

A POSSIBLE DRAFT PLAN AND EIS SCHEDULE
(Assuming "Unsynchronized" Plan and EIS)

ASSUMPTIONS

Public Review Times

Spring: April 1 - May 15th (or earlier); all meetings completed during April.
Fall: September 1 - October 15th (or later); all meetings completed after Sept. 15.
No Significant Public Review or Meetings during the Summer

Other Time Requirements.

Collating comments, responding, and making changes based on review requires 2½ months.
If alternatives and a final plan were previously reviewed by the public, collating comments and changes requires 1½ months.
Preparing for publication requires 3 weeks.

SCHEDULE

February 1993	<i>Optional Step: Trustees pick preferred alternative.</i>
March 1993	Draft Plan Published (without EIS)
April 1 - May 15	Public Review of Draft Plan
May 15 - June 30	Collate comments; recommend changes based on comments.
July	TC Meeting to Pick Preferred Alternative (made up from the ones reviewed in the draft plan)
August 15th (Approx)	TC meeting to approve publication of Final Draft Plan and Draft EIS for Publication.
Sept 1 - Oct 15	Public Review of Draft EIS and Final Draft Plan
Oct 15 - November	Analyze comments; recommend changes based on comments.
Early December	Trustee meet to approve Plan & to approve EIS; 30-day review of Plan and EIS begins.
January 1994	30-day comment period ends; collate comments; recommend changes.
February 1994:	Plan adopted.

**RESTORATION TEAM MEETING
DECEMBER 10, 1992
10:00 A.M.**

Attendees

Dave Gibbons
Marty Rutherford
Mark Brodersen
Ken Rice
Kelly Hepler
Byron Morris
LJ Evans
Pam Bergmann
Kathy Chorostecki, NEPA Attorney
Jerome Montague
Bob Loeffler
John Strand
Chris Swenson
Veronica Gilbert

The following items were distributed:

Agenda

Resolution of the Exxon Valdez Settlement Trustee Council
December 12, memo from Kelly Hepler to the Restoration Team
December 7, memo from Bob Loeffler to the Restoration Team
December 10, memo from RPWG to the Restoration Team
Draft Timeline - for 12/10 RT meeting
December 9, memo from Doug Mutter to the Restoration Team
December 10, memo from Dave Gibbons to the Trustee Council
December 8, memo from Curtis McVee to Dave Gibbons
December 10, memo from Ken Rice to Dave Gibbons
December 8, letter from Mary McBurney to Trustee Council
Projects Still Requiring NEPA Compliance - December 10, 1992

AGENDA

1. Symposium update - Kelly Hepler
2. Timeline for Draft Restoration Plan/EIS - Dave Gibbons
3. Minutes of the Restoration Team meetings - Dave Gibbons
4. Review of documents before release to Trustee Council or public - Dave Gibbons
5. Instructions for the preparation of detailed study plans - Jerome Montague
6. Public Participation Memo (10/7/92) - Marty Rutherford
7. PAG involvement with Restoration Team - RT
8. Assumptions and process for the 1994 Work Plan - Dave Gibbons
9. Christmas Potluck
10. Contracting and scheduling of 1994 framework meetings - Bob Spies
11. Summary of projects submitted by the public

12. Time-critical projects/NEPA funding
13. PAG funding request
14. Next RT meeting

The following items were discussed:

COURT PETITION

The second court petition was distributed to Restoration Team members to discuss with their Trustee Council member. Comments are due back to Dave by c.o.b. on December 16.

