To: Dave Gibbons
Acting Administrative Director

Date: Sept. 8, 1992

From: Marty Rutherford
Restoration Team Member/ DNR

Subject: EVOS 1993 Proposed Projects

Upon returning to work following my leave of 8/31 - 9/04 I reviewed the voting record of my alternate on the Restoration Team, Mr. Art Weiner. I am satisfied with his approach on all but four projects. In each of these instances he had some specific concerns that led him to vote no, resulting in their not being included in the Restoration Teams' recommended package.

Following further conversations with the Chief Scientist and either the specific projects' program manager or other staff from the applicable agency involved in the project, I feel that the misgivings Art had concerning the technical merits of the projects and/or a desire to see an agency involved in cost sharing these projects can be addressed adequately during the development and review of the detailed study plans. Additionally, concerning project #93-034 (Pigeon Guillemont colony survey), there is recent clarification that there is a greater opportunity for habitat protection than was previously understood.

Therefore, because these projects are in my opinion important elements of the 1993 Restoration package, I am changing DNR's vote on the following projects so they can go forward as part of the Restoration Teams' recommended package to the Trustee Council:

93-004/93-013 Pink Salmon documentation, enumeration, preservation of genetically discrete wild populations in PWS;

93-012 Kenai River sockeye: genetic stock identification

93-015 Kenai River sockeye: salmon restoration;

93-034 Pigeon Guillemont colony survey.

Your assistance is appreciated.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Damage Assessment

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that there is continuing injury to the resource and/or service, but the extent and/or mechanism is not understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

X Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

Fry: Retroactive damage determination very difficult or impossible to get.
- Idea: focus on what injury is still occurring with some past injury.
* Do recreational restoration under enhancement heading and do not do a damage assessment study.
- Approach TC to spend $ to do recreation activities directly & not do study - have no proposals in hand because we will not have a restoration plan.
- Information indicates damage to recreational services. If not comfortable to make this, we have proposals on table.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 0**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	N	N	N	N	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.
** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Recreational Resources (93-001) - Ken stated that this project was supported if there is insufficient evidence through the federal government economic study #5 or any state study dealing with recreational resources. Ken stated that this project was contingent upon any economic studies which are available. Funds are being targeted toward direct activity and not a study. This project does not come forward with any actual projects. Ken suggested as an example using the education project as a marketing project to show what has happened to the environment. Pam stated that building cabins was suggested before. Pam thought that the this study would be done in some form if the TC accepted there was injury. Ken stated the vote was "yes" contingent upon the TC saying we don't have sufficient evidence. Dave stated it is a "no" vote as this project is written and it was decided not to do more studies. **Con: The Restoration Team believes that there was sufficient information from damage assessment studies to conclude that recreational resources and services were injured and that if the Trustee Council disagreed, then we would move ahead with a study similar to the one proposed. This project will need to be reviewed and refined. If the study moves forward, an RFP will be recommended.** Only if the TC wanted something along these lines, would we go back. Pam stated that education accomplishes a lot of objectives, but would not sell education solely through recreation. Pam suggested that this project might need a cover sheet for explanation of the recommendation. The vote was "yes" unless with -0- budget. Jerome suggested voting again because of concerns expressed by Byron. Dave recommended keeping the "yes" vote and documenting the decision. Pam stated it would be cleaner to say "no" with no dollar amount. It should be highlighted as a unique case. Marty stated that we should be consistent with how it appears on the first list. This project is included in the package but will not be recommended to go forward. The intent is not to do this study, which is contingent upon the Trustee Council's decision. Byron stated that to be consistent, it should be changed to "no". It was agreed to change the vote to "no" and keep the above justification statement.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Damage Assessment

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that there is continuing injury to the resource and/or service, but the extent and/or mechanism is not understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Continuation of FS-27.
- 300,000 smolts out of Kenai River in 1992 (in 1991 2.5 million smolt).
- Trustee Council in June meeting added additional funds to this project.
-Cook Inlet sockeye expenditures per year by ADF&G is about $5 million (Montague).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Sockeye Overescapement (93-002) - Pro: The damage assessment information from this year still indicates worsening damages consistent with the hypothesis of overescapement. This project is time critical. If nothing is done this year, we will not have a feel for the severity of the problem. Vote was 5 to 1 "yes"; DOI voted "no".

