

RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP
AUGUST 27 - SEPTEMBER 8, 1992

Attendees:

Cathy Berg
Karen Klinge
John Strand
Art Weiner
Ray Thompson
Bob Loeffler
Carol Gorbics
Chris Swenson
Mark Fraker

The following items were distributed:

Curt McVee 8/26 memo to Mike Barton
Revised Evaluation Form

The following items were discussed:

Tomorrow RPWG will divide the work for the deliverables to the Restoration Team. Bob will be the point of contact in John's absence. Henry Gerke called and wants to talk with RPWG. John and Carol will meet with Henry and Doug Muetter to go over the process that RPWG will use to develop restoration alternatives. John and Carol will also respond to questions on the annotated outline to the Draft Restoration Plan.

EIS

Art stated that we need some direction from the Restoration Team as to where RPWG's schedule stands now that the EIS contract with Walcoff is dead. John stated this will become clearer after the teleconference on Monday, August 31.

EVALUATION EXERCISE

Ray and Chris will go through and review the public comment for each resource and service at the end of this process. Girke provided a definition for criteria #5, which John forwarded to Karen for review. RPWG continued with the evaluation exercise.

The following evaluation forms were modified per direction received from the Restoration Team on 8/26.

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pigeon Guillemots
Option 4 - (does not apply; nest too sparsely; no rating)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
2. Technical feasibility
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
4. Enhancement
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
 - other target or nontarget resources
 - other target or nontarget services
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pigeon Guillemot
Options 20,22,36 (special designation)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Medium; moderate effect over a moderate portion
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
 - other target or nontarget resources
High;
 - other target or nontarget services
Medium; would not do special designation on upland sites; would be near-shore coastal
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium; less than outstanding benefits at a moderate cost
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pigeon Guillemot
Option 17B (reducing predator access) (expanded to include Pigeon Guillemot)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium; if it works
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
No rating; not applicable
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pigeon Guillemot
Options 37,38 (acquisition and protection of private lands)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Medium; given the dispersed nature of the bird
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low; high costs

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Black oystercatcher
Option 13 (oiled mussel beds)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Not applicable;

2. Technical feasibility
Unproven; Low;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

Medium; some short-term impact associated with cleaning
-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Black Oystercatcher
Option 14 (restore fucus)
(same as 13 above)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Not applicable;

2. Technical feasibility
Low/unknown;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

Medium;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Black Oystercatcher

Option 20, 22, 26

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium; by reducing disturbance, rate or degree of recovery would be improved

- 1b. Potential to protect area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

Medium;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Black Oystercatcher

Options 37,38 (protection from private owners)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits
Low;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harlequin Ducks
Option 8A

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium; hunting presence is low, but it could still have a moderate
effect
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harlequin Ducks

Option 8B (education)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

Medium;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Low;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Low;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harlequin Ducks

Option 13 (mussel beds)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium; linkage is still being proven

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Not applicable;

2. Technical feasibility

Low/unknown;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

Medium;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; species are declining

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harlequin Duck

Options 20, 22, 26 (special designation areas)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium; based on the assumption that disturbance is a factor

- 1b. Potential to protect area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium; impacts to logging through expanded buffer zones should be minimal; there is also limited development planned in the EVOS area

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No; there is not an urgency on public lands

9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harlequin Duck

Option 26 (forest practices act)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High; the actual technical feasibility of doing it is poor because of the politics
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Low;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium; high cost and high benefits
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No; could be done any time
9. Public comments
Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harlequin Ducks
Option 37, 38 (protection on private lands)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High; could be pretty wide spread and significant
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium; high cost and high benefit

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; especially in the spill zone

9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Bald Eagles

Options 20,22,36 (more protection to buffer zones)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Medium; most imagined protection strategies would be focused on single species; some larger designations could encompass strips of the coastal area, which would benefit more than one

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium; moderate costs

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Bald Eagles

Option 26 (buffer strips)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Low; long-term impact

