

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
APRIL 15, 1993

Attendees

Bob Loeffler
Sandy Rabinowitch
Karen Klinge
Ray Thompson
Chris Swenson
Veronica Gilbert
Mark Kuwada
Carol Gorbics

The following items were distributed:

4/15 Memo from Chris regarding: Ideas on Monitoring

STATUS OF RESTORATION PLAN

Veronica stated that Chapter I is completed and has been distributed. Bob stated Chapter II does not need to be done yet. Chapter III is done and distributed. There are interim reports to review. Carol will distribute Appendix A. Appendix B will be done before May. Appendix C is a placeholder for Karen's information. Bob would like to give comments to the individual authors to incorporate and then pass out a memo with things which require group discussion. A revised draft should be ready for distribution by May 3. Comments should be forwarded by next week. Sandy suggested everyone give their comments to Barbara who will maintain the most current version. Bob stated that Chris will be the gatekeeper for information, and Barbara should keep the latest paper copy. Sandy stated we should have all the information where it is accessible. RPWG will meet on Wednesday. Veronica stated most of the information should be based on the brochure, which already has agreement.

Ray stated Rich McMahon has asked what RPWG will need in terms of geographic graphics for the Restoration Plan. Bob stated for his chapter he doesn't need anything. Ray requested that if anyone thinks of something to let him know. There is an opportunity to utilize them more than we have. John asked if there will be illustrations in the draft Restoration Plan. There were illustrations in the framework document. Bob stated you could certainly put pictures in. John asked if Debbie and Steve will be used and is there a contract. Bob stated that Debbie can do a style sheet but someone else could do the WordPerfect because it would take too long. Karen stated it helps to have illustrations. Veronica stated if Debbie can produce something in a week to ten days, then we should use her. The problem before was a matter of strategy. RPWG agreed to talk with Debbie. Bob stated someone needs to coordinate with the printer to determine constraints. Ray

asked if we have a contract printer. Sandy stated it has always been done through the Forest Service. Ray will provide coordination. John suggested Ray talk with Dave.

Karen asked if RPWG should get a contractor to analyze the public comments. This would enable tallying, which RPWG does not have time for. Carol stated she feels that by August there will be extra time available to work on the comments. Karen stated that a contractor might be able to put the comments in a more usable form. Bob stated he would like to coordinate the effort. Karen stated we spent a lot of time on this process before. Bob stated he is more interested in spending more time on the comments. Karen stated if it takes a lot of the group's time, she would rather use a contractor. Veronica stated a contractor could experiment with distributions. John stated there may be money in DEC's budget for this. Karen stated that RPWG will interpret the analysis. Carol stated we have to create a well-done summary document for the Trustees. Sandy stated we should keep in mind Jon Isaacs who is already in the system. Veronica suggested Jack Kruz. John suggested asking the RT for another work group. Bob stated that some things he would not like to pass on to a work group. Carol stated she doesn't feel comments will come in before August 7.

Bob stated that he spoke with Ron about the process for setting up the database and keying the information. Bob stated Ward will set up the database and either Cherri or Barbara will do the keying. RPWG will do some of the coding. Ray stated the Forest Service has resources to assist. Karen stated that a lot more could have been done with the framework comments than was done. Karen stated that she doesn't necessarily understand the coding process, and it is a matter of interpretation. Bob stated that maybe RPWG's forces can be divided to have people work on those things they are most interested in. Karen stated she is just concerned about best use of time and best product. Sandy suggested doing the work ourselves and handing off the work to a contractor which also could give independent credibility. Karen stated that looking at another work group might be feasible. John stated he would want a RPWG member to be in the work group as a chair. Veronica stated she doesn't think the RT is amenable to more work groups. Bob stated that someone has to write up the results, and he doesn't agree with passing on our responsibilities. Karen stated she doesn't want additional burdens. Carol stated her preferred alternative would be to have Bob chair a subgroup other than RPWG. Ray stated that he would like some independent judgment.

Veronica asked how you would deal with the allocations. Bob stated you would do a frequency distribution on each category. Veronica stated she would like to have a technical advisor. Bob agreed. Veronica stated the subgroup could include a technical advisor and at least one RT member. Sandy suggested consulting Reckhow, Richardson and Issacs. John stated he would like to make the RT aware of our needs. Ray stated it is important to make some

suggestions to them if we need help. Bob will take the lead in working with CACI staff to set up data entry. Ray will determine what kind of availability Forest Service staff has to work with the subgroup.