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Damage Assessment

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that there is continuing injury to the resource and/or service, but the extent and/or mechanism is not understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

-Objective:

- Experiment to test if oil caused sterility in pinks or is it due to some other cause.

- This project is strongest of all the proposed 1993 pink salmon work (Spies)

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Pink Salmon (93-003) - Form 3B should be expanded. The vote was 6 to 0 "yes". **Pro: The 1991 and 1992 information indicates continued increase in injury. Determining the cause of the injury is critical. There is reason to believe that the injury to pink salmon is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) X MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
Objectives for 93004 & 93013:
- Objective #1 - do work on reduced number of streams if defensible (straying & in-season management).
- Objective #2 - Contingent upon past results (break out costs).
- Objective #3 - Do if no cost.
- Objective #4 - Reduced number of samples (see objective #6).
- Objective #5 - Otoliths for streams from subset of stream in objective # 1 (funding contingent upon findings from past work).
- Objective #6 - Reduced level of project #13 (perhaps 100 fish/stream and 2 hatcheries and 10 streams. Do disparate parts of PWS to provide maximum change to detect differences.

Sent back for new budget.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 4**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.
** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Make it a scoping project not full fledge analysis of genetics (Fry).
- genetic studies already conducted on pink salmon in Southeast Alaska and Alaska Peninsula.
- Tony Garret (Auke Creek) found genetic differences in same run based upon location in stream (Hilborn).
- Hatchery straying tends to be higher than wild fish straying.
- If project 13 does not go forward, the number of samples taking this project is reduced.
- 100 fish/stream and reduced number of streams.
- Incorporate small component of genetic study #4 into study #13 (do disparate parts of PWS to get maximum chance for finding genetic differences).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES * No vote, incorporated into 93013**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Using method suggested, thee has been no demonstrated population effects (Spies) Objective #2 - Results % of past work not completed to our knowledge.
- Objectives (Ray Hilborn)
    - #1 - Good objective (adds accuracy to aerial surveys).
    - #2 - Contingent on results of past work before funding.

Voted on project as is with objective #2 funding dependent upon results from past work.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 3**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	Y	N	Y	N	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.
** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Pink Salmon Documentation (93-004)(93-013) - These were combined and include work on a reduced number of streams. The combined budget is reduced by $300,000. The genetic sampling component is reduced in those sites which indicate considerable straying into the wild streams. The vote is 4-2 "yes"; DNR and DOI voted "no". **Pro: The ability to impose stock-specific management on the commercial fishery and reduce fishery exploitation on oil-impacted stocks is vital to their restoration. It will help determine if it is possible to maintain genetic integrity of the wild stock. There is reason to believe that there is continuing injury to the wild stocks or pink salmon, but the extent and/or mechanism is not understood. This project provides important information that would contribute to their restoration. Con: On the 28th Bob Spies stated that the project addresses a hatchery-related problem which existed prior to the spill and is difficult to support. Differentiation of wild stocks from hatchery stocks is a management issue which existed prior to the spill and continues. We are unsure if the genetic portion of the study will give us any results. There is a fair level of uncertainty that we will get some definitive answers. The evidence for population-level effect on pink salmon is inconclusive.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

Bob provided comment on the following projects:

93-004 and 93-013 - These address problems that are mainly hatchery-related conflicts which existed prior to the spill and he would have a hard time supporting these. These should be funded from some other source.

