

RPWG
I

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
OCTOBER 1, 1992
10:00 a.m.

ATTENDEES:

Bob Loeffler
Carol Gorbics
Mark Fraker
Karen Klinge
Chris Swenson
Veronica Gilbert
Art Weiner
Ray Thompson

The following handouts were provided:

Bob Spies Draft Injury Summary

RPWG Members

Art introduced Veronica Gilbert who will represent DNR on RPWG. She has regional planning experience and brings a wealth of knowledge of Alaska to this process. Art will still be around to provide science commentary.

SCHEDULE

We will go over everyone's computer runs to see what people have thought about in creating alternatives. Art asked if Spies' injury summary will be discussed now that we have the list. Carol stated that the list is considered to be a draft and Spies has requested comments. Art stated we should take a good hard look at the list and let it influence decisionmaking. Art further stated he had problems with working in areas that have not been recognized as injured and felt it was redundant to work on something that will fall by the wayside.

Bob stated that other RPWG members will review the database and work on sorts. Karen gave an overview of the sorting process for developing alternatives. Spies' table can be used to verify the certainty of injury. Karen stated that using double searches would help to prioritize. Multi sorts from the database may be necessary to compare levels of information. Karen stated she always assumes there is some prioritization, such as we are going to suggest that options be done first or if there is a matter of money. Bob stated that he did his sorts in a similar way. Karen stated that for starters you should run it for what you think would be useful to call up. Bob stated he kept in mind providing a range of choices for the public when doing his sorts. Art stated that we should also write down the justification rules or bias of what went into the sorts. Art and Chris talked with the legal team with respect

to whether some options are direct restoration or enhancement. Art stated it is very important to categorize things for the public. Sandy stated what is important is what the public cares about. Art stated we should be prepared to defend why we call something direct restoration. Karen stated that when there are problems or questions, they can be posed to the peer reviewers. This will eliminate the need for further group review of the evaluation criteria. Veronica requested clarification on the various work products on the table. Bob stated that updated versions will be provided to her. Karen stated that prioritization will become clear in the justification rules. Art suggested that a one-on-one demonstration of sorts be given to members who have not done them by those who have. Sandy suggested keeping a list of sorts that have been done and looking at the results. Karen preferred not to do this because there would be a greater range of ideas if each person did a separate sort without any input. Carol stated that she agreed with Karen from a creativity stand point.

DRAFT SUMMARY OF INJURY

Bob stated that someone, John, should be designated to compile the comments to the draft summary of injury and discuss them with Spies. Art stated that if there is disagreement, the source should be cited, such as PI comments. Bob stated that his comments will probably relate to missing information and not science. Bob further stated the draft injury summary does not deal much with recovery, and Spies should elaborate more on this. Art stated that Bob's questions probably won't be answered until the reports come in from the PI's. Carol stated that these reports probably won't be available to the public until February. Mark questioned the numbers used for finds and stated there needs to be some wording that doesn't obscure the fact that some species don't lend themselves to study. Data is often too hard to collect to find answers; therefore, Mark questioned if this is an accurate representation of the information. Veronica stated that in reviewing the information, there were questions of injury or probability of injury and whether species lend themselves to any type of manipulation. Sandy stated he doesn't feel all the framework criteria are addressed in the draft summary of injury and they should be. Sandy further stated there are more columns to add to the summary, such as lack of productivity. Art questioned who will be the final decisionmaker on the summary of injury. Sandy stated that you either meet the criteria or you don't. Carol stated that the Trustee Council is the final decisionmaker. Art stated we have to decide who we will listen to. Bob stated that this is an interactive process. Carol stated there is a very clear chain of command, and Spies is an advisor to the Restoration Team. Art stated that the summary of injury is fundamental to a lot of the work RPWG is doing. Carol stated that once the Trustee Council adopts Spies' recommendation, that will be the final decision. Art stated that Spies is the only independent authority in this process. Karen stated that we would use the most current informa-

