

RPWG
I

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
MARCH 15, 1993
2:00 P.M.

Attendees

- John Strand
- Bob Loeffler
- Karen Klinge
- Ray Thompson
- Veronica Gilbert
- Carol Gorbics
- Chris Swenson
- Mark Kuwada

The following items were distributed:

- March 15th RPWG to RPWG memo regarding March 15th Brochure Draft Estimated Natural Recovery Rates of Injured Resources and Services
- Acreage for Habitat Protection Option
- Natural Recovery
- What was Injured by the Spill and Is It Recovering
- Habitat Acquisition on Private Lands: How Much Land Could Potentially be Purchased

BROCHURE

RPWG provided suggestions for edits to the brochure package. Bob made the edits on a hard copy for later revision.

Karen stated she asked for a 90% confidence interval for the estimated natural recovery rates of injured resources and services. Carol stated she is uncomfortable with best and worst case estimates, but she doesn't know how to fix it. Bob stated this emphasizes that there are softer numbers. Spies stated if you say less than 30 years it overstates the probable injury. Carol stated she would like to keep the numbers squishy. Karen stated Spies feels by presenting just the upper bounds, you are not giving natural recovery adequate credit for what it can do. Veronica suggested the following footnote: Estimates are based on interviews with peer reviewers and reflect a 90% confidence level. Bob stated he softened the precision by using less than. John stated you can soften the estimate by rounding off and adding a footnote, but he does not agree with using less than. Veronica agreed with rounding up to the nearest five because it is more accurate. Karen stated this makes her nervous because it is a solid number. John stated we have to say how squishy these numbers are. Karen stated there are a lot discrepancies among the peer reviewers, and there is no time to resolve them. Karen stated she is willing to put the range in, but it needs some description. Karen also stated there needs to be a pretty detailed example, and RPWG agreed. Carol and John

will review what Karen develops. John stated we also need some caveat that explains these estimates were developed through consultation with agency scientists. Mark asked why a long-term estimate would be needed. Karen stated it represents severity and also it may become an endowment issue.

Bob suggested a paragraph explaining there is no quantitative rate for services.

Carol suggested adding the following: Other injuries such as reduced growth rate may not result in a lower population. RPWG agreed.

Ray asked why Promotion of Human Use was used. Veronica stated ordinary people need some additional language, and this term was recommended by Jack Kruse. Promotion of Human Use reflects that the actions will promote human use. Veronica stated the RT may have problems with this term because it had been changed from Strategies and Opportunities. Bob stated he preferred opportunities.

Carol stated she doesn't agree with tying cost effectiveness to substantial improvement. RPWG agreed to the following: One strategy is to consider only those restoration actions likely to produce substantial improvement over natural recovery. Carol suggested the following: On the other hand, if restoration actions were to continue after a resource has recovered, they may enhance injured resources and services. Veronica suggested adding: They may continue to protect or enhance the resource. Bob suggested adding: They may mitigate other problems. Veronica suggested adding: They may offset other disturbances. RPWG agreed with Veronica's suggestion.

The sentence, "However, too much or inappropriate additional use could hurt recovery or some injured resources and services," was deleted.

Carol suggested harlequin duck be used as an example instead of marbled murrelet and the language changed as follows: The recovery of harlequin ducks may be helped by protecting nesting habitats from future changes which may hamper recovery. RPWG agreed.

Regarding the Acreage for Habitat Protection Option table, Mark stated he doesn't think the public cares about the recovery time, but they do care about the amount of acres they can buy. He doesn't feel the table is representative of all the factors considered in the acquisition process. Mark recommended giving some maximum value and letting people work it up in their own minds. Bob suggested the following caveat: This could be off by five or more percentage points either way. Mark suggested caveating with the same assumptions Kim used if you want to break it out by alternatives. Mark also stated if you add too many

caveats, the meaning gets lost. Bob questioned if it can be caveated so it is not misleading. Veronica stated you need to use the same assumptions across the board and show how it changes and suggested using a bar graph. Mark stated that by putting in numbers, you will fix expectations in people's minds. Veronica asked if a range would be misleading. Mark stated "no" but would it be informative. Chris stated a range is informative as long as it doesn't get too broad. Veronica, Chris and Mark were assigned to explore this. Karen suggested because of the time crunch, RPWG could agree to use version 1 for the brochure and use the more elaborate version (2) in the draft plan. Veronica suggested using a three dimensional bar graph that would indicate a range. It may not be particularly accurate but it will show the changes across alternatives.

Bob stated the sentence regarding chronic marine pollution sources needs "such as" added for consistency.

Ray suggested adding: Exxon has made deposits into the restoration fund. John suggested adding: Endowment could be used to fund some or all categories of restoration activities.

Break - group will reconvene at 4:07.

RPWG needs to give the graphic artist direction to make sure the pie charts are clearer and more professional.

Carol suggested adding No Action to Alternative 1 for clarification. Carol suggested adding: Could **annually** fund approximately \$3-5 million worth of restoration activities. Carol suggested adding: The asterisk in the table denotes options that may produce substantial improvement in **assuring** the recovery of a biological resource.

Bob stated that in order to give people an opportunity to complete reading the brochure package, RPWG will adjourn until 3/16 at 9:15. Carol will attend from 9:30-12:00.