To: Dave Gibbons
Acting Administrative Director

Date: Sept.8, 1992

From: Marty Rutherford
Restoration Team Member/ DNR

Subject: EVOS 1993 Proposed Projects

Upon returning to work following my leave of 8/31 - 9/04 I reviewed the voting record of my alternate on the Restoration Team, Mr. Art Weiner. I am satisfied with his approach on all but four projects. In each of these instances he had some specific concerns that led him to vote no, resulting in their not being included in the Restoration Teams' recommended package.

Following further conversations with the Chief Scientist and either the specific projects' program manager or other staff from the applicable agency involved in the project, I feel that the misgivings Art had concerning the technical merits of the projects and/or a desire to see an agency involved in cost sharing these projects can be addressed adequately during the development and review of the detailed study plans. Additionally, concerning project #93-034 (Pigeon Guillemont colony survey), there is recent clarification that there is a greater opportunity for habitat protection than was previously understood.

Therefore, because these projects are in my opinion important elements of the 1993 Restoration package, I am changing DNR's vote on the following projects so they can go forward as part of the Restoration Teams' recommended package to the Trustee Council:

93-004/93-013 Pink Salmon documentation, enumeration, preservation of genetically discrete wild populations in PWS;

93-012 Kenai River sockeye: genetic stock identification

93-015 Kenai River sockeye: salmon restoration;

93-034 Pigeon Guillemont colony survey.

Your assistance is appreciated.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- "Passport in Time" (Pit) portion is not cost effective and intent is covered by site stewardship (07) proposal (Dummond).
- Remove ARPA training for Park Rangers ($10,000).

MOTION

- Postpone "Pit" portion for 1993 and do remaining portion of public education as proposed.
- Pit too costly and not cost effective at $549,000.
- Look at combining with 009 later.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Archaeology (93-005) - Jerome questioned if this is one of the big five injuries and if there appears to be an imbalance of archaeology projects. Pam stated that it has been pretty short shifted since 1989 compared to the other resources. The program has distinct components which fit together into a logical goal to accomplish something. Vote was 6-0 "yes". **Pro: This project is time critical to ensure that additional injury does not occur. There is potential for additional injury to cultural resources by not initiating some programs. Cultural resources are non-renewable. Due to the increased number of people in the area during clean-up activities, increased knowledge of site locations occurred, leading to a higher rate of vandalism. It is possible to decrease this increased rate of vandalism through public education.** Fix budget and increase detail on contractual.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
*- Limit to 24 sites and of these that are repairable. Work pending.
- Independent review of McAlister report.
- Duplication of sites with SUNY-B Damage Assessment Study (Archaeology).
- SUNY-B sites out of intertidal area were not injured.
- If sites are fixable, then do it but many are intertidal and are questionable for restoration (Dummond).
- Previously injured sites role of agency - what level of increased vandalism.
- Curation costs limited to sampling processing labeling, etc. but not long-term storage.
- Need McAlister report to verify injury (due 9/92).
- Take out internment costs.
- General Administrative cost improperly determined (only 7% of contracts not 7% of line 300).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Site Specific Archeological Restoration (93-006) - This project takes whatever restoration actions can be taken contingent upon peer review. The costs have not been removed for bones which need to be repatriated. DNR's costs are twice as much, and Marty may need to explain this. The focus is on known sites. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: This is direct restoration of known injured sites. It is time critical to protect those injured sites from further injury. Monitoring injured sites is one component of this project and is an appropriate restoration tool for cultural resource sites.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Duplication of 1992 work, "eliminate duplication" (i.e., development of training materials, printing, etc).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTE 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Archeological Site Stewardship (93-007) - This is a continuation of the study developing materials for use by local village residents to enlist their aid in protecting cultural resources in their area. DNR is the lead agency. Ken stated this is a lot of money to keep the program going. Byron questioned the budget for printing training materials and the fact there is no 1992 approved budget. Pam stated all the budgets need a lot more work. These budgets represent an upper limit and will need a more detailed look later. The vote is 6-0 "yes". Site stewardship builds local education and awareness. Funding a program for a limited area and expansion of that program will be done on a case-by-case basis and will not be locked in long-term. **Pro: This project continues work that was begun in 1992. The 1992 work prepared materials for the site stewardship program, and 1993 work will include recruiting and training of site stewards. This is time critical to protect injured sites from further injury.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- What is existing level of agency efforts vs. Exxon funding.
- Will help public awareness.
- Be coordinated with site-stewardship.
- People (public) realize somebody cares.
- More agency coordination needed - appears more is needed & possibility reduce budget by elimination of duplication.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Archaeological Site Patrol Monitoring (93-008) - The vote was 6-0 "yes". Site stewardship and site monitoring are complimentary projects. Ken stated he would like a report of how many people were contacted. If you can make an example of a couple of people, you can make a big impression. You also show the public that someone cares. **Pro: Increased awareness and presence of agencies is important to deter vandalism.** We need to scrutinize this project closer next year.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