SYMPOSIUM UPDATE

Kelly Hepler gave a quick overview of where the symposium stands. 91 papers and 21 posters have been submitted for presentation. The eight major topics of damage assessment/ restoration are covered. John Michelle will be a keynote speaker. The Governor has some scheduling conflicts but will try to make it. Attempts are being made to contact Vice-President elect Al Gore regarding participation. The operations for the symposium look very good and many tasks have been passed on to LJ. Kelly prepared a memo which attempts to summarize some alternatives that have been discussed by the editorial committee. There are basically three vehicles for publishing: 1) an established journal, 2) peer review process, and 3) the Oil Spill Recovery Institute. The editorial committee feels journals are the best vehicle because of the widespread distribution. The problem is finding a journal which covers all the topics. Bob Spies recommended The Marine Environmental Research. He is an editor of this journal and felt comfortable that this journal could handle all the topics. Pam asked how many full-blown papers would be presented. Kelly stated that only about 35 papers could make it through a stringent peer review process for a journal of this type; however, most people want to publish. The suggested length is 1,200 words. People want to publish but need some direction on where to go. NOAA is thinking about putting together a book to collect all the marine mammal information. If a well known publisher is not used, distribution goes down. Jerome asked if there are examples of publications done by The Marine Environmental Research.

Kelly stated that Spies suggested he talk with the publisher. Jerome had concerns regarding contacting a publisher before a journal has been chosen. He further asked if this is an american journal. Kelly stated it is international. Byron asked about extra printings for the public and asked for information on whether this would be a special edition. Kelly stated that he will get further information on this. Jerome stated the only advantage to doing it ourselves would be speed. Kelly stated the advantages of doing this in house through the peer review process would be speed and less cost; however, he stated that this group has been criticized as a good ole boy club in the past and might set

themselves up for more criticism unless independent peer review is used. Byron stated that many journals do peer review, but there is no cost associated with it. Kelly stated he has asked if there are any journal which will provide rigorous review and peer review, and he keeps getting the same answer, the journal which Spies is associated with. Marty stated that there may be an appearance of conflict of interest with Spies being involved as an editor if he is being paid. Ken stated if Spies is not an editor of what is published, it may be okay. Mark stated if there is some financial gain involved, then an arm's length relationship may need to be developed. Kelly stated that Spies is nervous about this potential conflict of interest. Marty stated that the Restoration Team needs to speak with Spies further regarding this. Pam stated that people may believe there is a conflict by Spies' association with the journal. Ken asked if this will have an impact on the buy-off by the public of the publication. Mark stated that the peer reviewers will be external. Jerome stated that the easiest way to handle this would be to have Bob not edit the book or be the chief journal editor. The fact that he is on the board should be irrelevant. Mark stated this was the arm's length relationship he had spoken of earlier. Kelly stated he informed the Restoration Team of this conflict issue in case of any future questions by the Trustee Council. Byron proposed that the Restoration Team try to resolve this asap. Ken stated that the third alternative, independent bid, could be taken. Mark stated he supports the journal route if the questions regarding conflict of interest are answered. Dave suggested that the Restoration Team wait until this issue is discussed with Spies before closure is reached. Kelly stated that this symposium will be a very important piece of work and will leave quite a legacy.

TIMELINE FOR DRAFT RESTORATION PLAN/EIS

Dave stated that Bob Loeffler will redraft the December 7, memo re: Schedule: Restoration Plan and EIS and get back to the Restoration Team. John provided a memo dated December 10, which requested that the integrated schedule is not solely a RPWG product. Dave stated that Steve Pennoyer faxed him messages that he wanted to establish some quarterly dates for the Trustee Council meetings. Dave stated he reviewed various timelines and sent the information back to Pennoyer stating that it was from him and was not reviewed by the Restoration Team. Ken Rice provided a draft timeline also. Dave stated the proposal is to use Bob's timeline as a starting point because it integrates Ken's timeline also. Byron stated he wanted to see Ken's timeline for the EIS to see how Bob's integrated timeline was arrived at. Ken stated he met with John, Bob and Mark to get to a final Restoration Plan Trustee Council decision. Within a 30-day time span, the same date was reached.