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Bald Eagles

Option 37, 38 (private lands)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Medium; most often it will focus just on bald eagles

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Brown Bears

Option 8

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium; short term
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments

Will be rated later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harbor Seals
Option 4

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Not applicable;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low; (ask Mark about haulout)
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium; depends on the level of restrictions
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

High;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; harbor seals are declining

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harbor Seals
Option 8b

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

High;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

Medium;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Low;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

Medium;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium; high costs with high benefits

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harbor Seals
Options 20, 22, 36

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

High; has great potential to reduce disturbance

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

High;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Cutthroat Trout

Option 2a

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium; great ability for improvement for small streams

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium; ability to prevent

2. Technical feasibility

High; something already in place, is there enough data to

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Low;

4. Enhancement

Low; temperature preference

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Cutthroat Trout

Options 11a, b, c,

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium; problem is near shore and focuses on fresh water
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Not applicable;
2. Technical feasibility
High; all techniques will improve all salmonids
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Cutthroat Trout
Option 14

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High; we are assuming a positive link between Fucus and the prey for cutthroat trout
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Not applicable;
2. Technical feasibility
Yes;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Cutthroat Trout

Option 19

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Low;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

High:

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Cutthroat Trout

Options 20, 22, 36, 6

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Low;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Low;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed

Medium;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Cutthroat Trout
Option 26

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Low;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Low;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Low;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Low;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Cutthroat Trout

Option 37, 38

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Low;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

Note: Dolly Varden are rated the same as Cutthroat Trout

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon
Option 2a

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High; stock separation, intensify management
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium; stock separation
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services;
High; increase knowledge and management

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
High;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
Yes;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon
Option 11a, b, c

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High;
- 1b. Potential to protect area from further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
High;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
Yes;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon
Option 18a

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
N/A
2. Technical feasibility
High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Medium;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

Medium;

-other target or nontarget services;

High; assuming land use impacts are taken into account

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

High;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon

Option 18b

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

High;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon
Option 18c

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
N/A
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Medium; assuming that land use impacts are taken care of in
permitting process
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon
Option 19

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later.

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon

Options 20, 22, 36, 6

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Low;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Low;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE:

Option 26

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Low;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Low;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Low;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Low;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sockeye Salmon

Option 37, 38

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No; unless there is imminent threat

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Recreation, concentrated development (visitor center, highway access - need a better name)
Option 33b

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
N/A
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
N/A
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High; highway, in town, or elsewhere already designated for this use
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
High;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

Note: This is replacement, effectiveness of replacement using criteria in 1A - unsure if it needs rating as effectiveness of replacement, however, we feel a lot of people could get value out of it

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Back Country - developed
Option 6,20,22,36

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
N/A
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
High;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources
High;

-other target or nontarget services
Low;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
Medium;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits
Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed
No; unless imminent threat

9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Back Country Developed
Option 12a and b

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low; can prevent resource damage

2. Technical feasibility
High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service
Medium;

4. Enhancement
Medium;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

Medium;
-other target or nontarget services

Low;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed

No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Back Country - developed
Option 12c

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
N/A;

2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium;
4. Enhancement
High;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Low; long-term impacts, but they may not be severe
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Back Country Developed
Option 28

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium;
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Medium;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Back Country Developed
Option 37,38

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A;
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
High;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Low;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed
No; unless imminent threat
9. Public comments
Will rate later

9/2/92

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Archaeology
Option 1

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service
Low; may benefit social wellbeing to people in rural communities
4. Enhancement
Low; increases the knowledge base
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
High;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
Yes;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Preservation of Archaeological Sites
Option 10

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
1b. Potential to protect area from further degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low; may provide social benefits to local communities
4. Enhancement
Low; may benefit local communities with local volunteers and increase knowledge of local archaeological history
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
Yes; when critical sites are identified, the option needs to be scheduled quickly until then no
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Archaeology replacement
Option 35

