

RPWG  
II

**RESTORATION SUBGROUP MEETING**  
**January 16, 1992**  
**11:00 A.M.**

**Attendees:**

Art Weiner  
Ken Rice  
Karen Klinge  
Stan Senner  
John Strand  
Barbara Iseah

Stan - re: framework document evolution - at the December 19th Trustee Council meeting, one question McVee and Sandor asked was what can you do to make this framework more of a plan; the negative reaction was to the notion that it would take a whole year for the plan; Cole felt we had come up with a process but the council wants projects that are responsive to the public; Stan proposes that we take the approach section and ratchet down to one level of detail; it represents our best distillation of all public input, science data and the subgroup's ideas to be put out to the Trustee Council and then to the public; the framework document would reflect things that can be credibly recommended; a short descriptions of options to carry forward would then be written up and will go out in the framework document; public comment will be incorporated containing any additional options they recommend; then we take the document next fall and come back with round 2, which takes the framework document and makes it a public comment vehicle; this condenses the whole process but it produces a generic plan; reaction has been very positive from Alex regarding a list of options given to the Trustee Council to sink their teeth into

Ken - he likes most of the above regarding the plan; it goes back to the NEPA process in defining the course of action you want to take, then getting public comment and developing some alternatives based on issues; this allows the decision maker to weigh the pros and cons; if you don't have some way of showing the Trustees what the public is saying, you don't have a way of weighing what the choices are; this can be done with the framework document; he is not sure of a final plan by the end of the year but a solid draft could be done; comments should be used to find out the range of alternatives

Stan - one ramification of this scenario is that it would preclude the framework document from being a programmatic EIS

Ken - we need to do a programmatic EIS because this will set a course of action

Stan - if we do this, we will be lucky to have a draft by a year

from March and they don't want to hear that

Ken - he thinks Curt feels an EIS is needed

Art - who makes the call?

Ken - NEPA is a federal agency and they are responsible for it; the three federal Trustees have to say if they need an EIS; attorneys will say you are better off doing it than fighting it

Art - it seems that the decision whether to go forward with a programmatic EIS will drive this whole process

Ken - there has not been a decision on whether to do an EIS

Stan - the framework document has never been purported to be an EIS document; 90% of the contents of the framework document are set; the EIS decision has to be made before they can buy off on these documents and when they will come out

John - would we be providing examples only or can we get something for each of the resources?

Stan - Sandor was pleased to hear that we might have something specific in the way of options; (a sample write up was distributed on designation and management of protected marine habitats)

John - we need to go through some language process to give to the readers

Art - it would help to show the different approaches first and then get into more detail

Stan - the themes could be emphasized and a list prepared of ones that met the red face test; questions would then be invited; we need to tell what additional steps or analysis we will bring to bare

Ken - does this forego the evaluation criteria by putting in various options and have we applied the criteria?

Stan - it is a delicate line; two sections on the criteria have been written; we are now inviting public comment on the criteria so that in the future we have criteria that reflects public input

Karen - we would have the rejected sections to show we used the criteria

Stan - all the council is saying is that on their merits these options are sufficient to bring to the public for their comments; Alex feels we should give the council our list and if they have a problem with one, it can be put on the rejected list; the list



could possibly be circulated within our agencies first

Art - are we putting in the arguments and counterarguments?

Stan - a category could be put in with a sentence or two; the second stage might be two pages per option

John - isn't some of this dealt with in the criteria?

Art - it does in a specific sense, but in generic terms there are some broad-based arguments that need to be articulated

Karen - the second stage will help flush this out

Art - the word "could" should be used instead of "should"; interpretation of the document should not indicate a strong endorsement

Ken - it should represent an estimation and ask if we are on the mark

Stan - the initial list of items is about 40 or so

Karen - some items were split to provide some specifics

Stan - his suggestion would be we need to take the approaches list and get them nailed down for all the species and resources; to make wordsmithing manageable, the document should just be given to them to write their comments and then let them make the final cut

Art - he suggested using DocuComp to compare different versions of lists; we are developing a double standard; one set of projects has been through a rigorous process and now some projects appear to be put on a fast track

Ken - the criteria have been applied to some extent; in the public review process, criteria will be more rigorously applied than ever before

Stan - we are saying it is technically feasible and not inconsistent with state and federal law

Art - he would be more comfortable if there is an explicit level of fairness

Stan - we need to get all species up to the same level of detail; the work group needs to go to the options and approaches list and make sure everything has been captured

Art - he recommended to Ken that Bob Spies come up for the February 5th and 6th Trustee Council meeting

Ken - \$2 million dollars was put back into restoration science

Art - how has narrative introductory text been developed?

