RPWG
E I

RPWG Meeting
November 18, 1991

Attendees:

Art Weiner
Sandy Rabinowitch
Ken Rice
Stan Senner
Karen Klinge
Mark Brodersen
Barbara Iseah

Teleconference:

Ruth Yender
John Strand

The following items were distributed:

Agenda
Restoration Matrices Status
Group Discussion Items
Factors for Evaluating Science Studies

Note: meeting minutes for first half of day lost

TNC is flying people to Anchorage to incorporate any comments on Saturday. A suggestion was made that we do the review together and invite Steve Planchon to review with us. There is a meeting in January.

Note: RPWG members will get together Wednesday afternoon for conference call on TNC document.

Jones and Stokes are working on the foldout and will get back to us for clarification and will fax back the text we requested rewritten.

John will check with Steve Zimmer to find out what the restrictions are for harvest of marine mammals.

RPWG Factors for Evaluation of 1992 Restoration Science Studies

A. Documentation of probable consequential injury due to the oil spill

B. Is the study reasonable to carry out considering the expectations for natural recovery

C. Restoration activity or endpoint that may result from this study

D. Need for the proposed study with respect to the ability to carry out future restoration activities

E. Technical feasibility of the proposed study, experience of the study team and the prospect for successfully contributing to restoration objectives

F. Importance of conducting the study in 1992 (i.e., would delay beyond 1992 result in a lost opportunity?)

G. The cost of a proposed study relative to the degree of injury or to the cost of the potential restoration endpoint

Need policy decision that the two sets of criteria for criminal and civil settlements will be different. The standards in the end may be the same, but we recognize they are not identical.

What do we need to do in the way of a RPWG review of the proposals?

There will be one sieve, Management Team/RPWG. Barbara and Stan will come up with some headers for a form. There may be a RPWG meeting on the 26th. Meeting adjourned until 8:30 tomorrow.

RPWG
3 I

Restoration Planning Work Group
18-19 November 1991

Tentative Agenda

Monday, 0900 h

(1) Review of Restoration Options

- decisions on specific options (Karen/Barbara)
- process for identifying endpoints/options for more resources and services

(2) Economics and Restoration

- what have we learned?
- next steps regarding ADF&G proposals

(3) Development of Proposed Oil Year 4 Work Plan

(4) Status of/Process for Reviewing Restoration Science Proposals

- Criteria for review of proposals
- RPWG review
- NRDA (MT/RPWG) review in December

(5) Updates on Various Items (marine habitat review, etc.)

Tuesday, 0900 h

(5) Meeting with Pam Brodie and Alan Phipps

(6) Restoration Framework document

- content
- assignments

(7) Restoration Planning/Technical Capabilities needed to Implement Settlement

RPWG
3 I

Restoration Matrices Status....18 Nov. 1991

SPECIES COMPLETED	"MUST COMPLETE"	"UNCERTAIN"
Sea Otter	Pigeon Guillemot	Spot Shrimp
Harbor Seal	Bald Eagle	Crabs
Common Murre	Sockeye Salmon	Killer Whale
Marbled Murrelet	Black Oystercatcher	
Dolly/C-T Trout	Pacific Herring	
Pink Salmon	Recreation	
	Subsistence	
	Cultural Resources	
	Coastal Habitat	

RWG
B I

GROUP DISCUSSION ITEMS

SPECIES	OPTION	COMMENT
Pink Salmon	F	Criteria B - may be applicable to injured streams Criteria E - expensive to protect individual streams from predators (Ken) **Option F: Control predators on fish eggs and juveniles**
Pink Salmon	Q	negligible; should be n/a, most salmon are coastal (John) **Option Q: Restrict high-seas interceptions to provide more control over fish mortality**
Pink Salmon	U	Criteria B - not a true restoration option for the resource; this is directed more towards the market Recommendation - the perception of oiled fish does not appear to be affected the market (Ken) **Option U: Increase public relations and quality assurance efforts to redevelop damaged markets**
Marbled Murrelet	O	maybe applicable during molting (?) (Karen) **Option O: Minimize disturbance from tourists, fishermen, researchers, and others through public eduction and law enforcement**
Common Murre	I	Comments - should we highlight this for education? (Karen) **Option I: Restrict hunting and reduce illegal "taking" of eggs and adult birds**
Common Murre	L	Criteria E - extremely expensive; Comments thought we eliminated high seas drift net buyout from serious consideration (Ken) Recommendation - n/a; too few taken;

