

OIL SPILL RESTORATION PLANNING OFFICE

437 E Street, Suite 301 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 271-2461 FAX: (907) 271-2467

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 22, 1991

TO: Ken Rice Sandy Rabinowitch

Mark Brodersen Linda Comerci

FROM: Jo Stan Senner Susan Mac Mullin

SUBJECT: Materials for July 30th Meeting with Legal Team - RPWG Review Copy

Enclosed are draft materials for discussion with the Legal Team for your review. The materials are:

- 1. Agenda
- 2. Restoration and Compensation Determination Plan Outline
- 3. Steps Leading to Evaluation of Restoration Action Table
- 4. Example of Options Table
- 5. Categories of Alternative Table
- 6. RPWG Current and Completed Projects

Please return your comments to Susan MacMullin by Thursday, 7/25, COB.

Enclosure

cc: Ruth Yender

Restoration Planning Work Group-Legal Team

"Restoration Planning and Legal Needs"



CACI, Simpson Building Anchorage, Alaska 30 July 1991 08:30 h

TENATIVE AGENDA

What is a Restoration Plan?

-who is it for and what are its purposes? -what are its components?

- What information is needed to support a Restoration Plan?
 -database categories?
 -documentation required (process and content)?
- What currently is being done to produce a Restoration Plan?
 -what is RPWG now doing?
 -is it sufficient in scope and content?
- What additional steps/projects should RPWG undertake?
- What resources and expertise are required?
- What is the timetable?
- Additional questions and discussion

DRAFT

LITIGATION SENSITIVE CONFIDENTIAL

1. The following is a proposed outline for a document that will set forth the restoration plan of the State and Federal Trustees. This document will be used to help develop the restoration claim with the responsible party.

2. Such a document will be subject to change as new information on injuries are received and as new restoration options are identified and evaluated.

3. The outline incorporates the requirements of the DOI NRDA proposed regulations (56 FR 19752).

4. Outline:

RESTORATION AND COMPENSATION DETERMINATION PLAN

- I. Introduction
- II. Description of Injuries and Restoration Needs
 - A. Baseline
 - B. Injuries
 - C. [Restoration Needs]

III. Description of Restoration Alternatives

- A. Natural Recovery
 - 1. monitoring
- B. Low Intensity
 - 1. monitoring
 - 2. increased management
 - 3. limited direct actions
- C. Ecosystem-based Ecological
 - 1. monitoring
 - 2. implementation of balanced selection of management practices, protection of strategic habitats and recreation sites, direct restoration, replacement, and acquisition of equivalent resources

DRAFT

LITIGATION SENSITIVE CONFIDENTIAL

D. Maximum intensity

2.

- 1. monitoring
 - implementation of all or most available
 restoration options, in the categories
 of management practices, protection of
 strategic habitats and recreation sites,
 direct restoration, replacement, and
 acquisition of equivalent resources
- III. Preferred Alternative: Actions and Analysis of Decision
 - A. Description of actions required to implement this alternative [organized by resource or geography?]
 - 1. action(s) to be taken
 - number of sites and geographic location of sites
 - 3. costs
 - B. Rationale for selecting alternative (factors)
 - 1. technical feasibility
 - 2. cost/benefit relationship
 - 3. cost/effectiveness
 - 4. results of any actual or planned response activity
 - 5. potential for additional injury
 - ability of resources to recover with or without actions
 - 7. acquisition of equivalent land for Federal management
 - 8. potential effects on human health/safety
 - 9. consistency with applicable Fed/State laws and policies
 - 10. benefits to multiple species and ecosystem¹
 - C. Costs Methodology
 - 1. Methods used to determine costs of selected alternative
 - 2. Methods used to determine compensable value of lost service

1 Not part of the proposed NRDA regulations.



STEPS LEADING TO THE EVALUATION OF RESTORATION ACTIONS

	Habitat Protectio	Species Mgmt.	Direct Restoration	
H	Ecological Significand	ce	-Review current regulations and harvest -Impacts to species	-Literature synth. -Feasibility test -Consult experts -ID appropriate sites
Acquisition	Management Designations	Land Use Changes	-ID alternative regulations/	-Monitoring effectiveness
<pre>-mechanism -willing seller -cost to acquire* -cost of land *<u>e.q.</u> legal survey</pre>	-review mgt. status -eval. effect. -ID alternative designations -cost to manage/ implement	<pre>-review current/ proposed chngseval. impacts -ID alternative uses -cost to manage/ implement</pre>	harvest levels -Cost to implement -Cost to manage	-Cost to implem/ maintain
Element	s Common to All			
- Replace - Public	cement/acquisition opp c input			
	Acquisition -mechanism -willing seller -cost to acquire* -cost of land * <u>e.q.</u> legal survey Elements - Cost I - Replac - Public	Identification (linkag Ecological Significand Land Status (ownership Management Designations -mechanism -willing seller -cost to acquire* -cost of land *e.g., legal survey Elements Common to All - Cost benefit analysis	Identification (linkage) Ecological Significance Land Status (ownership) Management Land Use Acquisition Designations -mechanism -review mgt. -willing status seller -eval. effect. -cost to -ID alternative acquire* designations -cost of -cost to manage/ land implement *e.g., legal survey Elements Common to All - Cost benefit analysis - Replacement/acquisition opportunities - Public input	Identification (linkage) -Review current Ecological Significance -Review current Land Status (ownership) -Review current -mechanism -review mgt. -Impacts to species -mechanism -review mgt. -review current/ -willing status -review current/ seller -eval. effect. -cost to -cost to -ID alternative uses acquire* cost to manage/ implement *e.g., legal implement implement *e.g., legal Elements Common to All -Cost benefit analysis - Replacement/acquisition opportunities - Public input

DRAFT

LITIGATION SENSITIVE CONFIDENTIAL

o Below are examples of the possible array of restoration options for an injured resource, In this example the resource is <u>pink salmon.</u> Each cell represents an <u>action.</u>

	-	1001111000		
OPTION	Western PWS Mainland	Western PWS Islands	Kodiak Archipelago	AK Peninsula Coast
Spawning Channels	5	3	1	9
Egg Boxes	25	23	17	11
By-passes	4	0	2	1
Closures	+	+	-	_
Restrict harvest areas	_	+	+	+
Acquire buffers		-	+	+

LOCATION

o A similar analysis will be done for each injured resource.

o Using the nine factors in the NRDA regulations and the addition factor of ecological benefit, restoration alternatives will be developed. An alternative consists of a series of defined options.

LITIGATION SENSITIVE CONFIDENTIAL



o Four broad categories of alternatives are contemplated:

Natural Recovery	Low Intensity	I Ecosystem I	Maximum Intensity
-Monitoring	-Monitoring -Management options -Direct restoration options	-Monitoring -Management options -Direct restora- tion options -Protection options -Replacement	-Monitoring -Management options -Direct restora- tion options -Protection options -Replacement

o Selection of a preferred alternative includes analysis of the costs and the actions.