Bob stated the schedule versions are as follows:

December 7 - after meeting with Ken, Mark and John (integrates EIS

and plan)
December 10 - RPWG only

Marty stated she is concerned people have been told a draft Restoration Plan will come out in March and feels the public will react negatively. Bob suggested using "Draft Restoration Plan with Alternatives" to avoid public conflict. Bob stated it is important to RPWG that the public realize they met their deadline. Dave stated this is also important to the Trustee Council. Bob stated this schedule reflects as fast as RPWG believes it is possible to do. Three weeks is quite fast to collate the expected 300 comments. It will take about a month for RPWG and the Restoration Team to make recommendations. This is extremely fast to get back to the Trustee Council and interest groups. Marty stated this will also be fast to get them to close on something. Assuming the Restoration Team is agreed on July 7, RPWG will know where to go. It takes two to three weeks to publish. The two areas where there is great potential for delay is RPWG and the Restoration Team making decisions and the Restoration Team making a decision in a single shot. Dave stated that publishing can be done over two weeks. Bob stated that you must take into account this is over the Christmas holidays. Byron stated he was confused by having two draft plans. Ken suggested changing the action on July 19, to "approve draft Restoration Plan with preferred alternative." Byron stated there are two draft plans with one 45-day review period and one 60-day review period. Marty stated that the presentation of what is being doing is very important and suggested naming the actions "Draft Restoration Plan with alternatives and Draft Restoration Plan with preferred alternative. Kathy stated the problem will be that you expose the plan to two rounds of public comments. Mark stated that the first round deals with a suite of alternatives. Bob stated that you have to get out the key elements to the public.

Marty suggested that for text purposes on July 19 and August 6-13 it will be referred to as "Draft Restoration Plan with preferred alternatives."

Byron stated that normally when a proposed action and an EIS are done, something is prepared for the public to scope. Ken stated that the Framework Document was the scoping document. Kathy asked if there were formal scoping meetings in the past. Dave stated there were. Ken stated that a notice of intent went out and identified a preliminary set of options. Community meetings were held discussing this and other topics. An open house was also held with minimal attendance. Ken feels that was the scoping which leads up to the formulation of alternatives. Mark stated that the requirements of scoping were met. Marty stated we are now at the point where we want the public to feel they can have real and significant input. Dave suggested adding the length of the public comment to the timeline for the Trustee Council's clarification.

Marty suggested the following changes and Bob will revise as follows:

5/15-6/7	-collate comments on draft with alternative
6/7	-preliminary DEIS available for internal review
6/7-7/7	-RPWG/RT develop draft based on preliminary DEIS comments
7/7	-Restoration Team recommend preferred alternative to RT
8/6	-Draft Restoration Plan with preferred alternative
12/8	-Trustee Council meet to approve proposed final Restoration Plan and final EIS
12/8-1/2	-print and distribute documents
1/2-2/1	-30 day notification period
February 1994	-record of decision adopted

Bob stated that changes to the draft plan include responses to comments. Byron asked if this is really a comment period. Kathy stated that this is actually a cooling off period. Bob stated that he sees the 30 days as an appeal period. Ken stated that he will talk with Maria regarding the 30-day period. Kathy stated that you can't formally adopt the final plan for 30 days.

John asked how the timeline will be presented to the Trustee Council. RPWG's activities from now to March 15 will be presented by John at tomorrow's Trustee Council meeting, and Dave will present the timeline after March 15. Bob will prepare a memo containing a schedule which accommodates both the RPWG and EIS needs. The memo will be from the chairs through Dave to the Trustee Council.

Jerome questioned why the schedule continues to be pushed back and felt the EIS could be done by March. Ken stated that this could not be done because the EIS team has not received the alternatives. John stated that the database is being revised per the suggestions of peer reviewers. The alternatives should be fleshed out by early January. The alternative themes have been given to the EIS team. Jerome asked if key deliverables were outlined in the contract with the EIS team. Ken stated that the complexity and the level of detail needed in the plan were not understood. Bob stated that agreement on the Summary of Injury has not been reached with the Chief Scientist. Marty stated that the Restoration Team has to shoulder responsibility for the schedule because they have paid limited attention to what RPWG has done. Mark stated that RPWG came to the Restoration Team on numerous occasions but was shut out. Byron stated the EIS issue was what complicated matters. Ken stated there are some key notes where if something isn't provided, then something will slip. Jerome asked what the Restoration Team will do to prevent the same thing from happening on other things. Dave stated that part of the problem was that RPWG was not fully staffed until recently. John stated that there is no precedent for any of this and we are feeling our way through. Ken stated it is

important to adequately explain what we will have and when, and why the final Restoration Plan schedule, which was agreed to, will not be met. Dave suggested each Restoration Team member run through the schedule with their Trustee Council member prior to tomorrow. John stated there is also some delay based on sequence. Byron stated he lays sole blame on NEPA requirement compliance. Bob will provide a revised schedule to the Restoration Team this afternoon. Dave stated this schedule will be presented tomorrow as part of the restoration package.