Karen stated she will be working on thesis work for four to six weeks when the plan goes to the printer.

Bob stated he would like to work with Rebecca and Ron on protocol in collecting and collating original comments. Veronica stated that Rebecca has started this already. Ray asked what should be done with telephone comments. Sandy stated that a record should be made and given to Rebecca as a comment. Carol suggested guiding telephone comments through the brochure.

MONITORING

John provided an update with respect to the Phase I contract. Carol stated she was impressed with some of the tools. John asked for feedback on the utility of the workshop as soon as possible. Parametrix will be working on completing the draft conceptual plan within the next ten days. The Phase I contract will end June 11. There were some areas where the initial approach needs RPWG's further refinement. John spoke with the RT regarding the RFP for Phase II. They will put this on hold until seeing the results of Phase I. Chris asked if Phase II will be in the final plan. John stated it will be a tough fight. Spies feels going ahead with Phase II as now planned is an expenditure which need not be incurred and could be done for far less money. John stated that the process was not evolved in a vacuum. Carol stated if we want an objective, well thought out monitoring plan, we need to move on Phase II. Mark stated that a monitoring plan could be designed that would make everyone happy. John will poll the individual Peer Reviewers for a written opinion of the workshop. Karen stated that ideally Parametrix had hoped to come out of the workshop with a prioritized list, but instead time was spent on questions. John stated he thought it was a very good workshop and a lot was learned. Mundy and Richardson liked the approach.

John is hopeful to get good competition for Phase II.

Karen discussed definitions because she got the impression there was a gap in monitoring types. RPWG suggested to Parametrix it is just "recovery monitoring" and not "natural recovery monitoring". It is a matter of how we want to break things out and it wouldn't be a problem for Parametrix to change it. Bob asked if it is possible to use the concepts in the brochure. Karen stated that is the way she guided Parametrix and they were okay with that. Karen stated that Parametrix needs to state that individual projects will have their own monitoring components. Recovery monitoring includes aided and unaided but is not effectiveness. John will write something up so that Parametrix is clear on the definition. Carol

stated recovery monitoring could be combined with restoration monitoring which saves the three level approach. Bob asked about Chris' question on long-term ecological monitoring. Karen stated that she heard yesterday that there were some things for services which required long-term monitoring. John will give guidance to Parametrix to combine recovery and restoration monitoring and distinguish it from project level monitoring. The two categories will be recovery monitoring and long-term monitoring. Karen stated guidance for the long-term monitoring might be a chapter in the monitoring plan. Chris stated that we need to reiterate to Parametrix that project level monitoring deals with whether or not the project is effective on a local scale. Karen stated that recovery monitoring determines if things are recovering. Parametrix will be asked for guidance on project monitoring.

RPWG meeting adjourned at 4:00.

John stated that Dave wants someone to talk with the RT about the draft Restoration Plan status. Bob volunteered.

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska Department of Fish & Game Habitat and Restoration Division


TO: RPWG

DATE: April 15, 1993

FILE NO.:

TELEPHONE NO.:

SUBJECT: Ideas on Monitoring


FROM: Chris Swenson

Here are some thoughts on monitoring:

1. Monitoring Categories: In terms of clarifying our categories of monitoring, we could arrange things as follows:

a. Project Level Monitoring: Each project will include monitoring to determine whether or not the project is working out as planned. For example, fish passes would be monitored to determine whether fish were actually using the pass and were utilizing upstream areas to successfully spawn.

b. Recovery Monitoring: Each injured species and service would be monitored, when feasible to do so, to ascertain the rate and degree of recovery. This would apply to those resources and services being actively restored as well as those being allowed to recover naturally (this subsumes the old categories of Natural Recovery Monitoring and Restoration Monitoring). For example, PWS wild pink salmon would be monitored as a whole for recovery.

c. Long-Term Ecological Monitoring: This category remains the same as originally stated, and would focus on monitoring long-term trends in ecological interactions. During our discussion with Parametrix on 4/12, it was decided that this type of monitoring would not apply to services and would focus exclusively on biological trends.

