PR	
	Add an annotated table of contents, or list of what's in the brochure, or something similar so readers can quickly go to what they are interested in. (From Group Reviewers and Larsen)	PR	
	Essentially need planning process information: Why just starting plan/NEPA process now. How the alternatives have been developed, previous public involvement, etc.	PR	
p2-3	Delete all references to funding. Make the question, "How to restore the injuries", not "How to spend the civil settlement fund." (Similar comment from USFS)	DG	Priority
P1.	To attract attention and get interest, get the \$600 million up front: perhaps in the title, don't wait until the "Civil Settlement, Restoration Fund"	PR	
p1, ¶2	Eliminate entire paragraph about what the plan will not do.	NOAA	
p2, ¶1	Add to when are comments due sentence, "We would appreciate early comments by _____ (April 30th, May 10th?), but..."	DOI	Priority
p3, ¶1	Add to ¶1: "Although there were various other restitution payments, the civil settlement funds are the subject of this plan."	DL	
p3, ¶2	Delete last phrase about, "but no purchase will be forced on an unwilling seller."	DG DEC	Priority

p3 ¶2	Add Fish and Game Boards, or boards and commissions to the sentence about not managing fish and wildlife resources.	DNR	
p3 ¶3	Add state special areas (state parks, marine parks, etc) to the list of oiled stuff.	PR	
p3 ¶4	Break out criminal settlement under a separate heading, and make it clear that the criminal monies are not part of this plan. By mixing it all together, that information is partially lost.	DL	
p3 ¶5	Criminal \$ can be used for actions other than restoration.	USFS	Priority
p4, ¶5	Last Sentence: "Examples of natural resources are birds, fish, mammals, subtidal plants and organisms, and archaeology." Archaeology is a field of study. Why not cultural resources, historical artifacts, archaeological sites...	PR	
p4, next to last ¶	\$740 million remains for restoration, not \$610	NOAA	Priority
p4, Funding	Some differences in the amounts listed in last paragraph. How did we get the estimate of \$90 million remains to be reimbursed to governments?	DG	
p4, last ¶, p5	Delete funding from here. Include how much is left, but leave the detail for the endowment section which should be remained "Funding" and have the detailed funding info. In addition, it isn't obvious to the casual observer that the funding adds up. Make it clear; perhaps in tabular form.	DL	Priority

### Injury Summary

Review group: Sublethal injury is both jargon and misleading with respect to a population. One reviewer: sublethal refers to an individual animal, not a population. Larson: how can you have 400 killed being a sublethal injury. Review group recommended changing sublethal injury to "injury", or for changing the injuries from population decline and sublethal to population decline and injuries that did not cause a population decline.	PR	} Priority <i>discuss together</i>
You have a definition of sublethal as being no population decline. However, in some cases you say 400 are killed. This doesn't make sense.	DL	
Change categories of injury to "Population-level and Less than population-level injury." Define population-level injury "Measurable reduction in population that shows up in more than one generation."	DF&G	

	What happened to other species: bears, deer, etc. Needs a sentence or small paragraph saying they were studied but not injured, or whatever.	PR	
Various locations	Bob Spies has a number of comments that he has not give to us yet.	BS	Priority
p7, title	Change title to "Current Situation"	DL	
p7, ¶2	"Only one factor" Implications is that oil spill may not be the cause. Say what the other factors are.	DL	
p7, ¶3	Use sea otters rather than marbled murrelets as an example of decline in population (2nd line).	NOAA	
p7, ¶3	Use a different example, rather than herring.	DEC	
p8, various	The relationship between carcasses to estimated kill varies. Its confusing. Why is it two times in some cases, and ten times in others.	PR	} Priority
p7, Killer Whales	What is the "AB" Pod?	DL	
p7, Killer Whales	Last sentence. "These births show suggest that the AB pod..."	NOAA DG	
p7 Killer Whales	There is problem with killer whale sublethal conclusions.	DEC USFS	
p9 Sockeye	The fact that overescapement was in 1987 and 1988 raises questions about what can be blamed for the spill.	PR	
p9 Sockeye	Language should better reflect the severity to Sockeye salmon by quantifying the amount of smolt reduction.	DF&G	
p10 Rec & Comm Tour	Split out Commercial Tourism from recreation. Include a separate description.	NOAA	Priority

p10 Sport &  
Comm Fish

In Commercial fish section, and in Recreation-Sport Fishing, mention potential impacts of Kenai River Sockeye closures.