Restoration Planning Work Group CURRENT AND COMPLETED PROJECTS

Identification and Scoping

Public symposium (March 1990)

1st technical workshop (April 1990)

Public scoping meetings (April-May 1990)

Annotated bibliography of restoration literature (1990)

Restoration planning progress report (August 1990)

<u>Federal Register</u> notice of intent announcing preparation of draft 1991 Restoration Work Plan (November 1990)

Development and Preliminary Evaluation

Review of proposed 1991 restoration science studies (November 1990)

<u>Federal Register</u> notice with draft 1991 Restoration Work Plan (March 1991)

2nd technical workshop to integrate damage assessment synthesis process with planning for 1991 restoration science studies (March 1991)

Restoration science studies (1990 and 1991*)

Assessment of science information needs to guide development of 1992 restoration science studies (June 1991)

Synthesis of recovery literature (1991*)

Development of long-term monitoring plan (1991- *)

Workshop on marine habitat protection (August 1991*)

Development of criteria and process for identifying and evaluating strategic wildlife habitats and recreation areas (1991*)

Review of upland management guidelines and land uses on public lands (1991*)

Develop matrix and database on restoration options (1991- *)

Synthesis of restoration literature (1991-?)

1 10

Federal Register notice announcing availability of detailed study plans for 1991 restoration science studies (July 1991*)

Review of restoration planning and litigation products (with Legal Team) (July 1991*)

Detailed Evaluations and Recommendations

Survey of restoration opportunities for wild pink salmon (1991*)

* = in progress
? = deciding now whether to initiate

[SES:07/20/91; file: products.RWG]



RAWO

November 1-2, 1990 Simpson Bldg., Anchorage

DRAFT AGENDA

Thursday, Nov. 1

09:00	Introductions, purpose of meeting	Senner/Ross
09:15	Basis for 1991 Restoration Program: overview of injuries presented at RPWG/PI/PR work sessions	Senner/Ross/Strand Rabinowitch/ Meacham/Spies
10:30	Break	
10:45	Summary: RPWG approach to developing 1991 Restoration Program (incl. discussion of issues list, attached)	Senner/Ross
12:00	Lunch	
13:00	Discussion of agency proposals for 1991 restoration projects	Senner/Ross/Strand Rabinowitch
14:45	Break	
15:00	Discussion of agency proposals for 1991 restoration projects, continued	Senner/Ross/Strand Rabinowitch
17:00	End of day 1	

Restoration Synthesis Meeting: Proposed 1991 Restoration Program

November 1-2, 1990 Simpson Bldg., Anchorage

DRAFT AGENDA

Friday, Nov. 2

08:30	Discussion of agency proposals for 1991 <u>feasibility studies</u>	Senner/Ross/Strand Rabinowitch
10:00	Break	
10:15	Discussion of agency proposals for 1991 restoration monitoring projects	Senner/Rabinowitch, Strand/Meacham
12:00	Lunch	
13:00	Synthesis discussion: recommendations for 1991 Restoration Program	Senner/Ross
14:30	Break	
14:45	Synthesis discussion, continued	Senner/Ross
16:00	December FR report outline revisions	Ross
16:30	Adjourn	

Restoration Synthesis Meeting: Proposed 1991 Restoration Program

> November 1-2, 1990 Simpson Bldg., Anchorage

RPWG ISSUES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF 1991 RESTORATION PROGRAM

Presented below is a preliminary list of issues relating to RPWG's development of the draft Restoration Work Plan and 1991 Restoration Program It is proposed that RPWG's approach to addressing these issues be articulated the Management Team as soon as possible so that any misconceptions can be addressed before the first draft of the document is presented to the Management Team on November 28, 1990.

- Definition of Restoration projects versus NRDA projects ("factors")
- Role of natural recovery monitoring in the 1991 Restoration Program
- Likelihood of reimbursement for 1991 restoration projects
- Identification of injuries via NRDA studies versus other sources
- Prioritization of projects (not RPWG role if projects meet "factors")
- Consolidation of projects
- Cost sharing among agencies
- Approach where lack of consensus (elevate to Management Team, etc.)

REVISED OUTLINE FOR DECEMBER FR NOTICE

I. Introduction

Purpose of document

 Primary purpose to present draft Restoration Work Plan and proposed 1991 Restoration Program for public comment
 Secondary purpose, to report on the results of 1990 RPWG activities, including 1990 Feasibility Studies, etc.

Background

- Spill stats, etc. (canned language)

- Incl discussion on NRDA process and its overall goal to provide for restoration of injured resources ...

II. Draft Restoration Work Plan

Chapter Intro

- Relationship to response and damage assessment
- Dynamic process, information still being assessed
- Leads to final restoration plan after settlement of damage claim
- Commitment to public involvement
- Timeline

-

Work Plan Components

- Determine need for restoration
- NRDA data, feasibility studies, lit. review, etc.
- Develop restoration alternatives and approaches
 - Public involvement, workshops, reports, etc.
 - Summary of restoration alternatives proposed to date

- Evaluation of restoration alternatives and approaches for each injured resource as information becomes available

- Three types of restoration to be addressed (direct,

replacement, acquisition of equivalent resources)

- Matrix approach, through PI/Peer Review meetings

- Application of "factors to be considered" (based on DOJ "proofs")

- Summary of potential restoration actions that may be taken, depending on specific injury to the resource

- Develop and implement restoration projects as necessary prior to settlement
 - Peer review process prior to implementation
 - Public comment prior to implementation
- Develop and implement final Restoration Plan following settlement
 - Peer review process prior to implementation
 - Public comment prior to implementation

REVISED OUTLINE FOR DECEMBER FR NOTICE

III. Proposed 1991 Restoration Program

Proposed 1991 Restoration Project Options*

- Specific proposals for:
 - a) Coastal/Intertidal resources
 - b) Fish/Shellfish
 - c) Birds
 - d) Mammals
 - e) Recreational resources
 - f) Cultural resources

Proposed 1991 Feasibility Projects

Literature Review

- Natural recovery lit. review, etc.

Development of overall restoration monitoring plan

- Measure and provide public accountability for success of restoration actions

- To ensure efficient integration and sharing of agency monitoring data

Opportunities for Public Participation

- Comment on FR notices (draft and final documents) - Other?