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
N/A; this is a replacement project
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Medium; if done correctly and not offering to purchase, there should be no problem
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Brown Bears
Options 20,22,36

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Low;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium; broad scale application of more sensitive management through existing agency authorities
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action

to the expected benefits

Low;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Brown Bears

Option 13

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Unknown;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Unknown; extent of injury is unknown, therefore, unsure if it is causing injury

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

Medium;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Unknown;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Brown Bears

Options 37, 38

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

N/A

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

High; would have to be applied on a broad scale basis which covers concentration sites used by bears

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one

resource or service

High;
4. Enhancement

Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;
-other target or nontarget services

Low;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No; if imminent threat to critical habitat, it would be important to implement quickly, but on a broad scale application, it is low

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Killer Whales
Option 4

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A; if there is current disturbance at a rubbing beach that is preventing their use, then this should be rated

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Medium; this assumes the potential for increased disturbance

2. Technical feasibility
Medium;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium;

4. Enhancement
Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;
-other target or nontarget services

Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Killer Whales
Options 20, 22

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A; if there is current disturbance at a rubbing beach that is preventing their use, then this should be rated
1b. Degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium;
4. Measurement of results
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: River Otter
Option 8A

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium; may cause significant loss to some individuals
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

High;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: River Otter

Option 13a

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

High; equal Sea Otter

- 1b. Potential to protect from further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

Medium;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: River Otter

Option 14

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Unknown; we need to determine frequency of foraging (contact PI)

- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Unknown; same as above

2. Technical feasibility

Yes;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one

resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Unknown; need to contact PI

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: River Otter - Special Designations
Option 20, 22, 6

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

N/A

1b. Potential to protect area from further degradation

Low;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: River Otter
Option 37, 38

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1b. Degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harbor Seal
Option 8A - Marine Mammal Protection Act

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High;
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Low;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
Medium;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No; other opportunities; a voluntary program would be just as effective
9. Public comments
Will rate later

Note: There were no notes for this period.

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Intertidal
Option 13

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Medium; high potential when focused on mussel beds but lower when focused on mussels in general. We assume cleaning mussel beds would provide a great improvement for a small area.
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Not applicable; they are stable and not getting worse
2. Technical feasibility
High; in reference to mussel beds
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low; not an enhancement
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Medium;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High; disregarding workers
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium; this would be low if the insomniac mussels have a substantial amount of oil
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
Yes;
9. Public comments
Will review later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Intertidal
Option 14

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium; if it works, it will help that discrete area

1b. Potential to protect the are from further degradation
Not applicable;

2. Technical feasibility
Unproven;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;

4. Enhancement
Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium; high cost and high benefits

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;

9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Intertidal
Option 15B

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low; small improvement over a small area

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Not applicable;

2. Technical feasibility
High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;

4. Enhancement
Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High; in general there is not enough oil trapped in those at-risk areas; limited number of potential cleanup sights; in a few areas my be useful
-other target or nontarget services
High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Low; (may want to revisit after reviewing the write up)

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

Note: There are no known options for taking care of subtidal species. Herring substrates will be dealt with for Herring.

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Wilderness

Option 37,38

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

High;

1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

High;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Low;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No; only if imminent threat

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Recreation

Option 12C (backcountry commercial facilities)

Note: We assume that this is done in an area already designated for its use and could be private or public land currently undeveloped.

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Not applicable; what we are dealing with for recreation is a replacement for recreation uses lost but right now we don't have

injury. There is a continuing injury to perception.

1B. Degradation

Not applicable;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Medium;

4. Enhancement

High;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

Low; long-term impacts which may not be severe if properly managed (e.g., disturbance to marine mammals through increased vessel traffic)

-other target or nontarget services

High, we are not evaluating land use impacts because the land is already designed for that use.