BOB SPIES REVIEW

Bob gave the following comments on 6-0 and 5-1 Restoration Team votes:

93-008 - Bob wanted to be assured this project was not too top-heavy in administration. The balance between administrative training types and field personnel actually involved in doing the work was questioned. This can be revisited at a later date.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Focus products to specific user groups/restoration of resources.
- Very ambitious, scale back and focus on restoration end-point.
- Cruise ship training material only, not bodies for boats.
- High Quality products.
- Price tag too high - reduce to $450,000
- Objectives

  #3 scale back to training only
  - 1 video (look)
  - 3 brochures (look)
  - school curriculum
  - cruise ship training
  - printing

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 3**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Public Information (93-009A) - Pam would like to give NPS and FWS an opportunity to do some pieces of this project. Jerome stated ADF&G was suppose to do the Watchful Wildlife Program component. Pam would like a commitment from Ken that some way to split funding will be explored. Art questioned the sense of immediacy on this project for this year. Ken stated there is a component which deals with recreation resources, and the recommendation is to fund some projects which deal with recreation resources. The vote is 5-1 "yes"; DEC voted "no". **Pro: We are responding to public comment and a desire for accurate information, which will heighten the level of awareness to minimize injury to resources. Getting accurate information out to the public is long overdue.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion of in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Ranger for 8 months or RT suggest several Rangers in critical time period.
- Concentrate on party boat (charter boat) captains before season.
- Change emphasis "all colonial nesting birds, not just murres."
- What part is normal agency responsibility
- Connection with Federal law against harassment of wildlife; add law enforcement component but keep to a minimum.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Murres (93-010) - This is an education project targeted at intervening to prevent disturbance of nesting murres and further injury. There are limited options for accelerating the recovery of this species and reducing further decline. Pam stated this project targets the segment of the population causing the problem more effectively than the other education projects. Art questioned whether this would fall into normal agency management. The vote is 3-3. DNR, ADF&G and DEC voted "no". **Pro: This is a positive restoration action to affect the reproduction of an ongoing injured resource. It is time critical because the breed patterns at the colonies have not yet been restored. Any action to prevent further disturbance has the potential for significant positive effect on the colony. Con: This is not time critical. Before spending money on untried methods, we should see if we are getting increased breeding in these colonies this year. We are looking at long-term recovery, and one year will not make that much difference. We do not have documentation that human disturbance of the colonies exacerbates the low recovery that is occurring. In terms of sport commercial activities, this project would not do any good, and people will not change their fishing techniques and equipment because of this program.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion of in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Can latrine sites be used to validly predict population--question reliability & possible meaningful information?

*New Proposal - much lower budget to prepare paper record of harvest pressure on Harlequin & river otters-greatly reduced cost; keep it below $5,000. Identify agency matching funds.

♦-24 Harlequins harvested per year.
♦-6,000 Harlequins in Prince William Sound.