IV. Summary of 1990 Restoration Feasibility Studies

1990 Feasibility Study descriptions/preliminary results/status
 1990 Technical Support Study descriptions/preliminary results/status

* (We need to make it clear that we may do some but not all of these, depending on funds available, though, let's not say it that way) DRAGO ed Contents for Restoration Work Plan and 1991 Restoration Program

	Execu	utive	Summary 3 pps.
	I.	Intro	2.5 pgs.
EPA 1st cut		_1)	Purpose of document
(RPWG edit)		2)	Summary of 1990 RPWG activities to date
			 reports/events public participation (comments)
	II.	1990	Feasibility Studies Reports 7pgs.
EPA 1st cut (RPWG edit)		1)	Description
PI's		2)	Preliminary results
(RPWG edit) EPA 1st cut		3)	Status
(RPWG edit)			
	III.		ods for Evaluation of Restoration rnatives ("Criteria") 4pgs .
Brian		_1)	Introduction (relationship to NRDA, response)
RPWG subcommittee?		_2)	Restoration projects
(group review at meeting to finaliz	e)		
<u>1st cut by subcmte</u> (group review at meeting to finaliz	e)	_3)	Feasibility projects

RPWG Members	1)	Restoration Projects	
	2)	Feasibility Projects	
John	3)	Literature Reviews	
	4)	Public Participation Comments Meetings (proposed)	
	5)	Technical Review/Reporting Peer review Monitoring	
	V. Fut	ture Restoration Process	3 pgs.
RPWG 1st cut	1)	Timeline	
Sandy leads RPWG	2)	Public Participation	
discussion		(do we want to list options, decide on one, or ignore?	
Stan	3)	Technical Review	FOTAL
	4)	Other?	25pgs.

IV. Proposed 1991 Restoration Program 7 pgs.

5 76 4

۰.,

2 Traft Guran 3.90 DRAFT	
Restoration Workplan Schedule	
March 24, 1991 Publish in FR	
March 15, 1991 FR notice to Office of FR	
FEB February 28, 1991 end 45 day comment period	
JAN5 December 10, 1990 FR notice to Office of FR	
JAN December 10, 1990 FR notice to Office of FR	
December 5, 1990 For final signature (EPA, AA for Water?)	
December 3, 1990 Comments due	
November 26, 1990 Circulate final draft for review	
October 11-12, 1990 RPWG meeting to refine schedule and develop work plan, identify issues to be	
raised to management/policy levels	
October 5, 1990 Comment on initial FR Notice	
October 4, 1990 Circulate Schedule and Initial FR Notice of Intent for Comment	

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 28, 1990

SUBJECT: Proposal for an Accelerated Restoration Process

FROM: Stanley E. Senner Stonley E. Senner Restoration Program Manager Department of Fish and Game State of Alaska

> Susan MacMullin Sucan MacMullin Deputy Director Alaska Restoration Task Force Environmental Protection Agency

TO: Washington Policy Group Trustee Council Management Team

Summary

This memorandum is prepared in response to a charge to us by the Washington Policy Group and the State Trustee. The charge was to negotiate agreements to achieve a State-Federal draft of a plan for restoration of Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska to be announced in a <u>Federal Register (FR)</u> notice. In the following paragraphs we summarize our discussions and present an outline of the contents of a plan to achieve shared restoration objectives.

The recommendations presented below are based on two points of common ground we quickly established in our discussion:

-that the existing program of the Restoration Planning Work Group (RPWG) provides a basis for accelerated restoration planning; and

-that we can identify a group of ecologically sound, potential restoration projects that could be carried out in 1991, subject to careful scientific and legal evaluation and the availability of funds.

We believe that these points provide a basis for continued State-Federal cooperation in restoration planning.

Background

On September 18, 1990, the Washington Policy Group met regarding the restoration planning process and the Oil Spill Public Information Center (OSPIC). The Policy Group proposed to publish three <u>FR</u> notices between this fall and next spring. The first would announce the opening of the OSPIC and express the intent to publish a "draft restoration plan" in the <u>FR</u>. The second notice, to be published in late autumn 1990, would provide the first draft of the plan for public comment and propose restoration projects to be carried out in 1991. The third notice, scheduled to roughly coincide with the anniversary of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill, would respond to public comment and program.

On September 20, 1990, Alan Raul, General Counsel, U.S. Department of Agriculture, discussed the Federal proposal for an accelerated restoration planning process with Don Collinsworth, Trustee for Alaska. The State was invited to participate in this process. On September 24, 1990, in another conversation, Messrs. Raul and Collinsworth agreed to delay the initial <u>FR</u> notice for one week in order to allow for the State's restoration program manager, Stan Senner, to meet with a representative from EPA, Susan MacMullin, acting as Federal representative at the request of the Washington Policy Group, to discuss the potential for and substance of a schedule and document mutually acceptable to the State and Federal governments.

On September 27, 1990, we met in the presence of the following representatives of Federal Trustee agencies: Dave Gibbons, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Byron Morris, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and Paul Gertler, Cordell Roy, and Sandy Rabinowitch, U.S Department of the Interior. Steve Bugbee and Steve Torok, Environmental Protection Agency, were also present, as were Gina Belt, U.S. Department of Justice, and Liza McCracken, Alaska Department of Law. After the morning session, a working group of Senner, MacMullin, McCracken, and Rabinowitch outlined the discussion and tentative agreements reached in the morning.

Federal Intent Regarding Purpose and Scope of the Second Federal Register Notice

As a preliminary matter, Susan MacMullin recapped the following points about the scope and purpose of the autumn \underline{FR} notice, as proposed by the Washington Policy Group:

-the Federal government desires to accelerate the restoration process and formally notify the public that restoration is proceeding and how it is proceeding;

-a <u>FR</u> notice will be prepared to begin outlining a restoration plan for Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska, the notice will be published on or about November 16, 1990;

-the notice should characterize the restoration process as dynamic and explain that plans for restoration will necessarily change as additional data on injury, loss, and damages are received;

-the autumn <u>FR</u> notice should--

-describe restoration methodologies;

-describe restoration projects for 1991;

-evaluate these projects in terms of benefits to the environment and other applicable criteria;

-present the projects to the public as proposals, explaining that final decisions will be made upon further analysis of damage assessment data and receipt of public comment;

-discuss the damage assessment process, note that the process is not complete, explain that many data are yet to be evaluated, and identify how that affects restoration planning; and

-invite public comment.

State's Reaction to and Concern with Proposed FR Notice

Stan Senner outlined the State's concerns with the draft <u>FR</u> notice. At the outset, it is important to note that the State Trustee was only notified of the Federal intent to announce a draft restoration plan in the "11th hour." Specific concerns are:

-timing: The draft notice imposes a timetable--about six weeks--for preparation of a draft restoration plan; it is not possible, in that time, to draft a plan that is scientifically credible and legally defensible;

-content: The draft <u>FR</u> notice requires preparation of a comprehensive restoration plan before there has been an opportunity to fully evaluate NRDA study results;

-State involvement: The State's Trustee must be involved fully in the development and presentation of a restoration plan and schedule;

-joint resources: Resources to be restored in the spill area are a mixture of State, Federal, and privately owned; any restoration plan must be a joint State-Federal effort; and

-credibility: A restoration plan must be scientifically and legally defensible; premature publication of a draft plan would challenge the credibility of the Trustees and not serve the interests and needs of the public.