DF&G

**What are the Alternatives Section (i.e., policy questions, and restoration plan categories)**

	The policy questions table is self-explanatory. If need to can shorten the section by putting a little more in the table and eliminating most of the text. The parts of the paragraphs that compare alternatives, however, are useful. Perhaps they could be moved to the comparison of alternatives.	PR	Priority
p11 Title	Change title to "Planning Process" or something similar. This title made me take a while to figure out that both the issues and categories are in the alternatives.	DL	
p11, General	Retitle section to "Issues, Policy Questions, and Categories: the "Building Blocks" of Alternative (or something similar). Move 1st two paragraphs to Section describing alternatives, and move similar paragraphs that contrast alternatives to the Comparison of alternatives section. In other words, make this section shorter and purer.	DOI	
p11 table	In the table, the question about Status of Resource Recovery needs an "OR". That is, if you just say, "Should restoration actions cease when a resource has recovered? It is not clear what the alternative is. Without providing an "or" Should we continue... you'll get false "yes" answers because people won't know the other side.	PR	
p11 table	The words that describe the Issue (the left side of the table) don't give a sense of the issue. Recommend "Extent of Resource Recovery Efforts"	PR	
p11 table	Words under Issue column are not user-friendly. Perhaps need to expand introduction to the table.	DEC	
p11 table	Location. Shouldn't we add another clause about anywhere in Lower 48? (If so, similar changes throughout.)	DG	<i>WAAW</i>
p12 table	Add title to table: "What was injured by the spill?" Change labels under resources to: Population decline, Injuries without population decline, and Other. Change services to Human Uses.	PR	Priority
p12 table	Change order of services to: 1) Recreation; 2) Passive Use; 3) Subsistence, 4) Commercial Tourism, 5) Commercial Fishing. Eliminate the Recreation-sport fishing and Recreation-sport hunting categories. Make similar order throughout document wherever services are listed.	DOI	Priority
p12 ¶4	The 1st ¶ under Status of Resource Recovery. Haven't bald eagles recovered?	NOAA	

p12 ¶5	2nd ¶ under Status of Recovery. Using Alt 2 as an example of "Ceasing once the resource has recovered" is a poor description because the habitat protection will probably go on forever.	DEC	
p13 ¶4	Paragraph under location. Are there any activities outside the spill area that would affect the populations in the area? For example, like protecting winter murre habitat in Mexico.	PR	Priority
p13 last¶	Don't understand the paragraph about Strategies for Human Use	DEC	
<b>Categories of the Restoration Plan</b>			
p14, title	Change title from "What are the Categories of the Restoration Plan", to "Possible Restoration Activities"	PR	
p14 ¶2	Habitat protection - private land. Explain in the first sentence that the rules for purchase of habitat, that it must be used to protect or promote recovery of an injured resource or service. Explain link to recovery.		
p14	Habitat Protection. Purchase of land does not necessarily imply protection. The state, for example, could always sell it. Say that management policies would need to be crafted on a case-by-case basis, but that you presume that the land would be managed to protect the purposes for which it was acquired.	PR	Priority
p14 ¶5	Delete 1st sentence that "There is not enough money in the entire civil settlement to purchase...."	NOAA	Priority
p14, ¶6	Habitat protection on public land. Are funds going to be required? If so, is money going to be required for management? Is funds required under this going to be a large amount?	PR	Priority
p14 ¶6	Delete last sentence, that the Trustee Council has no proposals.	DG	Priority
p15, ¶1	General Restoration is a content-free name. Can you change it to something more descriptive.	PR	Priority
p15, ¶1	Eliminate example about testing subsistence foods for continuing oil contamination.	DOI	
p15 ¶1	Delete last two sentences about "Enough money allocated for General restoration to fund all activities ID'd thus far.	USFS	Priority
p15 ¶2	Spill Prevention and Response. What is potential funding requirement, who would be eligible for funds (is this going to private companies)?	PR	
p15 ¶6	Monitoring and Research Program. Needs a purposes statement, why this category is needed.	PR	

