

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
October 21, 1992
1:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES

Carol Gorbics
Ray Thompson
Bob Loeffler
Mark Fraker
Sandy Rabinowitch
John Strand
Veronica Gilbert
Chris Swenson
Karen Klinge

HPWG MEETING

Marty provided RPWG with copies of the Habitat Protection Work Group meeting notes. RPWG is on their agenda for October 23, 1992 at 2:00 P.M. John suggested sending a subset of RPWG to the meeting and asked how many members would be interested in going. The majority stated they were interested in attending. John asked for a volunteer to lead the discussion in his absence. Veronica stated it would be useful to find out HPWG's expectations of the Restoration Plan. Another issue is if HPWG and the RT will reach a decision on what the threshold criteria includes before the plan is completed. Veronica questioned if the habitat protection chapter will be a stand alone chapter. Karen stated she questioned whether we are ready to take our 7 alternatives to the other groups. Ray suggested we give examples without getting into the specifics. Bob stated it is very important that they have substantive variation in what is being done. Veronica doesn't think HPWG has thought a great deal about variation in general but is only developing the process. One alternative could place greater emphasis on certainty. Carol stated there has been a fundamental shift in simplicity versus complexity. Bob stated the difference is in terms of detail in information, such as cost and geography. Bob stated the process HPWG is working on is fine. Carol feels the task is to come out with a plan by April. The product could be refined with more information; however, because of the time frame, there will be some shortcomings in the plan. Carol stated that solicitations wouldn't be who wants to sell the land but who has the land to sell. Veronica stated that HPWG should clarify if they are looking for a certain direction from the plan. The notion of allocation should also be faced. Carol stated that the peer reviewers gave their split when this came up in her meeting. Ray stated that we need to be careful because land acquisition is not an end product but a means to accomplish restoration. HPWG appears to have a lot of focus on public support. Veronica feels HPWG has looked at (1) how to use the \$20

million and (2) how to develop a credible process. RPWG is asking in addition to that what are they looking for in the plan to give those activities some guidance. Ray stated HPWG can't set a precedent just by buying something because there is a willing seller. They must be sensible. John questioned how much we would tell HPWG on Friday. Veronica stated that the process is very specific and stands on its own. Another version would be certain things being considered, such as land acquisition, may vary from species to species. Bob stated that this makes sense in terms of species purchases but there is still recreation. Veronica stated that recreation is data-poor. Carol stated that most of the species information is data-poor. One peer reviewer stated that we should not identify coastal habitat based on species needs. Veronica stated the real question is are we looking for a single process or pair of processes, threat vs. comprehensive, without regard to alternatives or is HPWG looking for guidance from the plan in directing their efforts. We then make sure this is intelligently reflected to do the most effective things at the lowest cost. Carol stated regarding birds, the peer reviewers believe the recovery would be unchanged aided or unaided. It acknowledges that you can't affect the rate or degree of recovery by buying land. Chris stated that this depends on how you define natural recovery. Veronica asked if RPWG could construct alternatives so that Option 37 is included across the board in each alternative, except the no action alternative; or are we looking for some other guidance from the plan. Are we structuring the alternatives for this? Karen thought we used the database to query different resources and end up with manipulation and habitat acquisition options. After the first suite is done, you look at an ecosystem approach. The recommendation would suggest the importance of habitat acquisition. HPWG's process is then applied to those target areas. Ray stated that he doesn't know if anything could be done if it was not in the final Restoration Plan. Habitat Protection couldn't move ahead unless it had the go ahead from the process. Veronica stated these discussions are a way of making sure everyone agrees. John suggested this agenda item should be discussed tomorrow to have some consolidated view before meeting with HPWG on Friday. Bob stated he looked at this from the aspect of what will the public want to comment on, such as which agency manages the land. There is a whole tool box of purchase tools. Veronica stated The Nature Conservancy advocates not disclosing this tool box information to the public because it ties your hands. Veronica stated that Bob's concerns are fundamental issues being discussed by HPWG. John asked Veronica what HPWG is doing with respect to geographic specificity. Veronica stated they are looking at 4 sites. What HPWG is providing in December may be close, but may be different from what they present in the plan as a whole. Carol questioned where we are going with this discussion. John suggested a smaller group could meet tomorrow to lay out some ideas for Friday's meeting with HPWG. Veronica stated RPWG is close but needs to lay out specific ideas. John cautioned RPWG to speak as one voice.

DATA GAPS

Regarding marine mammal data gaps, Ken Reckhow proposed doing a telephone meeting with structured questions regarding population effects.

PEER REVIEW MEETING

Carol suggested the moderator and note taker get together to finalize the notes from the concurrent sessions. Notes will be forwarded to Barbara to compile into one document. Karen suggested the notes include a page of text on key points and problems.

John stated that the meetings were really good and useful information came out of them.

SCHEDULE

John asked when would be a good time to get back together. A presentation for the PAG has to be completed. Also detailed outlines are due on the 30th. Carol questioned the need to hurry the notes from the concurrent sessions. Karen stated RPWG needs to assess the information soon. Carol disagreed and stated that there will probably be a tremendous amount of changes and doesn't think it is necessary to do the notes immediately. Karen stated that this information might help her in thinking about writing alternatives. Carol stated that the outline has to be done based on what information we have today. John stated that RPWG has a lot on their plate right now. There are some priorities such as the HPWG meeting, the PAG meeting, and the outline. John stated that RPWG can work on their meeting notes and maybe Tuesday or Wednesday of the following week forward those to Barbara for compilation. There was some advice from the peer reviewers that translates into recommendations. Someone needs to synthesize this information so that the group can pass judgment. RPWG will meet two weeks from today. John and Karen will synthesize this information to provide to the group before the next RPWG meeting.

John asked if Bob would attend the PAG meeting for RPWG's discussion item. They will talk on Tuesday and Wednesday to polish their presentation and any visuals. John asked if anyone would like to work with he and Bob on this presentation. John stated that Marty will try to accommodate giving RPWG more time on the agenda for the PAG meeting.

Veronica questioned whether the summary of injury can still be used. John suggested as the notes are done, some of the recommendations could be included. Carol will get the format for the table out tomorrow to fill in the blanks for injury on Wednesday. Sandy suggested that Bob's notes from the services discussion will help the discussion of injury.

Because of the number of items on RPWG's plate, there will be a two day meeting, November 3-4.

John received a letter from DOI suggesting changes to the annotated outline and requesting a detailed outline be sent to the Trustee Council for approval. Sandy suggested everyone look at the suggested outline to determine if it has any useful input. John will forward copies of the DOI outline to the authors of the Draft Restoration Plan for their potential use.

Barbara brought to RPWG's attention that an EIS scoping meeting is scheduled for November 4. Although it coincides with a RPWG meeting, someone from RPWG may attend the EIS scoping meeting.

MONITORING PLANNING

John stated the responses to questions asked of the two candidate contractors have been received and a time needs to be scheduled to review them. The group that scored the original proposals will meet for a rescoring of the responses. John suggested that CACI staff could make copies of the responses for each scorer and a teleconference be held for discussion. The conference call will be at 8:00 on Friday, October 23rd.

RPWG meeting was adjourned at 3:15.