State-Federal Issues

Both State and Federal representatives recognized at the outset of the discussions the need to address:

-funding of restoration projects undertaken before settlement or recovery from Exxon;

-the relationship of a restoration plan to the NRDA science process; Although data from the 1989 field season have been analyzed for most studies, data from the 1990 season have only just become available. For some particularly crucial studies, such as Coastal Habitat, we do not yet even have a full analysis of 1989 data;

-the effects of a restoration plan on the NRDA legal case; and

-the implications of referring in the FR notice to a "restoration plan."

Basic Agreements: Content of a Draft Plan for Restoration

We agreed that subject to the approval of the State and Federal Trustees or their representatives, a notice in the \underline{FR} could be published, announcing the intent to prepare a document that will:

-discuss restoration methodologies (direct restoration, replacement, and acquisition of equivalent resources);

-consistent with advice of legal counsel, and using such data as are available, tie together damage assessment and restoration planning; and

-describe possible restoration projects for 1991 in the areas of direct restoration and habitat protection (i.e., acquisition of equivalent resources).

The document may also include:

-criteria used to select recommended projects (e.g., technical feasibility, public support, completeness of NRDA support data, cost, etc.);

-feasibility projects and related studies for 1991;

-plans in 1991 for:

-public participation;

-publication of a redrafted document, to be announced in a spring <u>FR</u> notice;

-a timeline for restoration planning; and

-further evaluation of restoration options in the August 1990 Progress Report;

-reports on 1990 feasibility studies; and

-summary of RPWG program to date.

As has been true in the past in other forums, the terminology for this proposed restoration planning document was at issue in our discussions. The problem, we believe, is based on two different perceptions of what the term "draft restoration plan" means. To the people involved in the NRDA process, the term has a legal meaning that suggests procedural and substantive requirements. From their perspective a less precise use of the term could be misleading by suggesting a degree of completeness or a point in the process that has not yet been reached.

On the other hand, people who are not involved in the NRDA process use the phrase, "draft restoration plan", in a nontechnical sense to suggest a dynamic planning guide. We recommend that both perspectives be respected and that the opportunity to go forward jointly with a <u>FR</u> notice this year announcing accelerated restoration activities should not be jeopardized by disputes over terminology. When appropriate, we recommend use of the phrase "draft plan for restoration," but that the actual document in the <u>FR</u> notice should be called "draft restoration work plan."

We agreed on a timetable that would allow for publication of the <u>FR</u> notice in December, as close to November 16, 1990 as we believe possible in terms of resources, project evaluation, and data analyses. This schedule will still allow us to publish a second <u>FR</u> notice in late March or early April. To meet this schedule, EPA will manage the <u>FR</u> process, write background sections, circulate drafts for review, incorporate comments, and, with respect to the Federal trustee agencies, resolve policy issues. The Restoration Planning Work Group will concentrate on assessing the 1990 feasibility studies, recommending restoration feasibility projects for 1991, making preliminary recommendations on projects, and writing summaries of these projects for the <u>FR</u> notice. Since the final review of restoration projects for 1991 has been scheduled for completion in mid-November under the schedule established by the Management Team, the December date is achievable. Since the Work Group's present activities are executed under the immediate direction of the Management Team, we propose that the Management Team continue to direct and work with RPWG for purposes of the objectives set forth in this memorandum.

In order to meet the schedule proposed above, we recognize that additional staff resources are required. Such resources are needed to supplement RPWG's substantive, editorial, and logistical capabilities.

Benefits of this Approach

In the approach outlined above, we strove to responds to the needs and wishes of the Washington Policy Group and address the practical and legal concerns raised by the State. We believe that publishing a <u>FR</u> notice containing or announcing availability of the Restoration Work Plan and 1991 Restoration Program would achieve the following:

-preserve State-Federal cooperation on NRDA science and restoration activities;

-provide both substantive and symbolic value;

-show that State-Federal governments are moving ahead with the task of restoration rather than awaiting the conclusion of protracted litigation; -demonstrate that, notwithstanding Exxon's intensive news media campaign, there are in fact damages to restore;

-take an ecosystem approach to restoration; and

-integrate the results of NRDA science studies with restoration planning.

Questions for Resolution

During the course of our discussions, we identified the following legal and procedural questions. We are preparing to bring them to our counsels and managers.

- (1) What National Environmental Protection Act, Coastal Zone Management Act, or other state or federal requirements apply to restoration activities proposed for the field? What time schedules and procedural steps do they impose?
- (2) Under NRDA procedures, are the parties constrained from spending money on restoration projects before a settlement or court award?
- (3) What effect will publication of a working restoration plan in the <u>FR</u> have on the needs or constraints of the Exxon Valdez litigation? Are these impacts acceptable to management?
- (4) How will proposed 1991 restoration projects be funded? Can the government directly bill Exxon? Do State and Federal governments have the ability to fund restoration projects now?
- (5) What will be the procedure for review of this proposal within the federal government and between the State and Federal governments?
- (6) How will the State Trustee's participation in further decisions be assured?
- (7) What is the mechanism for issuing a joint Federal-State <u>FR</u> notice?
- (8) In light of the process we have proposed for your review in this memorandum, will additional help be made available to the Restoration Planning Work Group?
- (9) As there probably will be continued beach cleanup of oiled beached in FY 1991, how will this restoration work plan be integrated with cleanup and response activities?

Next Steps

We have developed a preliminary schedule of milestones for accomplishing the publication of the autumn \underline{FR} notice. With the agreement of the Washington Policy Group and State Trustee, we will refine it, circulate a draft schedule to management and the RPWG by October 9, 1990, and continue to work toward the publication of the \underline{FR} notice.

Distribution:

Washington Policy Group: Alan Raul Tom Campbell George Van Cleve Dan Esty Marty Suuberg

Trustee Council: Walt Stieglitz Don Collinsworth Steve Pennoyer Mike Barton Al Ewing

Management Team: Gregg Erickson Byron Morris Paul Gertler Cordell Roy Susan MacMullin Dave Gibbons

Fill - RPWG RPWG Meetings I

Public Participation Workshop - Planned for 16-17 August in Anchorage. Notes for discussion by the RPWG:

1. Where should we hold it?

2. Who should we invite: (My preference is to limit invitations to those with hands-on experience with the participatory process. I don't think it would be helpful at this stage to invite people on the basis of what interest group they represent).