p15 & 16	Make endowment a new section called funding. (Parallel to the Categories Section). Put the detailed money info from the introduction, then describe the endowment.	DL	
p15 & 16	Make endowment a separate section called Funding Mechanism	DOI	
p16, ¶1, last 2 sentences	Delete two sentences about "Habitat acquisition, however, does not lend itself to an endowment...."	NOAA DEC	Priority
p16 ¶2	Real rate of return should be 4%-6%, therefore amount generated should be \$4 million t \$6 million for every \$100 million put into endowment.	DNR	Priority
p16, ¶2	Change so first \$3 million of endowment can be used for any purpose. Don't restrict to monitoring first.	DEC	Priority
<b>Description of Alternatives.</b>			
p17, new¶	Make an introduction before the alternatives. (It could be ¶2 from p11).	DL	
Alt #1, p17	Text says "wilderness...not expected to recover". Shouldn't it be designated wilderness area to be consistent. Also, shouldn't natural recovery chart say, "not expected to recover" to be consistent.	PR	
Alt #1, p17	Disagree with assessment that wilderness is not expected to recover.	P R (Othrs)	Priority
Alt #1,	Alternative #1 should be identified as the no action alternative in the title. We should specifically say what happens to the 94% balance (i.e., nothing happens). Otherwise, its confusing as to why its there.	PR	Priority
Alt #2, p21	Under "injuries addressed" change to Resources whose populations declined and injured services" That way its clear that "whose populations declined doesn't modify services." Similar changes throughout.	PR	
Alt #2, p19	2nd sentence. In this and similar sentences in other alternatives, the alternative doesn't dedicate nor set aside a percentage. It sets as aside "as much as", or "up to 75%" or whatever.	NOAA	Priority
Alt #5, p25	In the Issues & Policies table, the "Provide some improvement..." Is "some" greater than "substantial." The confusion, is that the statement looks like it describes the overall effect of the alternative (some improvement), not the projects that would be funded (those that produce some or substantial improvement.)	DL	



## Comparison of Alternatives

Nat Recovery Tbl; p27	The columns under five alternatives is confusing. It seems to indicate that there is no difference between alternatives 2 through 5 for most resources. What is meant is that alternatives 2 through 5 all address all services and population-level injuries, and alt #3 doesn't address sublethal injuries, but that is not what is communicated. Drop the five columns, and present that information another way.	PR	
Nat Recovery Tb; p27	This and following table need titles.	PR	
Nat Recovery Tbl; p27	Designated Wilderness Areas is with Archaeology, not Services. (Also reorder services per previous comment.)	DOI	
Nat Recovery Tbl; p27	Harlequin Ducks, comment should be "Still no reproduction within PWS"; add Red lake to comment under Sockeye.	DG	
Nat Recovery Tbl; p27	Recreation. Recovering Slowly?	DG	
Nat Recovery Tbl; p27	The time frames are listed under the heading " <i>Expected</i> time to natural recovery". In fact, what you listed is the outer bound of experts expectations. That is not the expected time. You should list the entire range, and caveat it appropriately. (That is, don't say < 50 years, say 10-50 years.)	BS	Priority
Table p 29	What does shading mean?	PR	
p30, ¶4 & 5	Eliminate reference to funds allocated to habitat protection.	DG	
p30, last ¶ Endowment	A 20% endowment wouldn't fund recovery monitoring first. Change next to last sentence to "but the annual interest from the account could fund <del>recovery monitoring and possibly a few other</del> a variety restoration activities indefinitely."	NOAA	

Somewhere	Need to give range of acreage that habitat protection will purchase. Otherwise public has no feeling for consequences of budget decisions. WE do not want the discussion to focus exclusively on money.	DF&G
-----------	---	------