tion we have. We are up against a deadline because the draft injury summary was received so late. Carol stated that critical review is not inappropriate. Sandy envisioned taking the recommendations of RPWG to the Restoration Team. Bob stated his comments will include things that were missed in the summary and communication problems. Sandy stated that this only shows injury to the resources and it should be explicit that the summary does not include injury to services. Bob stated that it should also address species which were not included. Sandy stated that Spies' list should include the resources from the framework because things have been dropped out in the past which are no longer germane to the process and preparation for a lawsuit. Bob requested that all comments be forwarded to John by next Wednesday for compilation. Karen stated that she spoke with Spies for more specific information, such as population level injury to pink salmon. She also discussed pigeon guillemot injuries with Spies, who stated he would keep it in but would not address it with the same priority. Karen also discussed other species which were not part of the NRDA process but were possibly injured. Spies felt this could be addressed through a habitat or ecosystem approach. Art stated we need to come to closure with Spies on the injury summary before meeting with the peer reviewers because the differences of opinion should be on the table.

SORTS

The sorts will be discussed on Tuesday and should be forwarded to Bob by late Monday. Karen stated that the sorting rules and criteria will be more important than the output. Chris suggested if anyone has ideas for sorting services, they could be circulated among the group.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30.

Table XOL Summary of injury from Exxon Valdez oil spill.

RESOURCE	INJURY (uncertainty 1-5)*				geographic extent of injury			Degree of recovery (1991)††
	eggs/young	subadults	adults	Total Adult Mortality	PWS	Kenai Peninsula/ Kodiak Island	Alaskan Peninsula	
Harbor seals	yes (2)	yes (2)	yes (2)	approx 200	yes	unknown	unknown	Differences between oiled and unoled areas persist in PWS, but there is an upward population trend in the oiled area.
Sea otters	yes (1)	yes (1)	yes (1)	approx 4,600	yes	yes	yes	Boat survey data have not established a significant recovery, a large proportion of prime-age animals are still being found on beaches.
River otters	unknown	unknown	yes (4)	approx. 12	yes	unknown	unknown	Some sub-lethal indicators of possible oil exposure remain in 1991.
Killer whales	no	yes (3)**	yes (3)**	13	yes	unknown	unknown	The A13 pod has grown by 2 whales since 1990.
Common murres	yes (1)***	yes (1)****	yes (1)	175,000 to 300,000	no	yes	yes	Breeding is still inhibited in some colonies in the Gulf of Alaska.
Marbled murrelets	no	yes (1)	yes (1)	8,000 to 12,000	yes	?	?	
Black oyster catchers	yes (4)	?	yes (3)	approx 120	yes	yes	unknown	Differences in egg sizes between oiled and unoled areas persist.
Bald eagles	yes (4)	unknown	yes (3)	150+	yes	yes	unknown	Population estimates unaffected and productivity returned to normal in 1990.
Pigeon guillemots	no	probably	yes (1)	approx 3,000	yes	yes	unknown	Unknown.
Harlequin ducks	yes	probably	yes (2,4)	approx 1,000	yes	yes	unknown	Still very little breeding in the spill areas of PWS.
Other sea birds	yes	yes	yes	375,000 to 435,000	yes	yes	yes	In general total sea bird recovery has not been measured.
Pink salmon	yes (1)	yes (4)	no (5)	not detected	yes	unknown	unknown	Egg mortality continues to be high in oiled streams of PWS in 1991.
Sockeye salmon	yes (1)	yes (1)	unknown	unknown	no	yes	no	Smolt survival continues to be poor in the Kenai River system as

P.2/3

3 b

SEP 29 '92 09:45 OOSDAR

Table XX. Summary of injury from Exxon Valdez oil spill.