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Recreation

Option 28

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Medium;

4. Enhancement

Medium; provides access beyond what we have now

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

Medium;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No; unless imminent threat
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Recreation
Option 37,38

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A;
- 1B. Degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
High;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Low;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No; unless imminent threat
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Nondeveloped Recreation

Note: Ratings are the same as Wilderness Values

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
2. Technical feasibility
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
4. Enhancement
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
-other target or nontarget services
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action

- to the expected benefits
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
- 9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Special Designation
Options 20,22,6,36

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High;
- 2. Technical feasibility
High;
- 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
- 4. Enhancement
Low;
- 5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Low;
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium; because of indirect costs
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No; unless imminent threat
- 9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Special Designation
37,38

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High;
- 2. Technical feasibility
High;
- 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
- 4. Enhancement
High;
- 5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

- other target or nontarget resources
- High;
- other target or nontarget services
- Low;
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
- High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
- Medium;
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
- No;
- 9. Public comments
- Will rate later

The following resources and services will be considered under education:

- Marine Mammals
 - Harbor Seals
 - Other
- Birds
 - Common Murres
- Fish
 - Cutthroat Trout
 - Sockeye Salmon
- Archaeology
- Public Awareness

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Harbor Seals
 Programmatic Options: Education

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
- Medium;
- 1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
- Medium;
- 2. Technical feasibility
- High;
- 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
- Medium;
- 4. Enhancement
- Low;
- 5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
 - other target or nontarget resources
- High;
- other target or nontarget services
- Medium; some affect for tour boats
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
- High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; there is a decline in population

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Other

Programmatic Option: Education

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Low;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Medium;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Common Murre

Programmatic Option: Education

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Low;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed

Yes;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sport Fish (Cutthroat and Sockeye)

Programmatic Option: Education

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

Medium;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one
resource or service

Medium;

4. Enhancement

Medium;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action
to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of
the option is delayed

No; given the other management tools

9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Archaeology

Programmatic Option: Education

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
N/A
- 1b. Potential to protect area from further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High; any education program must be done very careful so that a black market is not promoted
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
Yes;
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Public Awareness
Programmatic Option: Education

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High;
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
High;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
High;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

Meeting adjourned at 3:15. The only category remaining is law enforcement. Meeting will begin on 9/3 at 8:30.

Programmatic Option: Field Presence

Option 7 (Management of Human Uses)

Note: The criteria will be applied when alternatives are developed.

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
2. Technical feasibility
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
4. Enhancement
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
 - other target or nontarget resources
 - other target or nontarget services
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Herring
Option 2A - Increase Management

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Unknown; population level injury is equivocal
- 1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Unknown;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Medium; depends upon the specific management action
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
 - other target or nontarget resources
High;
 - other target or nontarget services
Medium; depends upon the specific management action

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low; high cost; benefits are unknown and current understanding is they would not be outstanding
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Herring
Option 15A

Note: Based on what the option is perceived to be and not the write-up

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Unknown; population level injury is equivocal
- 1b. Potential to protect the area from further degradation
Unknown;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Medium;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium; benefits are unknown but indications are less than outstanding
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Herring
Option 6,22,20,36

Note: Bob felt designating special areas has no effect on this particular resource.

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Not applicable; population level injury is equivocal

1B. Potential to protect the area from further degradation

Unknown;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Low;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 and will reconvene 9/8 at 1:15.

The evaluation exercise continued on 9/9. Joe Sullivan attended to provide input on fish.

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon
Option 2A (intensify management)

Joe - Pink salmon tend to stray and have been managed by considering them individual stocks. There was debate over the injury to pink. There is injury at the egg fry level. The difficulty was whether they have compensatory mechanisms at different levels to recover. Management for pink salmon is very difficult but is more developed with less controversy and consequences than some other options.

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

High;

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

Medium;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High; pinks feed a lot of other animals

4. Enhancement

Low; there are some political difficulties

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium; short-term effect on commercial fishing; short-term effect for long-term gain

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium; depends on pink salmon prices

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; this is time critical due to time gaps. It will determine if it is too late

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon

Option 11 a,b,c

Joe - Supplementing fry production will help a particular stream without messing up the gene pool.