		benefits don't outweigh the costs (John) **Option L: Eliminate high-seas gillnet fisheries and the resulting incidental mortality to birds**
Sea Otter	L	Comments - Siniff's 10/2/91 memo addresses this option. He considers it a reasonable idea but probably impractical (Ken) Marine Mammal Act cannot restrict mandated harvest by subsistence of otters; must be a voluntary agreement with Natives; possibly n/a (John) **Option L: Restrict/eliminate legal harvest of marine/terrestrial mammals**
Harlequin Duck	E	Criteria B - if prey base is the problem, augmenting production doesn't help; nest sites do not appear to be limiting factor. Recommendation - suggests we change this to reject (Ken) **Option E: Provide artificial nest sites/substrates to enhance productivity or redirect nest activities to alternative sites** **Option L: Restrict/eliminate legal harvest of marine/terrestrial mammals**

List compiled on 11/14/91. (Senner, Klinge, Iseah)

CRITERIA

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

H. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

I. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

J. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

---

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPWG
3I

Reference No.: PS-F
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Pink Salmon

Option F

Control predators on fish eggs and juveniles

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

N/A

B. Technical feasibility

On a broad scale, hard to do; feasible on a local scale to control or reduce selected predators

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

Conflicts directly with restoration of other injured species (e.g., Harlequin Duck and Dolly Varden

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

May not be consistent with applicable state and federal laws

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

None

Recommendation

Reject

Comments

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPwb
5

Reference No.: PS-Q
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Pink Salmon

Option Q

Restrict high-seas interceptions to provide more control over fish mortality

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

Recommendation

Further review

Comments

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPWG
B

Reference No.: PS-U
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Pink Salmon

Option U

Increase public relations and quality assurance efforts to redevelop damaged markets

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

Recommendation

N/A

Comments

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPWG
B

Reference No.: MM-O
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Marbled Murrelet

Option O

Minimize disturbance from tourists, fishermen, researchers, and others through public education and law enforcement

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

Recommendation

N/A

Comments

---

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPWG
B

Reference No.: CM-I
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Common Murre

Option I

Restrict hunting and reduce illegal "taking" of eggs and adult birds

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

Recommendation

N/A

Comments

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

TPWG
易工

Reference No.: CM-L
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Common Murre

Option L

eliminate high-seas gillnet fisheries and the resulting incidental mortality to birds

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

Recommendation

Further review (obtain memorandum from Kent Wohl at USFWS)

Comments

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPWG
B

Reference No.: SO-L
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Sea Otter

Option L (grouped with K & M)

Restrict/eliminate legal harvest of marine/terrestrial mammals

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

Recommendation

Further study

Comments

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPWG
EI

Reference No.: HD-E
Date: 9/10-11/91

Attorney/Client Communication
Attorney Work Product
Privileged/Confidential

Evaluation of Restoration Options

Species Harlequin Duck

Option E

Provide artificial nest sites/substrates to enhance productivity or redirect nest activities to alternative sites

Application of Criteria

A. The results of any actual or planned response actions

B. Technical feasibility

C. Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed action, including long-term and indirect impacts

D. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

E. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits

F. Cost-effectiveness

G. Consistency with applicable federal and state laws and policies

H. Acquisition of equivalent land for public (federal/state) management, where restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of land is not possible

I. Degree to which proposed actions benefit more than one species, communities, or ecosystems[1]

Recommendation

Further review

Comments

[1]Not from NRDA regulations as currently proposed.

RPWG
I

Privileged and Confidential
Attorney Work Product
Attorney-Client Communication

Via Fax

MEMORANDUM **8 NOVEMBER 1991**

TO: RPWG
FR: Stan Senner

RE: Factors for Evaluating Science Studies

Here are the factors we used for evaluating science studies for the 1991 field season. Other than changing the year 1991 to 1992 in item F, do we need to change or add anything as we consider the 1992 science program?

This should be an agenda item for the next RPWG meeting. If you have comments before then and want to scribble them on this sheet, please fax it back to me by Friday morning, 15 November.

My own view is that we should change as little as possible. We do not have time to do more.

attachment: 1 of 1 page

cc: Alex Swiderski/Donna McCready
David Street
Gina Belt
Karen Klinge

6/11/91

Factors for Evaluation of Science Studies

A. Documentation of probable injury caused by the oil spill

B. Estimated time needed for natural recovery

C. Restoration activity or endpoint that may result from this study

D. Need for the proposed study with respect to the ability to carry out future restoration activities

E. Technical feasibility of the proposed study and the prospect for success

F. Importance of conducting the study in 1991 (i.e., Would delay beyond 1991 result in a lost opportunity?)

G. The cost of a proposed study relative to the degree of injury or to the cost of the potential restoration outcome.