Bob made revisions to the schedule for the Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement and brought it back to the Restoration Team for review. Dave suggested the following revisions:

- the DEIS will be available on or before June 7 for internal review
- the schedule has the potential to slip
- some interest groups may not be readily available
- ~~"there is great potential slipping the schedule at this step"~~ was deleted because of redundancy
- the last two sentences in the third bullet were deleted
- the late February 1993, July 19, December 8, February 1994 lines were bolded (Trustee Council decision points)
- ~~"great"~~ was deleted from footnote

Note: Department of Interior's representative on the Restoration Team abstained from making any comments or recommendations on the schedule.

Mark suggested explaining why there may be some problems with slipping in the schedule. The above suggestions were forwarded to Bob Loeffler for revisions and will be returned to the Restoration Team for a final review.

PAG FUNDING

Pam stated that additional funding is needed to facilitate the PAG's January meeting. There is only \$7,000 left from the initial request to the court. The federal agencies are deficit spending and will not approve any transfer of funds to cover PAG costs. Pam stated \$6,800.00 needs to be shifted. Dave stated that the state agencies are legally in the same situation as the federal agencies. Ken asked what are the consequences. Pam stated the PAG will not hold their January meeting. Mark stated he is curious why Interior is drawing the line now at deficit spending. Pam stated the lead budget officer in Washington stated Interior doesn't have the money. Pam further stated that Doug's memo does not address the funding crisis. The problem is there are PAG subgroup meetings in December. Pam stated that money has to be in the accounts to sign the travel authorizations. Byron suggested looking at the first seven-month budget to see if any funding is available. Marty

stated that funding for peer review and the Chief Scientist contracts are committed. Byron stated he is concerned about the subgroups being formed with no approval to do so. Marty pointed out that Interior told the PAG at the last meeting that funding for subgroups didn't seem to be a problem. Dave stated that possibly the subgroup meetings could be facilitated through teleconferencing.

SPIES PRESENTATION

Pam had requested that Carol Gorbics and Ted Birkedal attend this afternoon's meeting because of specific project knowledge during Bob Spies' presentation on agency contracts; however, Dave stated that presentation will be postponed due to a delay in his flight.

PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE PUBLIC

Dave stated the Trustee Council requested a list of the projects suggested by the public. Dave polled each Restoration Team member to determine if their Trustee Council member had requested information on projects suggested by the public.

Dave will ascertain if there are any projects the Trustee Council members would like to remove from the 1993 package based on public comment. He will also ask the Trustee Council to approve a package subject to input by the Public Advisory Group by early January. A list of projects without NEPA compliance will be prepared. Dave stated the list of those without NEPA compliance should be easy to prepare, and about eight have been identified.

Projects Still Requiring NEPA Compliance

<u>Lead Federal Agency</u>	<u>Funding Needed</u>
USDA	
93024 - Coghill Lake (needs EA)	\$ 0
93016 - Chenega Bay Chinook & Silver Salmon (needs EA; ADF&G)	\$ 5,000
93032 - Pink and Cold Creek Pink Salmon Restoration (needs EA; ADF&G)	\$ 5,000
NOAA	
93019 - Chugach Mariculture Project (needs EA; ADF&G)	\$ 30,000
93030 - Red Lake Restoration (needs EA; ADF&G)	\$ 8,000
93031 - Red Lake Mitigation for Red Salmon Fishery (needs EA; ADF&G)	\$ 15,000
93038 - Shoreline Assessment (needs EA; ADEC)	\$ 0
93046 - Harbor Seals (needs EA; ADF&G)	\$ 3,000
FWS	
93011 - Develop Harvest Guidelines to Aid Restoration of River Otters and Harlequin Ducks (categorical exclusion; no funds)	\$ 0
93026 - Fort Richardson Hatchery Water Pipeline (\$70K (ADF&G) and \$14K (FWS) for EA only; \$200K (ADF&G) and \$40K (FWS) for EIS)	\$ 84,000 or \$240,000

TIME CRITICAL PROJECTS

Dave stated these projects will be handled by individual Restoration Team members.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00.

**RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
DECEMBER 9, 1992
1:15 P.M.**

Attendees

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

The following items were distributed:

A Possible Draft Plan and EIS Schedule
12/7 memo re: Preferred Alternative, Proposed Action and Schedule
Changes: EIS & Plan

Proposed Agenda

1. Long-term (post March) Schedule
2. Status of Tasks
 - Cost Information
 - Options Assessment
 - Geo. Dist.
 - Rec. Key Inf. Interviews
 - Rewrite Services
 - Subsistence
 - Commercial
 - Archaeology
 - Wilderness/Intrinsic Value
 - Monitoring
 - Endowment
 - Injury
 - Summary Table
 - Bob Spies Draft
 - Recompile
3. Special Designation
4. Ecosystem Database

SCHEDULE

Bob discussed a possible draft plan and EIS schedule. Sandy agreed that RPWG should develop their best estimate of a schedule. Veronica stated that the Restoration Team needs to communicate to RPWG if they have a hard and fast milestone and also the difference between a deadline and a target date. Carol stated that any schedule given to the Restoration Team and Trustee Council should note their review time so that they will know the critical path.

Veronica suggested assigning a person to explain key elements in the outline as they evolve. Karen agreed that this would be a good idea to get draft information out sooner rather than later.

Karen asked if Steven Levi is ready to begin work. Bob stated "he can change the sentence but he can't provide the thought." Veronica suggested doing some kind of write up dealing with prevention and stating while it is not being addressed in this plan, it is extremely important and the Trustee Council will continue to monitor prevention. Veronica and Chris will work on this. Chris stated it could go into the scope of the settlement section.

Veronica stated she is concerned we are accepting the onus of delaying the EIS. Bob diagramed the following Agriculture scoping meeting schedule:

		Plan	EIS
Meetings	Spring	1) Alternatives	
No	Summer	2) Draft Plan	Draft EIS
?	Fall	3) Final Plan	Final EIS

Carol stated that the meetings are not legally required. John asked what is the best schedule for the Restoration Plan. Bob stated you take out the word draft on August 15. In November the plan is adopted.

Carol stated she will be committed to another project in April, May and September, which will be during the public review period. The project is a series of classes in association with long-term assignments. Carol stated she could assign Karen or Cathy to do her tasks in her absence.

Bob will prepare a memo to the RT to go with the draft plan and EIS schedule. John stated that whoever wants to attend the RT meeting tomorrow is welcome to come.

Bob requested that RPWG members give a summary of their status on the following projects:

INJURY SUMMARY

Carol stated that she has received RPWG comments on the injury table and will be working on those today and tomorrow. It will go out to RPWG first thing next week and then to the RT. Carol stated she will highlight any conflicts. Bob stated that he talked with Bob Spies and he has completed the text for marine and terrestrial mammals. RPWG probably won't get everything until after Christmas. Sandy stated that the write up should drive the table.

Carol suggested adding that sublethal effects have been noticed. Bob stated that there is confusion over whether exposure is initial or continued. Mark asked if we were thinking that chronic and sublethal were the same thing when the table was put together. Carol stated "no". John stated that chronic deals more with the timing of injury (protracted exposure) and sublethal deals with the targeted effect. Carol suggested under description of injury have sublethal effects (yes or no). Sublethal means there was some physiological or biochemical change.

Veronica raised the issue of two columns showing injured and not injured. Mark stated there is a lot of gray area in separating injured and not injured. Carol agreed with Mark and stated we are trying to portray the results of NRDA studies. Carol stated how can you evaluate if one species was harmed any more than another. Sandy suggested listing the species in alphabetical order. Veronica suggested having a table of those species injured at a population level. Bob stated that we should use the same language in the alternatives and the tables for consistency so that the public will understand (population level injury after the spill).