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

High; for the important streams

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation

High;

2. Technical feasibility

High; there are so many options that one of them would be

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

High;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High; depends on the management technique; assumes you are taking it to pre-spill

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium; high benefits with lower costs in some cases

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; there would be problems with genetic mixing

9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon
15b (cleaning intertidal spawning substrates)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low; may be worthwhile in a couple of locations
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium; mixed results
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low; can't clean past pre-spill
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Medium; done on a limited scale
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
Yes; opportunity could be lost
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon
Option 18 a & b

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High; pumping out a lot of fish could help many things
4. Enhancement
High;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Low; potential to hurt target fish
-other target or nontarget services
Low; it has potential to hurt wild runs and thus hurts the service

that wild fish provide by being wild

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Low;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No;

9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon

Option 18c

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium;

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

High;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

Low;

-other target or nontarget services

High;

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Medium;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No; can be done later

9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Rockfish

Option 2b

Joe - Most of this species are long-lived. They are live bearers. The population size is unknown. Rockfish are very territorial. The only adult fish found dead after the spill were rockfish. The direct toxic effects on their population are unknown. This is a desirable commercial species.

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Unknown; the degree of impact from the spill is unknown

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation

Unknown;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Medium;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium; service of commercial rockfish was at a low level pre-spill

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Unknown;

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; there is the potential to lose rockfish and we should find out;

9. Public comments

Will rate later

The following were rated again because they were done early on in the evaluation process:

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sea Otter

Option 4

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Low; so dispersed

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation

Low;

2. Technical feasibility

Medium; because of the dispersed nature and importance of haulouts, implementation would be very difficult. Population level effects are problematic;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

Low;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Medium;

- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low;
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
- 9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sea Otter
Option 8a

Note: We are unsure if regulations in MMPA would allow this. We do not know if sea otters would apply as depleted under the MMPA. At present, we could not implement this option unless the population was determined to be depleted by the definition of the MMPA.

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low; small improvement in a small area
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low;
- 2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
- 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
- 4. Enhancement
Low;
- 5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Low;
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low;
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
- 9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sea Otter
Option 8b

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;

- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low;
- 2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
- 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
- 4. Enhancement
Low
- 5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
- 9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sea Otter
Option 13

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High; the linkage is unproven; therefore, this rating is speculative
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
High; See Bob or Karen's insomniac mussel footnote
- 2. Technical feasibility
- 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
- 4. Enhancement
Low;
- 5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
Medium
-other target or nontarget services
High;
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
High;
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

Yes; if pup mortality continues to be high and the population is declining

9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sea Otter
Option 20,22,36

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low;
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Low;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Marbled Murrelets
Option 9

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low; lacking data on the amount of incidental take
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low; same as above
2. Technical feasibility
Medium;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
Medium;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Low; if we eliminate night time fishing; techniques to reduce mortality may have an adverse affect on commercial fishing fleets.
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Low;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Sea Birds - replacement
Option 17a

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
High;
1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Not applicable;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Not applicable;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
High;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments
Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Marbled Murrelet
Option 37

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

Medium; it is unknown to what degree the nesting habitat would be affected

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation

Medium;

2. Technical feasibility

High;

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

High;

4. Enhancement

Low;

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources

High;

-other target or nontarget services

Low; any habitat-affected use

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

High;

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

Low; high cost not balanced by outstanding benefits

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed

No; unless imminent threat

9. Public comments

Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Marbled Murrelet

Options 20,22,36

Note: Rated the same as above

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery

1b. Potential to prevent further degradation

2. Technical feasibility

3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service

4. Enhancement

5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
-other target or nontarget services

6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety

7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits

8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon
Option 19

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
High;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No;
9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon
Option 6,20,22,36 (upland and spawning stream protection)

1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
Low;
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Low;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:

- other target or nontarget resources
- High;
- other target or nontarget services
- Medium;
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
- High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
- Medium;
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
- No;
- 9. Public comments