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
March 16, 1993
9:30 A.M.

Attendees

John Strand
Bob Loeffler
Karen Klinge
Ray Thompson
Veronica Gilbert
Carol Gorbics
Chris Swenson
Mark Kuwada

Karen prepared some new language for natural recovery giving an example that amplifies the uncertainty of information and distributed copies. Bob suggested adding: these estimates she will almost certainly change. Carol suggested adding: Scientist use models based on population numbers and growth rates. Bob stated he would take out the concept of a model. Carol stated the difference is models versus estimates. Veronica stated a model is a simplification of reality. Bob suggested adding: if, **as is likely**, the habitat quality is low. Karen will have the table completed within an hour.

Under General Restoration, John suggested adding: For some resources and services there is no known restoration action which, if applied, will prove effective. Karen suggested adding accelerate or assure recovery.

Karen suggested changing the Archaeology heading to Archaeological Resources. Veronica recommended adding an insert under recreation and commercial tourism and will provide the language. Karen stated she wants to add a sentence defining sublethal and provided language: Population level injures were those that resulted in measurable decline. Carol suggested: The table on page ___ categorizes the biological resource injures into those that resulted in a measurable population decline and those that did not. These other injuries include higher mortality in early life stages (e.g. eggs and very young animals), and sublethal injures that do not result in death. These injuries have not resulted in measurable effects to the overall adult population.

Karen suggested adding to bald eagles: While a minimum of 200-300 eagles were estimated to have been killed by the spill, this amount cannot be detected with population census techniques. Karen suggested adding: In 1992 the estimated number of Kenai River smolt migrating to the ocean was only 3%. Bob suggested adding: Some respondents reported that their perception of lost value is recovering. Mark suggested deleting the last sentence under passive use and RPWG concurred. Karen suggested adding to the last

sentence under subsistence that some subsistence species continue to decline.

Veronica provided language for Alternative 3 on page 18: except biological resources whose populations did not measurably decline. Veronica suggested changing the population question on page 11 to: Should restoration actions address all injured resources and services or **exclude** biological resources whose populations did not measurably decline because of the oil spill.

Ray stated that Ken feels you can either take out spill prevention and preparedness now or later. Ray stated he changed language that would delete any reference to spill prevention or preparedness. RPWG agreed to wait for formal direction. Karen stated Ken thought the concept of spill preparedness should be presented to the public to deal with. One possibility is to think about a paragraph that describes the need for spill preparedness and prevention to elicit a response from the public. Veronica stated the idea is if RPWG is told in writing by the RT not to include it in the brochure, then a fall back would be to treat it the same way as an endowment by saying this is another issue and add it to the other questions at the back. Carol stated we are spinning our wheels unnecessarily and should deal with it when we have more information from the RT. Carol also stated she agrees with Karen's solution. Ray stated there must be some confusion because Maria has asked for the spill prevention options. Carol stated she talked with Maria who felt spill prevention and preparedness should not be included but was not illegal.

Chris lead the acreage discussion. An average price of \$2,000 per acre was used. A number of caveats will be included. 100,000 to 275,000 acres represents a 5-15% range and will be included in the comparison of alternatives section. This is a soft figure and may change. Mark stated this is good because it doesn't identify a specific dollar figure.

The sentence, the Trustees can restore the spill injuries in a variety of ways, is deleted. Veronica stated the name for page 33 should be consistent, and it was agreed to use "tell us what you think". Veronica suggested that issues and policy questions on page 33 should be changed to match page 11.

Mark asked if the issue of measurable decline for services has been discussed. Veronica stated we don't have those figures but there is evidence. Chris stated we may have to define our restoration endpoint for services.

Veronica suggested adding **only** to the first question under Effectiveness of Restoration Actions.

Veronica recommended using telecommunication and weather systems instead of equipment under infrastructure.

Bob stated RPWG needs to think about:

- introductory bullets for the brochure
- something at the end which says to provide your name and we will put you on the mailing list. Bob will check with Dave so this additional mailing doesn't overrun the budget.
- add a little box about the planning process
- Bob will discuss amounts with Mark and Byron

Bob stated Steve Levi has provided some edits which will be incorporated into the next version. Bob will review the edits and discuss the ones where there is a difference of opinion.

RPWG will reconvene at 1:15.

HABITAT ACQUISITION

Language for habitat acquisition on private lands was distributed. Revisions were suggested. Karen suggested using the following bullets for some of the factors which would influence the actual amount of habitat acquired:

- actual land costs, which are highly variable depending on the land's commercial value
- whether the purchase includes full or partial property rights
- expenditures on additional protection of public lands and water (this is expected to be a small proportion of the remaining funds)

Carol also suggested language revisions which RPWG agreed to. Chris will make the suggested changes. Veronica suggested having John Harmening and Chuck Gilbert review the language. Mark stated he would fax them a copy.

Chris raised the issue of splitting scenic areas and human use areas and felt that for consistency it should either be kept together or split in both sections. RPWG agreed it didn't matter in this case.

Mark stated that people might want some assurance their comments were considered. How you capture or portray the information is important to show that it was considered.

Meeting continued; however, no notes were taken. Barbara began revisions to the brochure package.