COST INFORMATION

Veronica stated the next step is to put together a package for peer review. RPWG comments are requested by Monday. Further peer review might be anticipated for more objective assessment. Veronica will set up a time to discuss the package with RPWG and the peer reviewer. Sandy stated that the term of the settlement runs for 16 years; however, payment runs for 10 years. John asked how long peer review would take. Veronica stated probably a week. Sandy stated he would like to participate in the initial discussion with the peer reviewer. Bob stated the project definitions need to be done; however, this might have to wait until after the key informant interviews for other services are done. Veronica stated we need to wait for peer review on the methodology. Bob stated that at some point the package will need to go to agency principal investigators.

OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

Bob stated that Karen will be finished with the interviews by next Wednesday. John asked about the step of putting the information down into an intelligent product that will go into the computer. Bob stated he is working on this, which should take about a week, and hopes to have a draft before Christmas. John asked if this is a labor intensive job. Bob stated that Barbara will do the data input. John stated that he needs to ask Karen if the information she is obtaining will change anything. Chris stated that it will change the fishery information.

GEO DISTRIBUTION

Bob stated that the EVOS area will be defined. The maps will be

received next Wednesday. Sandy stated that he needs to look at the maps to clarify national park boundaries. Bob stated the area will be divided into units to show where each option will be applied and will be useful for the descriptive geographic assessment.

REWRITE SERVICES

Bob asked for the status of the following option rewrites:

Subsistence - John has gathered information on subsistence which he is reviewing. He will take a look at the injury summary for subsistence. Additional reports are being sent. Chris is working on three candidate subsistence options.

Commercial - Chris stated that based on the outcome of Karen's interviews, some of the options will be rewritten before Christmas.

Archaeology - Sandy has gathered the source data. He has been turned down by Judy Bittner to participate in the writing. Someone on the Park Service staff may participate in writing this.

Monitoring - John stated that the contract with Parametrix should be signed tomorrow and they will be up and running soon. John has rewritten the Memorandum of Understanding and forwarded it to DEC on disk. David Bruce can run this through his agency. The contract will be funded at \$129,258, of which \$70,000 has been provided by EPA and NOAA. The remainder of \$59,258 will come from DEC.

Wilderness/Intrinsic Value - Sandy stated that he can try to write this option but may not have any more to write about since April. Bob stated that the key informant interviews may provide some useful data. Sandy stated when it will be written depends on when the interview information will be provided. Sandy stated that a page or two can be expected in early January.

Endowment - Bob stated that the Endowment Work Group has a draft which will be ready for RPWG's review by next week. It has been boiled down to three endowment proposals.

Special Designations - Chris is shooting for mid-January. He needs to talk with Carol and Sandy. Sandy and John will be consulted for information on sanctuaries.

ECOSYSTEM EFFECTS

Chris will be working ecosystem effects into the database.

MEETING

Bob suggested scheduling a meeting to review RPWG's status and understanding of where we are before Christmas. December 17, was

suggested as a meeting date; however, Bob will check with other RPWG members regarding their availability.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00.

A POSSIBLE DRAFT PLAN AND EIS SCHEDULE
(Assuming "Unsynchronized" Plan and EIS)

ASSUMPTIONS**Public Review Times**

Spring: April 1 - May 15th (or earlier); all meetings completed during April.

Fall: September 1 - October 15th (or later); all meetings completed after Sept. 15.

No Significant Public Review or Meetings during the Summer

Other Time Requirements.

Collating comments, responding, and making changes based on review requires 2½ months.

If alternatives and a final plan were previously reviewed by the public, collating comments and changes requires 1½ months.

Preparing for publication requires 3 weeks.

SCHEDULE

February 1993	<i>Optional Step: Trustees pick preferred alternative.</i>
March 1993	Draft Plan Published (without EIS)
April 1 - May 15	Public Review of Draft Plan
May 15 - June 30	Collate comments; recommend changes based on comments.
July	TC Meeting to Pick Preferred Alternative (made up from the ones reviewed in the draft plan)
August 15th (Approx)	TC meeting to approve publication of Final Draft Plan and Draft EIS for Publication.
Sept 1 - Oct 15	Public Review of Draft EIS and Final Draft Plan
Oct 15 - November	Analyze comments; recommend changes based on comments.
Early December	Trustee meet to approve Plan & to approve EIS; 30-day review of Plan and EIS begins.
January 1994	30-day comment period ends; collate comments; recommend changes.
February 1994:	Plan adopted.

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL RESTORATION OFFICE

TO: Restoration Team
RPWG

DATE: December 7, 1992

FROM: ~~Bob Loeffler~~

TELE: 278-8012

FAX: 276-7178

SUBJECT: Preferred Alternative, Proposed Action, and Schedule Changes: EIS & Plan

At the December 3rd RT/RPWG meeting, the RT deadlocked on two apparently linked issues: Should the Trustee pick a preferred alternative (proposed action, draft decision)? Is an additional scoping process required for the EIS? I was asked to outline the schedule for the restoration plan and EIS, and show how the answers to these questions influence it.

- 1. If the Trustees pick a preferred alternative before the March meetings, does it speed up the schedule?** No. Detailed alternatives will be available for Trustee review in January. If the Trustees can pick a preferred alternative before the end of February, then picking a preferred alternative does not either speed up or delay the schedule. The attached schedule shows an optional step in which the Trustees pick a preferred alternative if they so desire.
- 2. The draft Plan will be published March 24th. Does the schedule change if the draft EIS is not ready at the same time?** Yes. Two periods of public review are required for the plan: draft and final. Two are required for the EIS: draft and final. If the two processes are not synchronized, then effectively three review periods are required: 1) draft plan; 2) (draft) final plan & draft EIS; and 3) Final Plan & Final EIS.

	<u>Original Schedule</u>	<u>"Unsynchronized" Schedule</u>
Period 1 (Spring 1993)	Draft Plan & Draft EIS	Draft Plan
Period 2 (Fall 1993)	Final Plan & Final EIS	draft Final Plan & Draft EIS
Period 3 (December 1993)	--	Final Plan & Final EIS
Plan & EIS adopted	Late Fall (November)	Earl Winter (February)

In the "unsynchronized" schedule, the third review period is curtailed because it is preceded by two other periods of public review. It is a 30-day public review period (possibly longer if it surrounds Christmas) but does not include public meetings. A more detailed version of the schedules accompany this memo.

- 3. Is it possible to speed up the schedule? Yes, but there are costs.**
 - *Summer Public Meetings.* "Resynchronizing" the draft plan and EIS would eliminate the third review period by 1) delaying the draft plan until the draft EIS is ready, and holding the public review in early summer; or 2) reviewing the draft EIS by itself, during the summer, after the spring review of the draft plan. This would allow the final plan & EIS to go forward in the fall. The cost of these suggestions is damage to public involvement from a summer review period.
 - *Publish a very general plan and EIS.* It is the level of detail that is delaying the process. Publishing the sketch alternatives without further detail would allow RPWG to advance the

March deadline and allow a general draft EIS to be published at the same time. The cost is that at this level of generality, the plan may not be useful.

4. **If the Trustees pick a "proposed action," and hold new scoping meetings, does it delay final adoption?** It delays the schedule relative to the original schedule. There is disagreement about whether it delays the schedule relative to the "unsynchronized" schedule. DOI claims that no delay would be required. The USFS believes that it would delay the schedule.
5. **If the plan is not adopted until next year, what can guide the 1994 work plan?**
 - *The March draft plan meetings.* In the proposed schedule, the Trustees pick a preferred alternative based on public comments alternatives presented in the Spring draft plan public meetings. This preferred alternative, though subject to public review in the fall, could guide the 1994 work plan.
 - *A conservative alternative.* Alternative #3 is a very conservative alternative. It focuses on the most severely injured resources and the most effective restoration techniques. The Trustees could choose this alternative as a logical interim policy. It would not foreclose adopting another alternative later on.