♦ Harvests very small.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

River Otters (93-011) - Spies stated the budget was too high and he was not sure it was worth doing. Mark questioned why this is not a one shot deal. Byron questioned the amount for phone and car rental under contractual. The vote is 5-1 "yes"; DOI "no". **Pro: The information will identify whether increased management emphasis is an effective tool as a restoration option. It is a potential cost-effective method of restoring injured resources.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

BOB SPIES REVIEW

Bob gave the following comments on 6-0 and 5-1 Restoration Team votes:

93-011 - Bob stated he understands that the Harlequin Duck are not prize birds for eating. He wonders if the funding required will make a difference for 20 ducks. He has a similar question for river otters. He is not sure this is worth doing for such a small amount; however, for $5,000 he will not make a big issue of this.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) X MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion of in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Funding contingent upon result form 1992 work.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 4**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Genetic Stock - Kenai River Sockeye (93-012) - Pro: Funding for this project is contingent upon 1992 showing a need to continue this work. The results from 1992 indicate further decline from 1991 to the most important salmon fishery in the oil spill region. This project is time critical. Stock separation should be done for effective management. This project needs component estimates. The vote was 4 to 2 "yes"; DOI and DNR "no". **Con: The percent contribution attributable represents approximately 33% of the overescapement. There are contributions which can't be attributed to the oil spill. Only a third can be attributed to the oil spill. The techniques in this proposal have broad application for salmon management in general. If agencies need this for management, they should fund it out of their own budget. The problem in 1989 was due to a management decision by ADF&G and taking no other action that would have mitigated the overescapement.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

To: Dave Gibbons
Acting Administrative Director

Date: Sept.8, 1992

From: Marty Rutherford
Restoration Team Member/ DNR

Subject: EVOS 1993 Proposed Projects

Upon returning to work following my leave of 8/31 - 9/04 I reviewed the voting record of my alternate on the Restoration Team, Mr. Art Weiner. I am satisfied with his approach on all but four projects. In each of these instances he had some specific concerns that led him to vote no, resulting in their not being included in the Restoration Teams' recommended package.

Following further conversations with the Chief Scientist and either the specific projects' program manager or other staff from the applicable agency involved in the project, I feel that the misgivings Art had concerning the technical merits of the projects and/or a desire to see an agency involved in cost sharing these projects can be addressed adequately during the development and review of the detailed study plans. Additionally, concerning project #93-034 (Pigeon Guillemont colony survey), there is recent clarification that there is a greater opportunity for habitat protection than was previously understood.

Therefore, because these projects are in my opinion important elements of the 1993 Restoration package, I am changing DNR's vote on the following projects so they can go forward as part of the Restoration Teams' recommended package to the Trustee Council:

93-004/93-013 Pink Salmon documentation, enumeration, preservation of genetically discrete wild populations in PWS;

93-012 Kenai River sockeye: genetic stock identification

93-015 Kenai River sockeye: salmon restoration;

93-034 Pigeon Guillemont colony survey.

Your assistance is appreciated.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Technical Support

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project provides essential support to restoration, monitoring, and/or damage assessment projects.

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Reduce it to a one year study.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 3**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	N	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Quality Assurance for Coded Wire Tagging (93-014) - The vote was 3 to 3; DNR, NOAA and DOI voted "no". Coded wired tagging is used to gather information for successful management of pink salmon in the area. Considerable money ($7m) has been spent already. This would allow for better use of past and future results from coded wire tagging efforts. This project supports another project. **Reasons not to go forward - Con: This project is not time critical and does not support a restoration endpoint. This should be something the agencies should do themselves as a matter of course.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) X MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion of in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 4**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Kenai River Sockeye Salmon Restoration (93-015) - This project was began as the companion to R53 in 1992. This is the adult component and is critical for dealing with results from damage assessment. Ken stated that the write-up leads you to believe that additional technical equipment must be purchased, and he thought this equipment was bought last year. This appears to be duplication and will need further review. The vote was 4 to 2; DOI and DNR voted "no". **Pro: The results from 1992 indicate further decline from 1991 to the most important salmon fishery in the oil spill region. This project is time critical and maximizes opportunity for adequate spawner escapement in 1993. Con: The percent contribution attributable represents approximately 33% of the overescapement. There are contributions which can't be attributed to the oil spill. Only a third can be attributed to the oil spill. The techniques in this proposal have broad application for salmon management in general. If agencies need this for management, they should fund it out of their own budget. The problem in 1989 was due to a management decision by ADF&G and taking no other action that would have mitigated the overescapement.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