Roger Clark will fund George Stankey and or Bob Lee, along with himself and has asked if we would fund Julia Wondolleck. Pretty good deal I'd say!

Members of the Alaskan public with experience on public/ agency task forces -- Celia Hunter, Chris Christensen, Nancy Lethcoe have been suggested, who else?

Other agency people with related experience such as Bob Profiler of the DNR who organized the task force that put together the Forest Practices Act.

To discuss how to effectively use the media: Ernie Piperand Terrence O'Malley plus members of the press and television media (for one session). Suggestions from our Public Communications staff are Howard Weaver or Charles Wohlforth, ADN; Paul Jenkins or Joe Hunt, AT; Steve Himmel, APRN. Suggestions from Terrence O'Malley for TV include John Tracy, KTUU; Steve MacDonald, KTVA; Susan Kim, KIMO; and Dave Hammock from public radio, KDZU, Valdez.

Financial arrangements?

Roger has asked that we do some brainstorming to identify and clarify what it is we want to achieve via public participation. He would also like to be informed about any constraints or peculiarities that need to be considered; e.g. geographic, political, financial, social, etc.

5. Any suggestions for an agenda - what do we need to know and how should we organize our time? Roger has suggested an informal half-day on the first day with the second day being organized around the topics we are seeking information and/or guidance on ending with a closing session to draft a plan. Invitees will not attend all sessions; for example, media people will only be limited to sessions specifically dealing with that topic.

RPWG I

Summary of RPWG Meeting July 3rd; 2 pm

Attending: Frankie Pillifant, ADNR Sandy Rabinowitch, DOI Brian Ross, EPA Stan Senner, ADF&G John Strand, NOAA (via teleconference) Linda Comerci, EPA

> ** NEXT MEETING OF THE RPWG: Friday, July 13 at 1 pm ** Topics will include (1) critical path planning and (2) status of feasibility studies and technical support projects.

Update on July/August tasks

Management Team will meet either July 10 or 11 to review and comment on draft Progress Report. As shown below, RPWG members will be available to meet with the Management Team or will be available afterward to work with the Management Team on the Progress Report.

Frankie Pillifant: available after July 11 Sandy Rabinowitch: unavailable July 9-12 Brian Ross: available all week Stan Senner: may have to sit in for ADF&G at otter meeting July 9-10 John Strand: available all week

Other dates

July 23	William Reilly visit (EPA Administrator)
July 23-25	LaJuana Wilcher visit (EPA Assistant Administrator for Water)
August 16-17	Public Participation Meeting Tentative location: Federal Building (Sandy will confirm) Agenda is under development (Frankie has lead, with R.Clark); RPWG has reviewed draft and will finalize.

RPWG members schedules for July/August

Sandy Rabinowitch:	not available July 9-12 (except for attending Management Team meeting)
Brian Ross: Stan Senner:	not available July 17 to August 7 not available July 17-20
John Strand:	not available July 18-20
Frankie Pillifant:	1

Status of Feasibility Studies and Technical Support Projects

Feasibility Studies and Technical Support Projects will be discussed again at the next meeting of the RPWG (July 13 at 1 pm).

Land Status

The Land Status Project will be discussed at an internal ADNR meeting on Monday, July 9.

Peer Reviewers/Outside Experts

Efforts need to begin now to identify a list of peer reviewers and outside experts (for each resource area) to help define 1991 Restoration Feasibility Study proposals. Stan, with John Strand's help, will put together an initial draft of a memo to be circulated widely inviting suggestions on potential peer reviewers and experts (including matching to specified subject area). The memo is to include the following:

- list of "further development" projects
- list of current peer reviewers and those involved in Technical Workshop
- one-page description of anticipated tasks for peer reviewers

A large list of outside experts is needed so that backups will be available in case of scheduling conflicts. The Management Team has some suggestions; these should be considered first. We do not want this to look like a vote to select specific participants, but rather a method to come up with a wide list of potential participants.

Peer Reviewers/Outside Experts will be paid under DOJ contract.

Report Schedules/Status

Symposium Report

The Symposium Report is at the printer. The first set of xerox copies are available; a box of xerox copies will be coming to RPWG within the next week.

Progress Report

The July 1990 Progress Report is out for internal review by the Management Team. Management Team comments are expected by July 12. Based on those comments, RPWG will begin finalizing the draft report on July 12 and 13. Steve Bugbee will coordinate with the Management Team regarding whether they need to see a revised draft before the report is finalized. (Stan Senner suggested they should have the opportunity to see it again if they had major comments on the initial draft.)

Technical Workshop Report

The VERSAR contract has been extended to September 15, 1990. Comments on the draft report will be sent to VERSAR (through Hal Kibby) early next week; VERSAR will provide a final draft.

RPWG members agreed that the report should present proposed feasibility study ideas in summarized form (condensed paragraphs) to capture the output of the workshop without causing confusion with actual feasibility studies subsequently proposed and initiated.

Mailing list

The official NRDA mailing list (800 names) has been received. It will be compared and merged with the RPWG mailing list. Names from R.Drier's list of community contacts will also be incorporated. Complete list will be ready by July 13. Depending on size of final list, more Symposium Reports may need to be printed. Planning for Additional Meetings

- Native/Rural Villages in Alaska

- Outside locations (DC, Seattle, others?)

Planning will begin this month for additional community scoping meetings to be held no sooner than August. Pete Nogul has requested that RPWG schedule a community leader "summit" meeting in August or September. RPWG will do both: have a "summit" meeting and go out to communities. Order of meetings is uncertain at this time.

Rose Drier (ADEC) is anxious to help; may be able to ask her to start coordinating schedules. R.Drier has sent RPWG a list of contacts (in RPWG files). Stan Senner suggested a phone call first, then a letter. A possible minor conflict may arise between community level and management level. May want to draft a letter to the Corporations to let them know we are "initiating small community contact." A community liaison working group already exists (R. Drier, ADEC) so precedent exists for community level discussion.

Should contact and begin working with Drier, Nogul, and L. Vining to start the coordination process. Brian and Stan will follow-up on any necessary phone calls including an initial phone call to P.Nogul to discuss strategy.

Status Report on Video Project

Michele and Rob are going out Sunday night to film marbled murrelet restoration feasibility project on Monday with K.Kuletz. Also, the film team has permission to go out on the USFS barge to film the critical fauna in rocky intertidal study.

Status Report on Yellow Book II Media Briefing

A News Media Briefing for the release of Yellow Book II is being planned. Will need someone (or two - Fed and State) to represent Restoration in a five minute spot. May also need handouts.

NOAA's Restoration Conference in DC

The NOAA Conference on Habitat Restoration will be held September 25 and 26 at the Department of Commerce (main building) in Washington, DC. RPWG will receive an invitation to attend when flyers are mailed out in about two weeks. Since the agenda is already set, a presentation by RPWG is not likely.