**General Options.**

p31, ¶2	DG: Why is this paragraph here. (USFS: this is red-flag statement.)	DG USFS	Priority
---------	---	------------	----------

p32, Sea Otter	LTS	DG
----------------	-----	----

p32 Fish	Shouldn't Improve access to salmon streams under Sockeye and Pinks be in Alt #4. Same with Improve survival rates of salmon eggs under Pinks.	USFS
----------	---	------

p32, Fish 3rd Optn	Not "Fertilize Coghill Lake in PWS to improve", but "Fertilize lakes to improve..."	NOAA
-----------------------	---	------

p32 Fish	Fertilize coghill should have local benefits only. So should improve survival rates of salmon eggs. Is Relocating hatchery runs feasible? What about Chum Salmon? Why isn't Anadromous Stream catalogue option listed under Dolly Varden?	DG
----------	---	----

p33 Birds	Shouldn't Black Oystercatcher have "Local benefits only"?	DG
-----------	---	----

p34, Svcs	Make separate section for Commercial Tourism.	NOAA DOI
-----------	---	-------------

p 3 4 , Subsistence	Shouldn't Provide new access to traditional foods should be "Local benefits only"?	DG
------------------------	--	----

**Questions**

p35, titles	Change "How should these issues be resolved" to "Resolving the Issues" Change "Questions about Issues and Policies" to "Your views of the Issues and Policies." (Similar change on p37 & 38).	DL
-------------	---	----

p35, Text under Intro	"Spending guidelines" should be "Potential spending guidelines."	DG
--------------------------	--	----



p 3 5 - 3 6 , General	Where it says, "Fund activities"; change to "Conduct activities."	USFS
Injuries p35	Injuries addressed. Make clear question doesn't apply to services.	PR
Status of Resc Recovery, p35	Change 1st box to "Continue appropriate activities to enhance a resource even after resources recover."	NOAA Priority
Effectiveness; p36	Test is from old draft; change to discuss substantial versus some improvement. Eliminate highly effective language.	PR
Strategies for Human use; p36	First three categories are not mutually exclusive and in fact are duplicative. Eliminate "Do not fund activities that..."	PR
Categories	For all questions on this page, where you can provide a short definition that (i.e., a phrase) that defines the categories -- like Ecological monitoring, Restoration Research), then include it in the question. That way, people won't have to look back in the brochure to remember what the subcategories mean. This may not be possible for all subcategories. Also, don't substitute an example for a definition.	PR
Monitor & Resc; p 37	Recovery monitoring is in all alternatives. Restoration monitoring occurs in any alternative involving projects. If any monitoring is appropriate, they are. What we really want to know is ecological monitoring and research. So eliminate the first two subcategories in the question. (or put them in the introductory sentence.)	PR
S p i l l Prevent'n, p37	Make titles consistent. "Infrastructure" is "Equipment" earlier in the document. Go over this throughout document.	
Endowment p37	Let people know the next chart is the place for spending guidelines for endowment. That solves the problem of people wanting to say in this question the actual amount they want to allocate to endowment. You tell them that info is for the next question.	PR
S p e n d i n g Guidelines, p38	Its unclear that the blank lines under "balance" are for people to write in their new choices for restoration categories. Put "Other _____" or some similar message to clue people in that is what those lines are for.	PR

p38, table	Tied to Act, cannot have 1% in Alt 5 (?)	DG	
H a b i t a t Protect'n p39	Question #1. Delete or dramatically reword. What is being asked does not come through. Parcel size does not seem important. The type of land may be more important, but parcel size is a poor substitute. What is being asked is not communicated in this question.	PR	Priority
Hab Prot; p39	Question #2. Probably recommend deleting question. It will be a large hassle to code and analyze the data from this question. Review group did not think we would get a distribution that is useable.	PR	Priority
Hab Prot; p39	Question #2. Drop	DNR	Priority
Hab Prot; p40	Question #3. Wording doesn't reflect intent of question. What we are really seem to be interested in is management questions, "how the land will be managed once purchased." This question doesn't do it as phrased. Some reviewers were unsure whether this could be answered in general. They thought it might have to be answered case by case (or at least type by type).	PR	Priority
Hab Prot; p40	Question #4. Question doesn't make sense. When RPWG explained what the question meant, it wasn't what the Peer Reviewers thought it meant. They asked, "if the first sentence is true, the second sentence can't be." When we explained it further, they said that we could not usefully get that information without a much more detailed set of questions.	PR	Priority