

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP/RESTORATION TEAM
JUNE 3, 1993
1:30 P.M.

ATTENDEES

- Dave Gibbons
- Jerome Montague
- Pam Bergmann
- Chris Swenson
- Karen Klinge
- Ray Thompson
- Sandy Rabinowitch
- Bob Loeffler
- John Strand
- Art Weiner
- Byron Morris
- Ken Rice
- LJ Evans
- Marty Rutherford
- Mark Brodersen
- Carol Gorbics

The following items were distributed:

Restoration Team Summary - June 3, 1993

Dave stated that the direction from the TC was mixed over the two day meeting period; however, the RT pooled their thoughts on what the TC told them to do in a package outlining the various facets of what the TC wants. The RT will discuss with RPWG their perceptions of the TC's rationale for their decisions.

Ray suggested that a flip chart or a written electronic copy of the motions on the table would be helpful to the TC during their meetings. Byron stated it would be helpful, but he didn't think they would go for that.

The RT gave RPWG the following direction:

COVER/INTRODUCTION

- brief description of the appendices (one paragraph)
- inclusion of policy questions and attachment of brochure
- outline steps leading to a Restoration Plan

Dave stated the steps leading to the plan were an important issue during the TC meeting, and the following questions need to be discussed:

- where are we now and what is the public getting in mailout
- process changes from what was listed in brochure

- public review and comment on brochure questions
- development of a draft final Restoration Plan and DEIS
- thirty-day public availability period
- record of decision

Karen suggested listing the questions and referring the reader to the brochure for more information. The RT is recommending that the brochure go out again. No definite date will be given for development of the plan other than Fall of 1993. The date for adoption of a final plan is 1994.

APPENDICES

- A- will stay as is but need to make sure the numbers are correct
- B- sentences on services will be modified. Craig prepared some alternative language. Marty will forward this information to John. The reasons for changing the language will be discussed with the TC members by their respective RT members.
- C- Art and Bob are working on trimming this appendix down
- D- the RT met with Bill Brighton and Craig Tillery to discuss which options were legally feasible. It was paired down to 16 options. Six options will be used as examples. The other ten will be included at the wish of the TC.
- E- this is okay

The following options are deleted:

3
11
16
18
19
21
22
24
25

John asked what was illegal about the ten deleted. Dave stated there was disagreement among the attorneys regarding the legality of some options, which may require resolution by Judge Holland. Mark stated that DOJ feels you can not restore services directly; the State disagrees. Mark stated that if options can be tightened, they should be. Ken stated that the opening wording should reflect that these are only examples. Additional options which have not been evaluated will not be included. Pam stated if you only give a few options, the public will see this as examples.

The TC wants the cover introduction by June 15th for review. The appendices will be xeroxed, but they won't be bound. Bob suggested

that the appendices will also need a cover letter and raised the issue that the appendices should be called "supplemental information" since they are no longer an appendix.

SCHEDULE

- 6/7 - Cover letter plus appendices to RT 6/7
- 6/9 - RT review
- 6/10 - RT return to RPWG
- 6/14 - Document to the TC for one week review

Veronica suggested having a new map of the EVOS area as an appendix. Marty suggested proposing the addition of Perryville. Bob stated that Perryville and Ivanoff Bay have evidence of oiling and were originally included as a severely affected community under subsistence. In addition, they were also part of the commercial fishing closures. Marty stated that DEC also requested a correction based on their oiling information. Veronica suggested that when the package is submitted to the RT, a map could be included for consideration. Bob stated that a map cannot be xerox printed.

Veronica stated that this is a sensible progression of events in developing suggestions before you develop a draft plan. It completes one step before you move on to another.

Meeting adjourned.

RESTORATION TEAM SUMMARY

June 3, 1993

1. RT summaries approved: 05/12, 05/14, 05/17, 05/18, 05/19, 05/26.
2. RT to get comments on February 28 financial statement to Sheridan by COB 06/07.
3. Seward Sea-Life Center will give a presentation on their proposal at 1:30 pm on 06/04 at CACI.
4. RT to provide peer reviewed Executive Summaries of reports to Gibbons by August 1.
5. Draft Restoration Plan: Summary of Alternatives
Outline:
Cover/Introduction 3-5 pages
Brief description of appendices and their availability
Include brochure with policy questions
Outline steps leading to a Restoration Plan
Where we are now - What public is getting in mailout
Process changes from what was listed in the brochure
Public review and comment on brochure questions
Development of a Draft Final Restoration Plan and DEIS
Public review and comment on Draft Plan and DEIS
Development of Final Restoration Plan and EIS
Thirty day public availability period
Record of Decision

Appendices

- A. Expenditures-Leave as is, check numbers
- B. Injury-Modify
- C. Habitat Protection-edit and trim
- D. Options-include 6 as examples and add in separate part with the other 10 for possible inclusion by the TC also
- E. Monitoring-OK

Bullets for TC

Changes to Appendix B

Text and tables regarding services amended to reflect consent decree.