To: Dave Gibbons
Acting Administrative Director

Date: Sept.8, 1992

From: Marty Rutherford
Restoration Team Member/ DNR

Subject: EVOS 1993 Proposed Projects

Upon returning to work following my leave of 8/31 - 9/04 I reviewed the voting record of my alternate on the Restoration Team, Mr. Art Weiner. I am satisfied with his approach on all but four projects. In each of these instances he had some specific concerns that led him to vote no, resulting in their not being included in the Restoration Teams' recommended package.

Following further conversations with the Chief Scientist and either the specific projects' program manager or other staff from the applicable agency involved in the project, I feel that the misgivings Art had concerning the technical merits of the projects and/or a desire to see an agency involved in cost sharing these projects can be addressed adequately during the development and review of the detailed study plans. Additionally, concerning project #93-034 (Pigeon Guillemont colony survey), there is recent clarification that there is a greater opportunity for habitat protection than was previously understood.

Therefore, because these projects are in my opinion important elements of the 1993 Restoration package, I am changing DNR's vote on the following projects so they can go forward as part of the Restoration Teams' recommended package to the Trustee Council:

93-004/93-013 Pink Salmon documentation, enumeration, preservation of genetically discrete wild populations in PWS;

93-012 Kenai River sockeye: genetic stock identification

93-015 Kenai River sockeye: salmon restoration;

93-034 Pigeon Guillemont colony survey.

Your assistance is appreciated.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Project must get necessary permits (RPT & ADF&G).
- Compensation project.
- Very few salmon other than pinks in Chenega area.
- Used pink salmon in past for subsistence, many pinks in area.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Chenega, Chinook and Coho Salmon (93-016) - Art questioned if the legal opinion has any bearing. The legal team did not specifically comment on 93-016. Vote was 5 to 1 "yes"; DOI "no". **Pro: Replacement of injured resource to provide subsistence service.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion of in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Jim Fall (#17) will do survey.
How: communities/villages will identify & prioritize sites to be surveyed for oil. Then this will be fed into project #38.
- Perhaps: instead of transporting subsistence users to collect food items, give Natives money to clean-up beaches to their satisfaction.
- Trustee Council will make decisions on further oil removal or subsistence plan, not subset of agencies.
- Oil spill communities should identify where subsistence site and problem areas (oil) but not too what extent of removal of oil at these sites.
- On project 93038: Trustee Council should develop new standards for oil on beaches (i.e., on subsistence areas, oil should be removed to a higher standard.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Subsistence Restoration (93-017) - This will be revisited next week. Pam stated she will ask Maria to share the Chenega Bay information with Jim.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Subsistence Restoration (93-017) - Joe obtained an answer to the question of whether there was overlap on this project. MMS incorporated the BIA project. It was the intent to take the joint MMS and ADF&G study and apply it to what they want to do. Pam asked what part of 93-017 needs to come out. It sounds like some pieces of this study have already been done or are being done. Jerome stated that this is not duplicative. Byron had a comment on the hydrocarbon analysis and stated this study must adhere to NOAA's criteria and go to their lab for analysis. It would be easier if one of NOAA's lab did the analysis rather than through a contract. Byron stated it would be fine if they went to DEC labs also. Pam stated we should talk to Jim about the perception of the community of switching horses. Pam questioned if this change would affect overall costs. Byron stated it should not. Pam suggested adding that communities and villages should identify where geographic areas are and prioritize them by problems. The vote is 6-0 "yes". Art stated that if the public identifies and participates in the cleanup, this makes this package work. Byron suggested getting legal guidance on the statement "some mitigation of lost subsistence use will be provided by making funds available to communities to support travel to harvest areas away from oiled sites or to areas where resources have not been depleted". Dave recommended changing "will" to "may". Depending on the interpretation from the legal team, Art, Ken and Byron stated they might change their votes. Dave stated based upon the legal advice received, the RT suggests removing "will" from the text and the budget. **Pro: This project is time critical to identify the remaining subsistence injury and concerns. Subsistence resources such as Harlequin Duck and Harbor Seals have been damaged and are at reduced levels. The confidence level of the public is low. There continues to be concern that their subsistence resources are contaminated. This study addresses those concerns and takes appropriate steps to ensure that there is full participation. We need to restore confidence that subsistence resources are no longer being affected by the oil spill.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Management Actions

