

**RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP  
FEBRUARY 10, 1993  
9:30 A.M.**

**ATTENDEES**

Carol Gorbics  
Bob Loeffler  
Veronica Gilbert  
Chris Swenson  
Ray Thompson  
John Strand (via teleconference)

**DROP ALTERNATIVE**

Bob stated during the RT teleconference on Monday, some RT stated the TC was concerned about the complexity of the alternatives and felt RPWG should be prepared to drop an alternative. Bob stated he suggested dropping alternative 1 and that was viewed as not worth pursuing by the RT. Veronica has a proposal relative to dropping an alternative. She reviewed alternatives 3-5 to figure out if we would be raising reasonable policy issues. She suggested the possibility of dropping 3 and 4 as they exist now and substituting an alternative that includes all effective actions for resources affected at a population level. This focuses on two of the key variables we have looked at: should we just do restoration actions for populations affected at the population level or should we do restoration for resources injured sublethally. Any dropping of alternatives will result in losing some distinctions. We would lose the distinction between effective and highly effective. Veronica recommended including all effective actions in both alternatives. It simplifies the distinction of not having to explain the difference between effective and highly effective.

Veronica stated she has an additional suggestion to add before today is over. Carol stated she is convinced by Veronica's suggestion. Her only comment was that within this we need some priority process. Bob stated he was originally skeptical. He listed study options versus do something options and came up with 11 options total. Eight of those are study options which you don't know how effective they are until you do further study. Bob stated he has a problem with reducing the confidence interval. Veronica stated we have to work on simplifying everything including the explanations. Carol suggested another option. She separated the yes and nos by the most restrictive and least restrictive.

Carol diagramed the following:

pop. decline  
resources not recovered  
protect existing use

pop. decline and sub pop. decline  
all resources  
protect, increase or new use

Veronica deleted effectiveness of restoration options and chose to retain alternatives 3 and 5. It could be captured in terms of priority or in the text. Chris stated if we keep effectiveness in as some sort of criteria, it can be used to screen. Chris raised the issue of the need for some guidance. Bob stated this guidance might be budgetary. Veronica stated there is a need to define effectiveness. Bob stated that alternative 5 needs some side boards. Carol stated Chris raised a very important issue and feels RPWG has the power to mold this alternative further by defining effectiveness and budget categories. Bob asked where to put things that are not as tightly linked to injury that are replacement or acquisition out of the spill area. This is a fundamental question which needs to be captured.

Bob developed the following phrases which can go into a table:

rename variable: link to injury  
in alts. 2 and 3 - options targeted on spill area only  
in alt. 5 - option linked to injury throughout Alaska

The key concept is it has to be linked to injury because of the settlement. Carol stated the only unfortunate part to this idea is its closeness to the geographic variable. Veronica proposed allowing for fox eradication in both alts. 3 and 5 because of policy decisions already made by the TC and RT. Bob stated it is misleading to say everything will be considered and keep the budget constraints the way they are. There would be a trade off. Veronica stated her reservation is about the heading, link to injury. Carol suggested using geographic areas. Ray stated the geographic scope gives you further refinement. Bob recommended forming a wording subgroup to develop wording. Chris stated we need to get at populations injured and those that weren't. People will wonder if you are restoring what was injured. Veronica asked if Chris would limit all replacement to alternative 5. Chris stated he would like to. Bob suggested setting up as a trial balloon for tomorrow's meeting with the RT options linked to injury within the spill area and options linked to injury within Alaska. John asked what themes will we use to distinguish between alternatives 3 and 5. Carol stated themes would be: extent of recovery and geographic area. John suggested preparing themes for tomorrow's meeting.

Veronica stated that based on popular and organized opinion, there is the idea that the best thing to do is to prepare for the next spill, such as improving baseline data. Veronica proposed incorporating into this alternative a fund (\$100m) that would be set aside to address research response and prevention, which could lend itself to an endowment. A portion of the money (20% of the settlement) would do whatever is appropriate or legal to prepare ourselves for response or restoration. If we don't deal with it somewhere in the alternatives, we will be forced to address it later. John stated the baseline ecological data that was talked

about has been addressed as part of the monitoring program (third component). Veronica stated the significance is to incorporate this issue into the alternatives as opposed to relegating it to chapter 5. Carol suggested that RPWG considered adding this alternative to the plan. Veronica stated we could demonstrate the consequences of actions. John stated he agreed that spill prevention and preparedness should be in here. Veronica stated she is concerned about being backed into a corner and being made to commit to things we don't want to be. Bob stated he agrees spill prevention is very useful and what the public wants. Bob suggested preparing two versions of alternative 3 (one incorporating spill prevention). Veronica stated she has a fundamental problem with staff recommendations being squelched. She feels it is important for staff recommendations to be a part of the record.

John will forward Veronica a copy of a report from an oil spill in the Savannah estuary where settlement monies were used to enhance spill preparedness.

Bob summarized RPWG's alternative decisions as follows:

- drop all effective actions variable, if necessary
- drop alternative 4, if necessary (alt. 3 looks different if the above actions are done)
- try geographic constraint variable (subgroup will work out the language)
- prepare two budget recommendations for alternative 3 (depending on resolution of spill prevention issues)

Chris stated if we emphasize too much of a mix and match approach, we will get something less than a plan. Veronica suggested that she and Chris work on this more to crystalize ideas on alternatives for the fall back position.

#### **EDITING PROTOCOLS**

Bob prepared and distributed written guidelines for editing procedures. Veronica is the gatekeeper for cost; Sandy for chapter 3 (except resources injury table); Carol - injury. Carol asked for some protocols on font. Bob stated that Steve Levy will work on this. Gatekeepers will tell what changes to make and in what format.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS**

The Public Participation Working Group liaison is Sandy. Ray will assist Sandy. Bob stated he will begin getting the graphic artist to work on formatting and graphics. Chris will assist Bob.

#### **SCHEDULE**

Bob stated RPWG is one and a half weeks behind in writing the key

elements. Sandy will get all his edits to Steve Levy by tomorrow. Steve will get his edits done by Tuesday. Veronica suggested that Steve confer with the authors. Chris requested that RPWG have an opportunity to review another version. By Monday, 2/22, we will have a new chapter 3 ready for RPWG and the RT to review. Veronica suggested having Dave appoint an RT member to work with the gatekeeper on each chapter.

Veronica stated that it is important to interact with the Public Participation Work Group to determine the window for public meetings. Bob stated an introduction is needed which is the skeleton of chapters 1 and 2. Discussion is needed on how to simplify chapter 5.

**RPWG assignments:**

- chapter 1 - (skeleton)
- chapter 2 - (skeleton)
- chapter 3 - RPWG review 2/22
- chapter 4 - can be integrated into skeleton version of chapters 1 and 2 (John and Karen will work on)
- chapter 5 - discussion on how to collapse (2/17 at 8:30) bring ideas; needs to address habitat protection
- appendix A - Carol will be gatekeeper; Chris will assist; has to integrate cost and geographic distribution
- elements of  
chapter 6 - Veronica will work on spill prevention  
habitat  
protection - Art is working on; Chris assigned to coordinate with Art; need a short form
- brochure - Bob will write a draft

Ray suggested extracting from the cost background information. Veronica also suggested review of habitat protection information which Art is working on. John stated that Karen has a master list of authors and responsibilities. Bob suggested explaining annual work plan in chapter 1 in the skeleton version. The purpose of the introduction is to provide context that is missing. Chris will make sure that the habitat protection information is targeted. Effectiveness will be defined somewhere in the plan (possibly chapter 4) for services, habitat and resources. The threshold criteria will be explained in chapter 4. Chris will work with John on the history of RPWG's methodology. Chapter 4 is a historical chapter. Veronica stated considering the review process she is concerned with introducing a lot of new information.

John asked who will lead the discussion at the TC meeting. The package to the TC included the injury table and chapter 5. John suggested Carol could discuss the injury table for resources and Sandy could do services. Bob or Veronica could lead the discussion on chapter 5. Veronica stated it is important to stress to the TC that this is a living, organic product which will change with

different iterations. Bob stated there will be brief peer review of the brochure. Spies will be consulted regarding peer review.

Ray stated that Forest Service will be making a brief statement that the public meetings may not be necessary.

Meeting adjourned at 12:35.

# Restoration Planning Working Group

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL RESTORATION OFFICE

645 "G" Street

Anchorage, Alaska 99501

TO: RPWG

DATE: February 9, 1993

FROM: John Strand & Bob Loeffler

TELE: 278-8012

FAX: 276-7178

SUBJECT: Brief RPWG meeting: **Wednesday 9:30 A.M. to 11:30**

## Proposed Agenda

**1. Drop an Alternative?** At the RT meeting yesterday, the RT asked RPWG to be prepared to answer the question, "If the Trustees feel there is one too many alternatives, what should we do." That is, which alternative to drop or combine. I asked if we could drop alternative #1; they said that one did not count.

Please come prepared to discuss what you think we should do.

We should also be prepared to tell the RT/TC what they are missing by eliminating one proposal. (i.e., the benefits of dropping one are simplicity, we need to tell them what the cost is so they can decide).

**2. Editing Protocols.** Now that we are writing/editing towards publication, Ron and Barbara asked that we adopt standard conventions so we know what is the current file. Here is what they propose (they proposed it to John and Bob and it sounded OK to us).

- Barbara keeps the master file. No one edits it without asking Barbara.
- Barbara will have a folder with the latest version (day and time dated) of each chapter.
- Each chapter has a "gatekeeper." No one gives edits for Barbara to type without permission of the gatekeeper. That way, we know what changes are being made, and one person is responsible for the chapter.
- Sandy is proposed as the gatekeeper for Chapter 3 (no other gatekeeper assigned).

**3. Miscellaneous Stuff**

- Public participation working group liaison
- Graphics liaison

**4. Schedule.** We are now approximately 1½ weeks behind schedule in writing the key elements. We need to discuss schedules for:

Key elements: Appendix A (short forms); Chapter 3; Chapter 5; Elements of Chapter 6

We need to remind people of deadlines for other parts of the plan: Chapters 1, 2, and 4; Brochure.

If you have any additional agenda items, please let Bob or John know.