3. Causal Connections Between Projects and Recovery: Phil Mundy made the point during the workshop that it is generally not possible or necessary to establish direct causal links between restoration activities and species recovery. If we know that individual projects are working as planned (i.e. fish

passes are getting fish to new spawning areas) and that species recovery is occurring (i.e. PWS pink salmon are recovering), then it is often neither possible nor necessary to establish that the fish passes are the cause of the recovery. Phil's point was that natural processes are so complex that it was not realistic to try to establish links between our relatively small-scale restoration efforts and widespread populations of organisms, which are subject to numerous, poorly understood environmental influences. However, it may be possible to attempt this for some resources which are concentrated in time and location, such as colonial seabirds - but even so, is establishing this link really worth the time and money needed to do so?

3. Types of Monitoring not Exclusive: It was also pointed out at the workshop that the three types of monitoring wouldn't necessarily be conducted separately and that they may overlap.

4. Other Issues for RPWG: Other issues that came out of the workshop and subsequent discussions include;

a. Services did not fit as well into the conceptual plan as resources, and RPWG needs to give Parametrix some additional guidance on this (e.g., endpoints, what aspects of the services to monitor, etc.)

b. The contract for Phase 2 should specifically require planning a mechanism/process for integrating and interpreting monitoring data, especially for the ecosystem data. This integration would certainly be subject to peer review and agency input, but if this process is not undertaken by the group or committee charged with overseeing the program, the RT and TC will certainly not be able to do it by themselves.

3. The workshop exercise for choosing and prioritizing which resources and services to monitor was confusing for some participants and we still have work to do in this area.

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska
Department of Fish & Game
Habitat and Restoration Division


TO: RPWG

DATE: April 15, 1993

FILE NO.:

TELEPHONE NO.:

SUBJECT: Ideas on Monitoring


FROM: Chris Swenson

Here are some thoughts on monitoring:

1. Monitoring Categories: In terms of clarifying our categories of monitoring, we could arrange things as follows:

a. Project Level Monitoring: Each project will include monitoring to determine whether or not the project is working out as planned. For example, fish passes would be monitored to determine whether fish were actually using the pass and were utilizing upstream areas to successfully spawn.

b. Recovery Monitoring: Each injured species and service would be monitored, when feasible to do so, to ascertain the rate and degree of recovery. This would apply to those resources and services being actively restored as well as those being allowed to recover naturally (this subsumes the old categories of Natural Recovery Monitoring and Restoration Monitoring). For example, PWS wild pink salmon would be monitored as a whole for recovery.

c. Long-Term Ecological Monitoring: This category remains the same as originally stated, and would focus on monitoring long-term trends in ecological interactions. During our discussion with Parametrix on 4/12, it was decided that this type of monitoring would not apply to services and would focus exclusively on biological trends.

3. Causal Connections Between Projects and Recovery: Phil Mundy made the point during the workshop that it is generally not possible or necessary to establish direct causal links between restoration activities and species recovery. If we know that individual projects are working as planned (i.e. fish

passes are getting fish to new spawning areas) and that species recovery is occurring (i.e. PWS pink salmon are recovering), then it is often neither possible nor necessary to establish that the fish passes are the cause of the recovery. Phil's point was that natural processes are so complex that it was not realistic to try to establish links between our relatively small-scale restoration efforts and widespread populations of organisms, which are subject to numerous, poorly understood environmental influences. However, it may be possible to attempt this for some resources which are concentrated in time and location, such as colonial seabirds - but even so, is establishing this link really worth the time and money needed to do so?

3. Types of Monitoring not Exclusive: It was also pointed out at the workshop that the three types of monitoring wouldn't necessarily be conducted separately and that they may overlap.

4. Other Issues for RPWG: Other issues that came out of the workshop and subsequent discussions include;

a. Services did not fit as well into the conceptual plan as resources, and RPWG needs to give Parametrix some additional guidance on this (e.g., endpoints, what aspects of the services to monitor, etc.)

b. The contract for Phase 2 should specifically require planning a mechanism/process for integrating and interpreting monitoring data, especially for the ecosystem data. This integration would certainly be subject to peer review and agency input, but if this process is not undertaken by the group or committee charged with overseeing the program, the RT and TC will certainly not be able to do it by themselves.

3. The workshop exercise for choosing and prioritizing which resources and services to monitor was confusing for some participants and we still have work to do in this area.