NEBA report

Official copy expected Thursday (July 5). Official comments are due Sunday morning (July 8). Specifically, RPWG members will review for inappropriate language regarding restoration and natural recovery processes. RPWG comments will be provided either through a letter from RPWG to the Management Team or by a letter from one of the agencies directly to the Coast Guard.

Damage Assessment Synthesis Meetings

Synthesis meetings are ongoing. RPWG has received approval to sit in on these meetings.

Critical Path Planning

Critical Path Planning will be given a test run during the July meeting (July 13 at 1 pm). Topic will be the public aspect of public meetings (both local and outside of state).

RPWG Meeting Summary DRAFT - July 11, 1990

AGENDA **RPWG** Meeting July 3, 1990

R

- V 1. Update on July/August tasks
 - /2. RPWG member schedules for July/August; assignments for tasks
 - 3. Status of Feasibility Studies and Technical Support Projects Incl. initiation of projects not yet underway
- 1 4. Report Schedules/Status:
 - Symposium Report
 - **Progress Report**
 - Technical Workshop Report
 - Mailing List
- 5. Critical Path Planning (pick subject & date)
- J 6. Planning for Additional Public Meetings
 - Native/Rural villages in Alaska
 - Outside locations (D.C., Seattle, others?)
 - 7.
 - Status Report on Video Project Status Report on Yellow Book Media briefing 8-

8-29-90

Milestones (remainder of Oil Spill Year 2)

September	1	 Initiate development of cost estimates for "natural recovery" literature review; Request legal interpretation of MOA "restoration" definition.
	1-15	- Internal agency review of restoration options (from matrices) for potential feasibility study ideas. (all)
		- Subcommittee to review evaluation criteria for matrix options, including legal input. (NOAA, EPA, ADFG, DOI)
	19-20	- Village public meetings (Chenega and Tatitlek). (ADFG, USFS)
	21	 - RPWG meeting: - to determine preliminary list of 1991 feasibility studies, including long-term monitoring, for development and set up task forces to develop studies; - adopt evaluation criteria for matrix options and do a preliminary review of these options by resource catagory (subcommittees). - Possible meeting with DNR public participation team during brown bag lunch.
October:	1	- "Natural recovery" literature review - preliminary cost estimates due (EPA, NOAA, ADFG, USFS).
	1-15	 - RPWG task forces on feasibility studies meet, including selected peer reviewers, to develop 1991 studies and also review results of 1990 studies on upland habitat, forage fish, fucus, and intertidal fauna studies. - Obtain legal insight into definition of

- Obtain legal insight into definition of "natural recovery"; prior use of terms in court cases. (ADFG, EPA)

	15?	- RPWG meeting:
		 to review/merge "1st Generation" matrices (input from resource subcommittes); review cost estimates on "natural recovery" lit review and make a recommendation to M.T.; possible followup with DNR public participation team.
	15-30	- Possible additional village meetings.
		- Continued meetings of RPWG task forces on feasibility studies.
		- Recommendation to M.T. regarding "natural recovery" lit review.
November:		
	15-30	 -RPWG meeting to address: final recommendation of 1991 feasibility studies; resolve long-term public participation planning recommendations for 1991; draft 1991 workplan and budget.
	?	- Development of "2nd Generation" matrix (based on all information thus far, including any new ideas obtained through continued scoping, and identification of any information needs);
December:	3-7	- Present proposed 1991 workplan and budget to M.T.
	10-31	- Revise 1991 workplan. - Draft restoration chapter for "Grandson of Yellow Book"(GSYB).
January:		 Continue revising GSYB chapter on restoration per M.T. direction. Presentation of 1991 workplan to Trustee Council for approval.

بر المر بر المر بر المر

-5

RPWG MEETING - AUGUST 29-30, 1990 AGENDA

Wednesday, August 29

Start: 9:30

1. FEASIBILITY STUDIES

1

- proposal Development for 1991 (Technical Support Project No. 3)
 -determine which projects, incl. monitoring, to develop; assign leads
 - -set up schedules for proposals, meetings
 - -RFP to agencies? to public?
- decide how and when to evaluate 1990 Studies

2. EVALUATION OF MATRIX ENTRIES

- discuss needs and process
- form subcommittee to :
 - define evaluation criteria
 - establish process and timetable for evaluation

3. STATUS OF LITERATURE REVIEW

4. NATURAL RECOVERY

- definition
- how to monitor
- literature summary
- form subcommittee (?)
- 5. R. STEINER Coastal Coalition
 - discussion of proposal with Rick (tentative time 3:00 pm)

Thursday, August 30	Start: 8:30
- Litient	

6. MILESTONES

- revise Oil Year 2 milestones

- 1991 planning and budget

7. POSSIBLE FIELD TRIP FOR RPWG TO PWS

8. LAND STATUS & BEACH SEGMENT SURVEY PROJECTS - meet with DNR personnel (possibly 1:00 pm)

9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

scoping meetings:
-village meetings
-"outside" meetings - Seattle, D.C. ?
long-term project
other

- Pratt Museum in Homer (RPWG support?)

Tentative Agenda: RPWG Meeting Oil Spill Restoration Planning Office 9:00 am, May 30, 1990

- 1. Update on 5/25 Trustee Council meeting
- 2. Review and finalize "6/30" report outline
 - Milestone dates
 - Writing assignments
 - "Matrix:" what is it?
 - Final w/ memo to Management Team
- 3. Symposium report outline & publication schedule
- 4. Feasibility study projects:
 - Budget issues/process
 - Schedules
 - Results confidential or not?
 - P.R.?

As time allows:

- 5. Ongoing Public participation
 - village meetings
 - "outside" meetings
 - A/V ideas
 - Adler video
- 6. Continue OY90 work plan (meetings, monitoring, workshop #2, etc)
- 7. 1991 workplan/budget estimate
- 8. Periodic ststus report to Management Team
- 9. Office issues (space, etc.)
- 10. Other issuers?


OIL SPILL RESTORATION PLANNING OFFICE

437 E Street, Suite 301 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 271-2461 FAX: (907) 271-2467

September 17, 1990

<u>MEMORANDUM</u>

- SUBJECT: Transmittal of draft report on the Restoration Technical Workshop
- FROM: Restoration Planing Work Group
- TO: Management/Legal Teams

Attached for your information and review is an advance copy of RPWG's draft report on the Restoration Technical Workshop held April 3-5, 1990, in Anchorage. As you will recall this Workshop was the first attempt to get NRDA principal investigators and peer reviewers, along with selected additional outside experts, together to discuss potential restoration options and feasibility projects. The Workshop was closed to the public to foster open discussions based on preliminary NRDA findings. The Technical Workshop Report documents those discussions, and puts them in the context of the existing state-of-the-art in northern latitude ecological restoration. The report is meant to remain a confidential, internal document.