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon
Option 26

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
- Low; could potentially increase the buffer and identification of anadromous streams
- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
- Low;
- 2. Technical feasibility
- High;
- 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
- High;
- 4. Enhancement
- Low;
- 5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
 - other target or nontarget resources
- High;
- other target or nontarget services
- Low;
- 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
- High;
- 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
- Low; high cost including all indirect effects
- 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
- No;
- 9. Public comments
- Will rate later

RESOURCE OR SERVICE: Pink Salmon
Option 37,38

- 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery
- Low;

- 1b. Potential to prevent further degradation
Medium;
2. Technical feasibility
High;
3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service
High;
4. Enhancement
Low;
5. Potential for NO additional injury to:
-other target or nontarget resources
High;
-other target or nontarget services
Medium;
6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety
High;
7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits
Medium;
8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation of the option is delayed
No; unless imminent threat
9. Public comments
Will rate later

Evaluation exercise concluded at 3:30.

RPWG
I



United States Department of the Interior



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

1689 C Street, Suite 100
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-5151

August 26, 1992

To: Mike Barton, Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

From: Curt McVee, Special Assistant to the Secretary *Curt McVee*

Subject: Procurement of Contractor for Restoration Plan EIS

I am responding to your August 24, 1992 memorandum to members of the Trustee Council. We do not believe that an existing Department of Justice litigation contract should be used as the procurement vehicle to select and retain a contractor to prepare an environmental impact statement for the EVOS Restoration Plan. Preparation of the Restoration Plan simply is not a litigation related activity.

We believe that modification of a litigation contract could subject the Council to valid criticism from the public as well as unfavorable governmental audit findings on such a management decision. If a protest to such a contract was made, the resulting delays could well eliminate the purported time savings that would have been produced by the suggested contract amendment. Moreover, Interior, NOAA and EPA have received correspondence from the Department of Justice advising that Justice is terminating the contract with the science and economic experts that had been retained for the Exxon litigation. This issue was very briefly discussed in the last paragraph of my August 14 memo commenting on the outline of the Restoration Plan.

I agree with the earlier decision of the Trustee Council that procurement matters are to be handled under the rules and regulations of the State and Federal Trustee department or agency assigned responsibility for implementation of the relevant activities. With respect to the EIS, that responsibility has been assigned to the Forest Service. If the Forest Service Contracting Officer agrees with the use of a sole source procurement, and the Service also determines that Walcoff Associates is the best firm to prepare an EIS, we would not object to that decision. Our concern remains that the Council be in a position to make informed decisions on the matters presented to it and that it is able to respond on a reasoned basis to criticism about management decisions.

RESOURCE OR SERVICE:

DATE:

OPTIONS RATING

| CRITERIA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1A. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1B. Potential to prevent further degradation or decline | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Technical feasibility | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Degree to which proposed action enhances the resource or service | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Potential for NO additional injury to: a. other target or nontarget <u>resources</u> b. other target or nontarget <u>services</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Will the restoration opportunity be lost if implementation is delayed? (Y/N) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Public Comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

COMMENTS:

RESOURCE OR SERVICE:

DATE:

OPTIONS RATING

| CRITERIA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Technical feasibility | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Measurement of results ENHANCEMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Potential for NO additional injury to: * other target or nontarget resources * other target or nontarget services | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

COMMENTS:

RESOURCE OR SERVICE:

DATE:

OPTIONS RATING

| CRITERIA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Technical feasibility | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Measurement of results ENHANCEMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Potential for NO additional injury to: * other target or nontarget resources * other target or nontarget services | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

COMMENTS:

RESOURCE OR SERVICE:

DATE:

OPTIONS RATING

| CRITERIA | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Technical feasibility | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Degree to which proposed action benefits more than one resource or service | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Measurement of results ENHANCEMENT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Potential for NO additional injury to: * other target or nontarget resources * other target or nontarget services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Potential effects of the action on human health and safety | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed action to the expected benefits | | | | | | | | | | | |

COMMENTS: