

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
February 17, 1993
1:15 P.M.

Attendees:

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

AGENDA

1. Transmittal of Alternatives to Walcoff and Associates
2. March "Alternatives Information Package"
3. Approach/Format of April Public Meetings
4. Revision of Chapter V, Draft Restoration Plan
5. Integrating Habitat Acquisition into Alternatives
6. Pacific Sea Bird Conference
7. Monitoring Planning Workshop, April 13-15, CACI

The following items were distributed:

Alternative 6: No Action (same as above except for (3))

John asked for any additional agenda items. Chris suggested adding whether RPWG needs to meet with the RT. John stated the RT has a couple of items they would like to discuss (i.e., the alternatives information package and its scheduling, public meetings approach and format, the geography of the spill-affected area, and the restoration plan outline). John stated he would like to go to them with some concrete recommendations and specific topics. He will get back to the RT this afternoon with the need to meet and the topics. Veronica stated it would be useful to get input from the RT on what to do once a response is received from the attorneys regarding spill preparedness. RPWG will take a better vision of the alternatives package to the RT.

John spoke with Dave and RPWG will be scheduled from 8:30-11:30 tomorrow. The RT would also like to discuss the injury tables. Sandy stated that contractually the table has to go through Spies.

Carol stated that she thought the Public Participation Work Group would be disbanded by March 1. Sandy suggested finding out who will set up the public meetings if the PPWG has been sunsetted.

Carol diagramed the following geographic issues:

Geographic Element

- spill affected area
- geographic locations to implement options} revisiting an
- inside/outside spill area - suitability?} old issue

Consequences of not using geography as a variable

- doesn't limit
- diffuses effectiveness of \$
- doesn't provide annual guidance
- doesn't provide consideration of alternate views during public review

RPWG decided to present this geographic concept to the RT. Some closure is needed on the map changes so that the RT can see what the consequences are. Bob and Carol will lead the discussion on geographic elements. The March alternatives package will also be discussed tomorrow.

WALCOFF

John stated that Ken would like to transmit the alternatives to Walcoff and Associates. Veronica stated that we should include the caveats that the alternatives may shrink to 4, and geographic scope, an effectiveness policy, and spill preparedness might be added. John stated Ken felt the text in Chapter V might be appropriate to provide to Walcoff; the tables would not stand alone. Bob stated that there is a problem with the effectiveness information.

APRIL PUBLIC MEETINGS

Sandy stated his sense is to go to large communities; however, we would go to whatever communities requested it. At a minimum there should be one RPWG and RT member with one or two support staff. The public could be walked through the brochure, and comments could be taken. Veronica suggested having a three-month comment period to reduce confusion. Karen agreed and thought this would be adequate from an organization's stand point. Bob suggested giving a deadline for comments. Sandy stated Mark had some good suggestions for what to do with comments. Sandy also suggested doing a good job of advertising so that people know we are coming.

Veronica asked what are the legal requirements with respect to the EIS for meetings. Ray stated that the lead agency makes the decision to meet the legal requirements and give a reasonable opportunity for public comment. Otherwise, the public might perceive they have been left out. Ray stated that Walcoff will make a recommendation to the RT. Sandy suggested saying that the

subject has not been visited yet but when it is, RPWG will take their role. Carol suggested telling Ken that RPWG would like a schedule of the public meetings this summer so that RPWG can announce them at their public meetings in April. John stated we must let the RT know they will be expected to play a part in the public meetings.

BROCHURE

Bob will arrange for peer review of the brochure questions. Ray cautioned we have to be careful the questions are not construed as a part of the draft EIS plan.

Sandy suggested doing show and tell with examples of what the brochure will look like. Bob provided some examples for RPWG. Karen asked how much text is included in a page such as in Bob's example. Steve stated it depends who you are trying to reach whether you emphasize the graph or the text. Bob stated one of his examples is conceptual in its simplicity; however, the options are varied. Karen asked how the brochure would be mailed. Bob stated he would be more aggressive by starting out with a mailing list and finding other ways such as announcements and distribution points. Veronica stated it is cheaper to use news print. Steve suggested having a map on one side and the information on the other. Steve also suggested passing it out with state paychecks. Bob stated this might be biasing it too much. Veronica asked if the brochure would be good for a subcommittee to work on. John stated we have to talk to the RT about this conceptually, and Bob could provide an example. The subcommittee could coordinate with Steve regarding scheduling.

Steve stated the traditional way to develop a brochure is to go to the writer and say what you want and ask for a format. RPWG stated 5,000 copies is the target. John stated that funding for the draft plan is \$25,000. It is important to give Steve some boundaries. Steve stated he will come back with three proposals as far as length and then take comments. Steve will get back to RPWG by Monday at 8:30. Steve also stated if you provide something people want to keep, they will respond. He also stressed the time factor involved.

Bob stated that the location of private lands on the map are too small.

Karen stated there has been no conceptual thinking about the annual work plan. John stated he has already prepared a few paragraphs that might fulfill the requirement.

TRUSTEE COUNCIL MEETING

Bob stated he had the following observations from the Trustee Council on yesterday:

March/April brochure/meetings

- yes

No agreement among TC

- no major change in direction

Alternatives

- 5 but TC are open to see changes

Option List {**Bob - move into categories**}

- too much like projects

- too specific; not specific enough

- options as examples only? (**debatable**)

Compartmentalized ecosystem approach

Injury - "possibly" may be problem

Other restoration vs. other restoration reserve - combine (**yes**)

RPWG "backed into" allocation amounts (**consider ?**) (**change has allocation lower**)

Note: bold items represent RPWG's position.

Sandy stated he found our titles are very weak and could be more explicit. The public needs to have some tangible sense of what is being done and also there needs to be some spin-off benefit to the EIS. Veronica questioned if the core of the information is there. John stated it is.

John stated that Spies will be convening a group of peer reviewers to discuss the forage fish issue.

The fundamental problem is the TC doesn't understand the difference between an option and a project. Karen suggested having a tree diagram which narrows down into option titles as an example. This might be helpful in showing how we arrived at the options and the variety involved. Veronica stated we are not sure we have a full list of options; others can be added.

Veronica stated there might be some information which if included, would mean losing your audience. We have to be responsive to the Trustees and their concerns have been that we were too specific. Chris stated that people will want to know how their favorite species is being dealt with. Carol stated that some of the titles are not communicative. Sandy stated Steve might be able to help us communicate some of the terms. Karen stated we need a list of options and which alternatives go under them. Bob stated we should work on formatting and feels it is not worthwhile to do it comprehensively until we get something back from the attorneys.

John stated that a letter went out to the attorneys for guidance on use of civil settlement funds for spill preparedness. Veronica stated if a response is not received by the deadline, RPWG will have to do something anyway. John suggested prompting them to try to get something back by the 26th.

Steve stated it is necessary to move fast on the brochure to meet the deadline. Three mock-ups will be provided on Monday at 8:30. Veronica stated RPWG would be responsible for the following that would not be influenced by the mock up: 1) changes in alternatives (variables, number or content), 2) what questions to ask the public, and 3) line up the peer review. Steve stated that what you ask the public will determine how the send-back card will look.

Veronica will work with Bob on simplifying the options list.

INTEGRATING HABITAT ACQUISITION INTO ALTERNATIVES

Chris took a cut at how habitat acquisition would vary across alternatives. To be consistent we need to have habitat acquisition target different types of land. Once you get your pool of lands, the same process would apply. Chris stated to tie things together we need to: 1) make sure RPWG agrees things should vary across alternatives, 2) make sure HPWG agrees, and 3) after joint consensus, look at evaluation criteria for lands. It needs to be presented graphically that habitat protection varies. Chris stated RPWG needs to work with HPWG on a final list of criteria. Veronica stated RPWG needs a brainstorming session with the HPWG staff emphasizing the comprehensive process.