RESOURCE	INJURY (uncertainty 1-5) ^a			geographic extent of injury			Degree of recovery (1991)††	
	eggs/young	subadults	adults	Total Adult Mortality	PWS Kenai Peninsula/ Kodiak Island	Alaskan Peninsula		
							a result of the overescapements in 1987, 1988, and 1989.	
Pacific herring	yes (2)	unknown	unknown	unknown	yes	unknown	unknown	Effects on eggs and larvae were evident in 1989 and to a lesser extent in 1990. In 1991 there were no differences between oiled and unoled areas.
Rockfish	no	unknown	yes (3,4)	greater than 5 individuals	yes	unknown	unknown	Unknown.
Dolly varden	no	no	yes (2)†	unknown	yes	unknown	unknown	In 1991 differences in survival between anadromous adult populations in the oiled and unoled areas persisted despite the decrease in exposure indicators.
Cutthroat trout	no	no	yes (2)	unknown	yes	unknown	unknown	In 1991 differences in survival between anadromous adult populations in the oiled and unoled areas persisted despite the decrease in exposure indicators.
Intertidal organisms / communities	yes (1)	yes (1)	yes (1)	not calculated	yes	yes	yes	Upper intertidal zone has not yet recovered.
Subtidal communities	unknown	yes (2)	yes (2)	not calculated	yes	unknown	unknown	Recovery is not known, but differences between oiled and unoled areas established in 1990.

^a 1. dead organisms found or measurable affect on populations with comparisons to pre-spill conditions, little doubt of injury

2. Few dead organisms found after spill, or unmeasurable difference in populations between oiled and unoled areas

3. A small number of adults killed, no effects determined on population

4. Significant exposure to hydrocarbons and some sub-lethal effects determined, but no effects established on population.

5. Significant exposure to hydrocarbons but no effects established

†† The coincidence of 13 whales missing from AB at the time of the spill is very suggestive of an effect, but there is also much evidence to suggest that they could not have been killed by the spill.

*** The loss of eggs was due to poor reproductive success in affected colonies, such as those on the Barren Islands in 1989-1992.

††† The carcasses have not been aged but it is thought that at least some sub-adults were affected by the spill.

† Differences have been measured in the rate of return of tagged fish to oiled and unoled streams in 1990 and 1991.

††† Data from the 1992 field season has not been evaluated in most cases.

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
OIL SPILL RESTORATION OFFICE

TO: RPWG

DATE: October 5, 1992

FROM: Bob Loeffler

TELE: 278-8012

FAX: 276-7178

SUBJECT: RPWG Schedule thru October 21

John Strand asked me to write-up and distribute RPWG's schedule for the next two weeks. Below are the meetings and deadlines we've talked about.

WEEK OF OCTOBER 5TH

Tuesday. RPWG meeting 10:00 AM-? (early afternoon?)
See Agenda (attached).

Wednesday. Written comments due to John Strand on Bob Spies injury table.

WEEK OF OCTOBER 12TH

Monday AM. Options write-ups due. Black book and draft options summary.
(Assignments are on the RPWG blackboard.)

Wednesday. For your information only (nothing due for most RPWG members).
Package of info will be sent (DHL) to peer reviewers including Database ratings (at least the ratings for their species of interest), criteria and definitions, options write-up (mostly summaries, except for a few complex options), and a brief description of the process.

Wednesday 10:00 AM. RPWG meeting. Follow-up to 10/6 alternatives meeting.
Product: tentative draft alternatives. (We didn't set a time for this meeting. If this time is *not* OK, please myself or John know ASAP.)

WEEK OF OCTOBER 19TH

Monday, Tuesday, all day; and possibly Wednesday, 1/2 day. Meeting with Peer Reviewers to discuss database system and ratings.

**draft AGENDA RPWG Meeting
for October 6, 1992
10:00 AM**

Discuss Sorting and Alternatives.

Product: focusing in on group alternatives. Perhaps some one to run some tentative group sortings for alternatives.

Other Information.

1. Recent contact with Sharon Saari (Walcoff) -- Ray/John
2. Update on Editor/Writer contract -- John
3. Update on Peer review meeting scheduled Oct 19-21 -- John
4. Possible TC/RT/RPWG meeting to discuss Restoration Plan -- John
5. Update on first PAG meeting (RPWG on agenda) -- Sandy/Bob