The report has been revised based on RPWG and limited P-I review. Although primarily a historical document, 100 (numbered) copies are being bound for distribution to the P-Is, peer reviewers, and outside experts who attended the Workshop to assist them in formulating ideas for feasibility studies or restoration projects that could be proposed for 1991. We anticipate receiving some additional review comments from the attendees, as well. At your direction, RPWG could then produce a final Technical Workshop Report or merely append any comments to this version for the record.

A copy of this report has been provided to CACI for the repository at the Simpson Building in Anchorage.

ATT ACHMENT

State of Alaska: Departments of Fish & Game, Natural Resources, and Environmental Conservation United States: Environmental Protection Agency, Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Interior

90	74	65	2	3	4	87		
							r	

RPWG-Fahruary 28, 1001 Anchorage

The usual gang plus Christina Gardner-DoJ Washington, D.C. 202 272-6702 FTS same 202 724-5854 FAX

FAX	NSMITTAL M	ÊMÔ
DEPT: FROM:	FAX #: 271-2467 PHONE: 465-2610	NO. DF PAGES
CO: Poet-II "brand fax transmittal	FAX #:	X

Stan-Restoration FR notice signed, to be published Mar 1. Need to revisit milestone sheet for implementation of FR notice. To be done by Sandy and Linda as soon as possible, then pass on to Management Team.

Sandy-Need to-know how many more iterations for public will be done. Probably at least two.

Stan-EPA (Roseanna Kupek) thinks Feds will contribute to Implementation activities. Not the same message being heard from other Fed agencies.

Stan-Natural Recovery Literature Review. Jones & Stokes, Versar, Un. of Wash-universal types. Hubbes Sea World & San Diego State- Marine mammals, invertebrates Southern Illinois-birds

Pt. Reyes-birds

Conference call early next week to narrow list. Reviewers-Senner, Strand, Fox, Friedman, Kibby

Natural Recovery Literature Review needs to be renamed Recovery Literature Review.

Sandy-Program analyst could be hired in roughly six months.

Christina-ads placed by Sharon. Watcoff contract exempt from procurement regs. In superfund, things are exempt, this is not superfund.

contract is cost plus. In option year two now.

overhead 91% onsite at Walcoff, goes down to 10% for offsite people. No overhead for subcontractor, but have other costs.

Experts are charged on other direct cost basis.

Will develop ball park figure to give to Ken for discussion.

Public Participation-Stan, Kon, Linda, Sandy to discuss process of development of plan. Tentatively Mar 12 at 1 pm.

Have some study proposals in, more on the way, time line for implementation of study proposals Stap, John, Ken, Linda at 10 on Friday. Look at format for March session.

Strand-monitoring-present at March session

Implementation-

Senner-Cole says settlement probably will not help 1991 projects because of law suits,

2

2

settlement details, etc.

Need to get habitat process in motion.

Sandy-wants to know if any money is available, Ken also. Do not want to spend time on detailed study plans if will not be done.

Implementation projects-Develop detailed study plans to get public comment. Lack of money may push implementation into 92 Need to address problems with Management Team. Stan and Ken will prepare memo to MT.

Need to develop file on permits and compliance for projects.

need comments on information needs by March 14 to Senner. Review with guidelines for dotailed study plans and implementation projects.

Early April for session with DNR on land statue data baco.

Early April session develop time line for November document.

April 22 orientation will start for Maysap.

Action Items

- 1. Conference call on Rocovery Literature Review.
- 2. Public Participation Plan development Mar 12, 1 pm
- Christ
- Time line for studies
- Comments on information needs to Senner by March 14
- 5. Memo to Management Team on implementation activities

	437 E Street, Suite Anchorage, Alaska		<u>م</u> ر
m m	(907) 271-246 FAH: (907) 271-2	1	
II Spill	Restoration	Planning O	ffice .
*** * ** *	* * * * * * * * *	** * * * * *	÷ *
0:	coration Planning We	ork Group (see l	ist)
FFICE/PHONE: _	Oil Spill		
FFICE/FRUME			
ROM:Star	Senner, Alaska Fish	and Game	
ATE:2	October 1990		
	2		
* PAGES (incl. c)ver):		
MESSAGES:			
istribution:			
Brodersen, DEC	Security .		
laxwell, ADF&C	na		
	-NPS		
abinowitch ,			
Ross, EPA			

2 OCTOBER 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Restoration Planning Work Group

FR: Stan Senner, ADF&G

RE: Next RPWG Meeting and Scoping Meeting in Port Lions

By now you each should have received at least a fax copy of the memorandum from Susan MacMullin and me regarding a possible state-federal agreement to publish a "restoration work plan" in the <u>Federal Register</u> in December. This matter is not yet resolved, but indications are that this plan will proceed. Regardless, we badly need to get together to get moving on restoration feasibility studies and the like. In that regard, later today I expect to mail a memorandum and various attachments for your consideration.

When can we next meet? Some combination of days next week--October 9,10, 11, or 12--would be logical. What are your schedules? I am aware that Mark Brodersen has a conflict, but how about the rest of you? Would you be able to meet in Anchorage for any pair of those days? Is this one of those occasions to meet in Juneau?

Lastly, we have an invitation from the village council in Port Lions to come for a scoping meeting. They are eager to meet soon, but no date has been set. Are there any volunteers for this mission? You can take a scheduled flight out of Kodiak to Port Lions, so no charter needs to be arranged.

Please let me know ASAP by fax or telephone if and when you are available for a RPWG meeting. Also, don't forget the opportunity for a meeting in Port Lions. Please let me know about both items.

Thanks.

	437 E Street, Suite 301
	Anchorage, Alaska 99501
<i>~</i>	(907) 271-2461
	FAH: (907) 271-2467
011 Sp111	Restoration Planning Office
*** * * * * *	
TO: Jok	IN ARMSTRONG
OFFICE/PHONE:	
BRIA FROM: Rest	AN D. ROSS, U.S. EPA toration Planning Team Leader
DATE: 9-1	890
# PAGES (incl.	cover):3
MESSAGES:	

湖湖

~	Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 271-2461 FAH: (907) 271-2467
nii sp	III Restoration Planning Office

ro:	RPWG Members (see list below) finan
	HONE:Oil Spill
ROM:	Stan Senner, Alaska Fish and Game
DATE:	17 September 1990

MESSAGES:

Here is a tenative agenda for Friday. Note starting time of 09:00 h. There is a Management Team meeting scheduled for the same day in Anch orage. This may or may not screw up the RPWG meeting, but we should go ahead and get done what we can.

