

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
AUGUST 11, 1992
10:00 A.M.

Attendees:

- Bob Loeffler
- Karen Klinge
- Cathy Berg
- Mark Fraker
- Sandy Rabinowitch
- Chris Swenson
- John Strand
- Sharon Saari

SCHEDULE

John stated that RPWG needs to develop a list of requirements of the Restoration Team that can be forwarded to the Restoration Team on August 12th along with RPWG's revised internal timeline.

DELIVERABLES TO THE RESTORATION TEAM

- Meeting - 8/20
- 1.* Criteria - 8/18
 - a) injury
 - b) evaluate options
- 2. Rating of the options - 8/31
- 3.* Definition of ratings - 8/18
- 4. Summary of public comments re: mechanics of the framework
- 5.* What we need from the RT - 8/12
- Meeting - 8/26-27
- 6. Alternatives
 - a) themes - 8/21
 - b) grouping of options into alternatives - 8/31-9/4
 - c) write-ups; rationale explaining the grouping by theme (timing, geographic aspects, etc.) - 9/9
- 7.* Schedule - 8/12
- Meeting - 9/3

* These items need to go out very quickly

WHO DOES WHAT/WHEN

- Criteria Subgroup - 8/13
 - Sandy
 - Karen
 - Bob
 - Mark

Public Comments Subgroup

Carol
Chris
Mark
Art
John
Barbara

Schedule to RT - 8/12
John

WHAT DO WE NEED FROM RT

Review Deliverables

Issue Statements - comments back - 8/17
Outline - comments back - 8/17

Sign off

Criteria Definitions - 8/20
Themes - Decision Rules - 8/26
Alternative Package - 9/3

Bob stated that a small group could develop some criteria by Friday or Monday. Karen stated that it shouldn't take more than a day to come to consensus on the criteria. John stated that peer review was scheduled for the 18th and 19th to see where we were as a group in framing the alternatives; however, this will need to be rescheduled. Karen suggested working in small groups for rating. RPWG decided that it was better to work collectively. Cathy stated it is important to decide which is more important quality or time. Karen stated the purpose of the meeting on the 27th is to get confirmation of how to make the queries in the database, the next step. The RT wants to go over the criteria and decision rules. Karen suggested meeting with the Restoration Team on the 20th to get the criteria, definitions and outline finalized. The themes will be discussed on the 26th and 27th. The write-up should give the theme of each alternative, the option, and how we got there. RPWG will talk about some possible themes and then spend a week doing the ratings. Mark suggested breaking into half to do the criteria and the themes. Bob stated that the most work will be in rating the options. Karen suggested doing the ratings in a timed fashion.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES, RECORD KEEPING, PROCESS RECORD

Ray was not available for discussion of this topic. All RPWG meeting notes from June 1, to the present were mailed to Sharon Saari's office to ensure open communication between RPWG and Walcoff.

WORK LOCATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

RPWG may meet at Sandy's office next week for the evaluation

process.

HOW TO OBTAIN ECONOMIC ADVICE ON A REGULAR BASIS AS RPWG FORMULATES THE RESTORATION PLAN

John stated that Sandy suggested we obtain economic advice from Jeff Hartman and Lou Quierolo on a more routine basis. Thank-you letters were sent to both for their attendance at the economics workshop on the 5th. A mechanism for obtaining Lou's time would need to be devised through Steven Pennoyer. Jeff's time should be discussed with Jerome Montague. Chris stated that securing economists could be sold from the point of the need for future economics expertise and the possibility of organization of an economics work group. John stated that we could also possibly have economists come in and look over our shoulders from time to time on an "as needed" basis.

MONITORING RFP

The RFP for Phase I of the Monitoring Planning is out and in the hands of potential proposers. The proposals should be in by the end of the month. RPWG took the lead in developing a process to get to a more comprehensive and innovative monitoring program for monitoring restoration. Phase I will include a conceptual plan. Phase II will get to the costs. Chris asked if the RFP is out for the editor. John reviewed the RFP on Friday and gave it to David Bruce on Saturday. It will take 30 days, which will be the second week in September, before proposals are received. An editor could be on board by the end of September.

RPWG subgroups will reconvene at 2:00 this afternoon.