Steve stated the problem overall is that there are not just five alternatives because you can mix and match. You have to be careful you are not telegraphing to the public that there are only five choices. Veronica stated most people can look at a pie chart and see more flexibility.

Chris stated we need to go through the criteria to ensure that they address services. Bob stated you will have to address services in the April meetings.

RPWG agreed on item #1 above regarding alternatives. Bob stated he would like to be involved in the brainstorming session with HPWG. Chris suggested initiating item #3 above at the brainstorming session.

PACIFIC SEA BIRD CONFERENCE

Karen stated that the information she received at the conference has changed her thinking on sea birds. She will address this issue later when there is more time.

MONITORING PLANNING WORKSHOP

John requested that he not be scheduled to attend a public meeting during the week of the workshop (April 13-15th). He is in the process of putting together a list of people who might attend the workshop. There will be a separate and larger list of key informants who also will be contacted for their input.

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
FEBRUARY 17, 1993
1:15 P.M.
AGENDA

1. Transmittal of Alternatives to Walcoff and Associates
2. March "Alternatives Information Package"
3. Approach/Format of April Public Meetings
4. Revision of Chapter V, Draft Restoration Plan
5. Integrating Habitat Acquisition into Alternatives
6. Pacific Sea Bird Conference
7. Monitoring Planning Workshop, April 13-15, CACI

Alternative 6: No Action (same as above except for (3))

E. Comparison of alternatives **Rabinowitch/Gilbert**

VI. Implementation Process for Life of the Settlement

B. Funding mechanisms **Brodersen/Loeffler**

1. Current Mechanisms
2. Endowment

Appendices

- A. Restoration options **Various authors** ✓
- Summary of options and suboptions ✓
- B. Habitat Acquisition Process **Weiner/C. Gilbert**

*need summary
Do: G.C. Bob*

ALTERNATIVES INFORMATION PACKAGE - Loeffler

The Alternatives Information Package will accompany the Key Elements of the Draft Restoration Plan. The intent is to provide the public with a more reader-friendly summary (4-page newspaper insert) that can be read by those not inclined to read the entire document. The brochure will also be printed in greater numbers to facilitate a wider public distribution than the intended distribution of the Draft Restoration Plan. It also will have a tear-out, pre-addressed detailed comment sheet. The objective is to increase opportunity for public comment.

Public Meetings -- Where & When

- I. Introduction
 - A. Background
 1. The spill
 2. Activities to date
 - B. The planning process
 - C. How you (the public) can be involved
 - D. Relationship to EIS

- E. What the plan will not do
 - F. Summary of Implementation
-

II. The Settlements

- A. Criminal & Civil
- B. Spending Guidelines

III. Summary of Injury, Recovery, and What, if anything, can be done to help. For each injured resource and service, a description of injury by the spill, status of recovery, and what techniques are available, if any, to aid recovery, and the effectiveness of those techniques. Land acquisition will be included in this description (as a technique to aid recovery and avoid further degradation).

IV. Alternatives

- A. Introduction
 - 1. Options
 - 2. Evaluation, including cost and geographic distribution
- B. Goals, objectives, and policies common to all alternatives
- C. Description of alternatives (probably one newspaper page per alternative). One of which will be the no-action alternative; another ^{could} will be the preferred alternative.

V. Comparison of alternatives

VI. Implementation

- A. Annual Work Plans
 - 1. Implementation document
 - 2. Annual solicitation of ideas
 - 3. Annual public review of draft plans
 - 4. Timing of annual plans
- B. Operations/Administration
 - 1. Settlement Guidance
 - 2. Organization (including organization) chart
- C. Funding Mechanisms
 - 1. Current Mechanisms
 - 2. Endowment