If you have suggestions about the agenda, please fax them to the RPWG office no later than noon on Thursday.

Sandy and Stan will be in Chenega and Tatitlek on Tuesday and Wesndesday. Back on Thursday. Brain et al. are in an EPA training exercise Monday through Wednesday. Back Thursday. Things in Anchorage will be pretty well shut down until then.

RPWG members: Brodersen, Gibbons, Rabinowitch, Ross, Senner, Strand, and Thompson

	437 E Street, Suite 301 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 271-2461 FAH: (907) 271-2467
OII Spill	Restoration Planning Office
*** * * * *	
TO: CON	rad Kleveno
OFFICE/PHON	:
	AN D. ROSS, U.S. EPA storation Planning Team Leader
DATE: 9	-1890
# PAGES (incl	cover):
MESSAGES:	

Mar Trace



09:00 h

Public participation: where are we heading and when?

Literature review of "natural recovery" -cost estimates -recommendation to Management Team

Possible meeting w/Senior Scientist to review key results from damage assessment

Report schedule for feasibility studies, work plans, etc.

Matrix criteria: review product from committee

Report from Chenega and Tatitlek visits

Further discussion of purchasing options on timber rights

"Brown bag" lunch w/DNR folk re public participation (tentative)

Feasibility Studies

-review any agency suggestions about '91 studies

-review RPWG thoughts

-define task forces needed to review '90 and plan '91

-assign responsibilities for organizing

Monitoring: discuss results and recommendations from recent EPA exercise

17 September 1990 SES



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Oil Spill Damage Assessment and Restoration P.O. Box 210029 Auke Bay, Alaska 99821

.P.2/2

DATE:

October 24, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Federal Management Team and Federal Restoration Planning Work Group Members NOAA - Byron Morris

FROM:

SUBJECT:

Meeting with Washington Policy Group

I have been requested by the Washington Policy Group, on behalf of the federal Natural Resource Trustees, to notify you of a meeting scheduled for November 26 and 27th in Seattle between the Washington Policy Group, Trustee Council, Management Team, and Restoration Planning Work Group Members (federal representatives only, at this time). The purpose of the meeting is to discuss implementation of the decision made yesterday by the Policy Group to name NOAA as the lead Federal Trustee Agency for the Natural Resources Damage Assessment effort.

I have very little additional iinformation to provide at this time, other than that the meeting will begin Monday, November 26 at 1 pm, at NOAA's Sand Point facilities in Seattle (conference room yet to be determined). We are all expected to attend this meeting. Please notify your Trustee Council member of this meeting. You may wish to consult your Washington Policy Group representative for additional detail.

cc: S. Pennoyer T. Campbell C. O'Connor





MANAGEMENT TEAM/RESTORATION MEETING January 28-29, 1991 Anchorage, Alaska

DRAFT AGENDA

JANUARY 28 (Monday)

- 11:00 1:00 Management Team meeting MT chair
- 1:00 2:00 Lunch
 - (1 hour) Restoration Objectives RPWG
 - Oil Year 2 Progress
 - Oil Year 3 Objectives
 - Long-term Objectives
 - (15 min) Break
 - (1 hour) Oil Year 3 Proposed Work Plan/Budget RPWG
 - Restoration Options Analyses
 - Restoration Studies (Feasibility, Tech. Support, Monitoring)
 - 1991 Implementation Projects
 - Scientific Review
 - Literature review
 - Public Participation
 - Reports

January 29 (Tuesday)

- (2 hours) OY 3 Budget/Staffing/Organization, continued RPWG (Make recommendations for and schedule session with Trustee Council)
- (15 min) Break
- (2 hour) Completion of Federal Register notice
 - Schedule RPWG
 - Legal issues LT
- (1 hour) Lunch
- (1 hour) Other Management Team business MT chair

	OFFICE OF MARI	MENTAL PROTECTION NE AND ESTUARINE P CHINGTON, DC 20460	ROTECTION
	USE BLACK INK & NU	MBER ALL PAGES	
TO Ston Senner		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	FAX NUMBER (907)271-246
OFFICE/PHONE			
FROM RUTH YENDER	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
PHONE (FTS) 8245	5 4370	MAIL CODE	
(CML)		WH-	556F
OFFICE			
DATE /18-90		NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLU Z	DING THIS COMER SHEET)
		csimile messages Estuarine Protecti	
Equipment	Fac	simile number	
SHARP FO-330 PITNEY BOWES		S) 475-6689 (CML) (202 S) 382-6294 (CML) (202	
	NOTES/RI		Munnan ya Arekan Taraka kuta antara mana mana mana Na mana sa manan ili
Ch			
Stan- Susan asked v	re to Fax this	to you. She soi	d Paul Genator
wants it to Co	the will look	at It on Tursda	1.
Jusan 15 hot In	today but y	or Can talk to 11 and on Tussday.	er about any
Changes / addition	is you receiving	/ •• //	

Brian

1 martin

MANAGEMENT TEAM RESTORATION MEETING FOR OY3 January 28 - 29, 1991 Anchorage, Alaska

		Anchorage, Alaska
		Draft Agenda
	January 28	
	11:00 - 1:00	Management Team Meeting
	1:00 - 2:00	Lunch
	2:00 - 3:30	Restoration Science Literature Review Stan? Objectives Status
		Restoration Scientists for OY3 Restoration Efforts Linda?
		Expertise needed (Identify restoration alternatives and provide peer review) Mechanism for Identifying and Obtaining Restoration Scientists
$\langle \rangle$	3:30 - 4:00	Fublic Participation Options RPWG Recommendations
\sum	4:00 - 4:30	Monitoring
ma	4:30	Adjourn
	January 29	
-	8:00 - 10:00	Federal Register Notices Schedule Legal Issues NRDA Regulations NEPA Administrative Record Martha Fox?
This is the	10:00 - 12:00	Discussion of RPWG OY3 Workplan
	12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
	1:00 - 3:00	Restoration Budget/Staffing/Organization
	3:00 - 4:00	Next Steps
	4:00	Adjourn

MEMORANDUM

STATE OF ALASKA Department of Fish and Game

To: Stan Senner Restoration Program Mgr Anchorage File

Date: October 3, 1990

File No:

Telephone No: 465-4125

From: Gregg Erickson

Subject: Additional Participation in RPWG

During our recent discussion we agreed that it would be helpful to the Restoration Planning Work Group (RPWG) and the department if Judi Maxwell, the division's economics program manager, rejoined the RPWG. I believe her participation will be especially helpful in the areas of public outreach and will bring a desirable economic perspective to the evaluation of restoration proposals.

You remain the head of the department's and the state's delegations to the RPWG and speak for the department in that forum on policy matters.

cc: Judi Maxwell Brian Ross Agency RPWG Representatives