

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
JULY 7, 1993
10:00 A.M.

ATTENDEES

John Strand
Ray Thompson
Veronica Gilbert
Karen Klinge
Chris Swenson
Bob Loeffler
Sandy Rabinowitch (afternoon)

SUPPLEMENT

John congratulated everyone on a job well done.

ELEVATION QUESTIONS

Bob raised questions which should be elevated to the RT. Chris suggested RPWG needs to discuss whether they agree with his memo. RPWG discussed moving some of the pros and cons. Chris asked if everyone's perspective was included and RPWG stated "yes". There is no DOI perspective. Chris stated he will frame a specific question to the RT with this information as the background. It will then be circulated to RPWG for review and hopefully it can be finalized today.

Veronica stated our intention is to show the RT what a recovery plan is, and the question to discuss with the RT is how will that influence RPWG's timing and schedule. It would be useful to steer them away from an in depth discussion of what should be in a recovery plan. A model could be provided.

RECOVERY PLAN FORMAT - ENDPOINTS

Chris discussed the document that he and Karen prepared on endpoints. It puts the information in a different framework. There are basically three types of endpoints: recovery, restoration and monitoring. Chris asked if everyone had read the information. Everyone had not. Chris suggested breaking to give everyone an opportunity to read the document. RPWG will reconvene this afternoon at 1:00 for further discussion. The outline for the recovery plan might be similar to what will be forwarded to the RT.

RPWG began discussing Chris' memo. Chris said that endpoints define what is the desirable level for restoration. John asked how close this model is to Carol's. Chris replied it is more general. Veronica stated there is a problem with habitat protection's first implied priority. It might be important to state that as a low

priority. Chris believes that some prioritizations are implicit, one is doing something for injured populations first.

Prioritization would favor restoration of injured populations over enhancement for other populations. Karen stated it is good to do geographic separation because we don't know what happened to some species. By splitting geographically, it protects against just doing it where the NRDA studies were done. John asked where these assumptions are laid out. Chris agreed that will have to be done before this is signed off on. Karen offered some decisions don't have to be made as broad standards for everything. You can do some prioritization between regions. Karen suggested RPWG attempt to write some endpoints, explaining the rationale. This version could be sent out to PR and PI's (three reviews) and give them an opportunity to comment. RPWG could then synthesize this information and reconcile any disagreements with consensus. Bob felt there are a lot of implicit policies in Chris' memo. Karen said RPWG should decide on some of the policy issues. RPWG needs to tell people reviewing this information what our assumptions are. Veronica believes the procedure being talked about is something RPWG needs to start very quickly. Karen replied developing these endpoints without the actions can be done no later than September. RPWG needs to have this done for the monitoring plan and Restoration Plan. RPWG needs to decide if there are procedural prioritization patterns we want to use. Bob suggested the first step is to get the problem statement and endpoints done. Karen responded we would be better off doing this once.

Veronica stated if the decision is to do the recovery plan with the annual plan, this buys us a little time to work with the peer reviewers to develop good, defensible endpoints. Bob asked who is the target of the recovery plan. Chris responded primarily it is for the Trustees and staff but must be accessible to the general public. Chris also suggested we discuss how far we want to go without going to our individual RT members with new concepts. We need to figure out how to get sign off on this. The first thing is where the recovery plans go. John thought the RT will have to know where this fits in the larger document. Chris recommended we can include some sort of outline of the recovery plan. Veronica doesn't feel that most of the RT is tuned in to what RPWG has agreed to do. It might be useful to say at a minimum what RPWG feels the plan will include. The memo could emphasize that these are extremely important questions. Karen feels the RT could be asked to make sure the TC buys off on this. Chris thought in some cases RPWG members might be able to better present these issues to their TC member.

Karen believes the recovery endpoint is your overall objective. There is no problem with having more than one recovery endpoint if it is linked to an injury. John understands that with any species there are a number of different causes of mortality (fishing,

pollution, etc.). He could see different restoration endpoints but not different recovery endpoints. Chris stated in some cases there could be two concepts of recovery. John stated it may be a reality that to restore an injured resource, you may have to use a combination of restoration approaches. Bob stated he would have several different recovery endpoints because there are several problems. John stated that to suggest that you could do this for every resource is unreal. Before we can deal with multiple endpoints, we need to know more than we know now. Bob stated what he is trying to get at is are there separate problem statements.

Karen would like to put something in the monitoring section that there would be more detail when Phase 2 of the monitoring plan is in place. John agreed. Bob expressed concern about the jargon. Chris stated as far as the jargon goes, you just define what you are talking about.

Chris suggested biological, logistic and budgetary constraints may determine what you can do. Ray also added social constraints. After peer review a lot of these constraints will have been incorporated. All we are trying to do is provide the RT with an example of what a recovery plan is.

Veronica said two things we have tried to grapple with are ecosystem and data gaps. Some of this can be handled in the context of recovery plans. During monitoring there might be a series of annual reports which address the glaring data gaps. Chris thought this will come out in the recovery plans. It seems that there are other questions that demand we contend with the ecosystem as a whole. The ecosystem is more than just the sum of its parts. Karen imagined doing a chapter on the ecosystem that addresses each of the regions' problem points. There may be some way to bring all the parts together, recognizing that they all are inter-related. It might be more of a text chapter. John reported the PWS Science Center is advocating measuring energy flow to develop an understanding of the ecosystem relationships.

Chris will develop a cover memo with several appendices.

MONITORING PLAN

John will revise the RFP for Phase 2 of the monitoring plan. Karen indicated Dave needs an original copy of the monitoring plan for the administrative record. John will provide a copy as soon as Parametrix completes the revisions.

SCHEDULE

Ray reported Ken and Mark developed a schedule of when the draft Restoration Plan and EIS should be completed. Two scenarios were provided, a Restoration Plan with an EIS and a Restoration Plan

without an EIS. John asked if RPWG needs to provide input dealing with their schedule and requirements. Bob offered RPWG doesn't know enough about what is going on at this time. John said we don't want to commit to something we can't provide. Clearly, RPWG needs to have some input. Veronica's sense is that the schedule is reasonably conservative. Bob suggested it is okay to accomplish more than what you promise, but it is not okay to not accomplish what you promise. Veronica felt the first step is to get the RT to make decisions on the plan. RPWG should focus on getting good decisions and objectives. John thought RPWG should express their concern to Dave regarding being more involved in scheduling. Veronica stated we should state to Dave that RPWG wants to be involved when the details are nailed down for presentation to the TC. Ray stated we have to be cognizant of the big decisions because they will affect us.

John asked what RPWG's schedule will be for the next few weeks. Veronica stated that she, Bob, and Ray have formed an informal coding committee. RPWG has to move ahead to putting together the restoration objectives. RPWG scheduled a meeting for Friday afternoon and will map out a schedule. Veronica stated we have to figure out how we will do the public comments report.