Stan - achieving consistency will be a big job; for the moment we should not worry about the opening lines in the transitional material; we should just give the major themes out of a laundry list of options; it would make more sense to the public and be more ecologically-integrated if we went species by species

John - we need the process

Stan - prior to the option section, there will be a section on the injury criteria and the implementation criteria

Art - somewhere in the documentation, we need to define what the headers mean

Stan - there has been a definition of restoration and equivalent resources; Art's diagram might be a good graphic tool to aid the public in understanding

John - the sections need to be outlined

Stan - the relative weight put into each theme could be outlined

Art - we should exchange sections to review

John - the 10th was the due date for outlines

Stan - the 31st is the date for getting the drafts

John - there are workshops to hold for coastal habitat

Ken - the RT will set the objectives for what a coastal habitat program will be; the workshop will be a RT and peer review process

Stan - no one from the RT is acting as a formal liaison to Bob Spies

Ken - this group is referred to as the framework subgroup

Meeting was adjourned for lunch.

DRAFT [01/15/92, outline.opt, SES]

Options to be described in new section on Restoration Options  
(under the lettered heading, specific options are not ordered)

A. Management of Human Uses (restore, rehabilitate)

- patrol archaeological sites and educate public
- change management emphases and harvest practices for commercially-harvested fish and shellfish
- improve stock identification and assessments in support of more intensive management of fish and shellfish
- develop plans for fish and shellfish that previously did not require intensive management
- reduce disturbance at marine bird colonies and marine mammal haul-out sites
- redirect or reduce sport-fishing harvests
- redesignate Chugach National Forest as a National Recreation Area
- increase management presence in State Marine Parks
- adjust legal harvests for sea ducks and marine mammals and educate public about harassment and shooting problems

B. Manipulation of Resources, including Species and Habitats (restore, rehabilitate, replace, enhance)

- excavate archaeological sites and artifacts
- improve or supplement stream and lake habitats for spawning and rearing of wild salmonids
- create new recreation public-use facilities



- remove oiled mussel beds and provide clean substrates for recolonization

---

- eliminate sources of persistent contamination of prey and spawning substrates

- test feasibility of enhancing murre productivity through social facilitation and modifications of nest sites

- minimize incidental take of marine birds by commercial fisheries

- eliminate introduced predators from islands that are or were important for ground-nesting marine birds

- expand fisheries harvest opportunities by establishing alternative salmon runs

C. Habitat Protection and Acquisition (restore, rehabilitate, enhance, acquire the equivalent)

- update and expand the State's Anadromous Fish Stream Catalog

- establish EVOS "special management area" on State lands

- acquire privately-owned tidelands

- designate protected marine habitats

- establish Nellie Juan and College Fjord Wilderness Areas within the Chugach National Forest

- acquire additional marine bird/sea duck habitats for Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge

- acquire inholdings within Kenai Fjords National Park

- protect/acquire upland forests, watersheds, and streams

- acquire additional sites to expand Alaska Marine Park

system

- acquire extended buffer strips on anadromous fish streams
- designate and protect "benchmark" ecological monitoring

sites

- acquire access to sport-fishing streams

D. Other Resources/Services (whatever doesn't fall into the above)

- test subsistence foods for hydrocarbon contamination
- develop comprehensive, ecologically designed, post-EVOS monitoring program
- endow science fund to support long-term ecological and applied research
- develop integrated education and public information program to foster the wise use, enjoyment and protection of marine resources

an example...

TITLE: Designation and Management of Protected Marine Habitats

INJURED RESOURCES/SERVICES: sea otter, harbor seal, killer whale, river otter, marbled murrelets, pigeon guillemots, harlequin ducks, black oystercatchers, and coastal habitat

herring

DESCRIPTION: Designate one or more marine/intertidal areas and, if appropriate, adjacent uplands, as Marine Sanctuaries, Estuarine Research Reserves, Alaska Marine Parks, Alaska Critical Habitats Areas or other conservation designations.

PURPOSE: To focus special management attention on discrete (i.e., well-defined and relatively small) marine/intertidal areas that are important to the recovery of injured species. Such designations as Marine Sanctuary enable resource managers to foster coordination among governmental entities and program, focus research and public attention, and balance competing uses relative to the needs of injured species. [this can be stated much better]

INFORMATION NEEDED: Integrate and map habitat requirements of all injured marine species and compare benefits/costs of Marine Sanctuary and other designations relative to programs and designations currently in place (i.e., status quo).

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR: Final recommendations could be formulated in 1993, but designation process is lengthy and complicated. Marine Sanctuaries require congressional action.



bald eagle

- continue helicopter surveys to monitor nesting success
- determine number of eagles in Prince William Sound, Kenai, Kodiak/Afognak, and Alaska Peninsula areas.
- continue to follow radio-tagged eagles to improve understanding of use of shoreline areas for nesting and feeding and to improve management guidelines.

black oystercatcher

- determine linkage of oiled mussels to reduced productivity
- monitor population recovery

coastal habitat

- monitor recovery of injured areas in National Parks
- monitor natural recovery in affected areas
- study means of transplantation of Fucus to affected areas

subtidal habitat

- monitor populations of hydrocarbon-degrading microorganisms
- monitor changes to and recovery of invertebrate populations
- monitor changes in the composition of hydrocarbons that have been trapped in sediments
- monitor changes in affected eelgrass beds and associated invertebrate community
- monitor changes in deep and shallow benthic organisms in affected areas

archaeology

- protection and preservation of archaeological resources
- conduct salvage archaeology of damaged sites