

RPWG Meeting, January 6, 1993

Attendees: Veronica Gilbert, Mark Fraker, Chris Swensen, John Strand, Ray Thompson, Karen Klinge, Carol Gorbics

1. Development of Alternatives

RPWG reviewed the results of the follow-up peer review contacts after the workshop. Those results will be entered into the database.

The criteria will be modified to reflect the additional information possibly as follows:

- New 1-Potential to improve degree of recovery (percentage)
- New 2-Confidence change
- New 3-Potential to improve rate of recovery (number of years)
- New 4-Confidence change
- New 5-Prevent degradation, usually reflected in change in confidence bounds
- 6-Enhancement

2. Steps in Revising the Alternatives

- a. Develop injury list and sorting commands which correspond to each alternative theme
- b. Rbase sort to determine resource options for each alternative
- c. Evaluate list for species gaps (ie. if there is nothing that falls out of the sort for a species, we may want to consider additional options which don't quite meet the criteria to ensure that there are no significant species gaps)
- d. Identify costs for species/options
- e. Evaluate the total cost for implementation option by alternative
- f. Evaluate and determine the amount for other alternative components including endowment, land acquisition, monitoring and administration for each alternative
- g. Factor in the geographic application and ecosystem interactions

3. What about basic research needs? Does there need to be an additional component in each alternative?

Each option already should include costs for a feasibility study, if appropriate. The land acquisition option already includes costs of habitat evaluation research. The monitoring program already includes costs of some basic research to look at "un" understood injury or why some species aren't recovering.

How about building flexibility into the RP? Is there a way to ensure that funding can be provided for newly identified activities? Perhaps the endowment can cover this need. However, we need to look more closely at this.

#### 4. Costs

Cost effectiveness or cost benefit measure may be appropriate within a particular resource, but it is not appropriate to try to put a value on a resource.

#### 5. Individual TC comments on the RP outline

12/15/92 memo from McVee

\* Move Section III.B. to appendix: RPWG view this as useful information that belongs here. If, after review of the completed chapter, it is still determined to be distracting, it will be moved.

\* Move Section IV. to appendix: RPWG disagree. This is a section that focuses on methodology which clearly should be described in the document. The titles of the subsections will be clarified to better reflect that.

\* Proposed Action: To date, there has been RT agreement that the RPWG will not select a proposed action. If the TC decides to choose a preferred alternative prior to the publication of the DEIS and RP then the plan will reflect that. This issue has been discussed over and over. Any changes need to the direction need to be done by the overall TC.

\* Delete Section V, A.B. and C. This section is an introduction to the alternatives section. RPWG will change it as follows:

#### IV.C. Application of Criteria

1. Development of Alternatives
2. Definition of Alternatives

#### V.A. Introduction (includes old V.B. and V.C.) B. Alternatives

\*Revise V.D.2.: This information will be included, but the title will be similar to what McVee suggested, but less wordy.

\*Move VI.D. to appendix: Disagree. This is the heart of the what

the monitoring plan is. It contains essential information fundamental to the discussion of the monitoring.

12/16/92 memo from Pennoyer

#### ALTERNATIVES

Combining alternatives: RPWG will look at combining the alternatives after we have further developed the six alternatives. RPWG will look at the differences between the alternatives and revisit Pennoyer's comment.

Eliminating the Settlement Characteristics variable: This issue was discussed with the RT and there was extremely divergent opinion on this point. The RPWG will look at this issue during the revisiting of the alternatives and may request that the TC evaluate this issue.

Eliminating the Geographic area variable: The RPWG will look at this issue during the revisiting of the alternatives and may request that the TC evaluate this issue.

12/22/92 memo from McVee

Themes vs. alternatives: The RPWG has previously stated that alternatives will be fully developed. As we have stated previously, the themes were provided to get agreement from the TC and RT on the direction the RPWG was taking.

Proposed Action: To date, there has been RT agreement that the RPWG will not select a proposed action. If the TC decides to choose a preferred alternative prior to the publication of the DEIS and RP then the plan will reflect that. This issue has been discussed over and over. Any changes need to the direction need to be done by the overall TC.

Public comment: The RPWG agrees. RPWG still plan to hold public meetings in March concerning the alternatives information package.

Proposed action: See above.

Geographic area: Agree. RPWG is providing requested information.

12/22/92 memo from Pennoyer - No RPWG response needed.

#### 6. Action items:

a-reevaluate alternatives as described

b-look at flexibility in the plan at a later date

c-draft a letter to Gibbons responding to Pennoyer and McVee comments.