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion of in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Dolly Varden/Cutthroat Trout (93-018) - Byron doesn't agree with Bob and doesn't think the normal agency management argument holds water. Ken stated this is a policy call. Dave stated this is above and beyond normal agency responsibility and is in addition to the work already being done. The vote was 5 to 1; DOI "no". **Pro: Without the information that this project provides, there is potential for additional injury and it would be necessary to make some management decisions based on injuries to Dolly Varden and Cutthroat Trout.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

BOB SPIES REVIEW

Bob gave the following comments on 6-0 and 5-1 Restoration Team votes:

93-018 - Bob is of the opinion that this is normal agency management responsibility. Art asked why this one sticks out more than some of the pink salmon and others. Bob stated that for this reason, a lot of this isn't being funded.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: _ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments: - There is a question over whether we should have the results of the comprehensive subsistence study (#17) before proceeding. Need legal opinions on several questions relating to use of EVOS funds. 1) Can EVOS monies fund any or all parts of this? 2) Can commercial sale of oysters be used to support cost recovery of subsistence oyster venture? 3) Can legal interpretation of subsistence activities include commercial oyster ventures for their own sake? Pending answers to legal questions, the RT will give guidance for further technical work including: 1) Need for peer review. 2) Need to develop new approach to reduce cost or else justify present cost. 3) Need to be cost effective. 4) Need to know feasibility of project including operating structure. 4) Need to know how this project is justified in light of the mariculture activities in the villages.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 2**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	Y	N	N	N	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Chugach Region Village Mariculture Project (93-019) - Dave suggested that each RT member read the legal team's comments on 93-019 and 93-020. The vote is 0-6 "no". **Con: Based on legal opinion, injuries to Native economic well-being and self-sufficiency are not injuries for which the natural resources trustees could seek damages; it is a private cause of action for which the Native Interests are seeking damages from Exxon. Use of joint trustee fund monies to restore such injuries does not appear appropriate.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: _ HIGH (5-6 votes) X MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Limit to conceptual pre-design feasibility study.
- Develop site character sites and candidate sites.
- Identify potential species, production goal per species.
- Cost should not exceed $50,000.
- Facility should primarily focus on production.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 4**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Bivalve Shellfish Hatchery and Research Center (93-020) - Jerome stated there is potential matching money. Pam stated this would be a legal issue. Jerome stated that wording would have to be written that the facility will restore damaged shellfish and if it is later used for commercial purposes, it would require purchase. The vote is 3-3; Forest Service, DOI and DNR voted "no". **Pro: The project would provide direct restoration to damaged shellfish resources. This information is needed to determine if transplanting shellfish is a viable potential restoration option. This is a food source for many of the injured resources. Con: This project is not time critical. We do not know the extent and level of contamination in shellfish beds. We do not know if they will repopulate naturally.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

X Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- USFWS would not provide permits to transplant chicks.

- Do chick transplant only if wiped-out colony completely (Robey).

- Research project proposed by Podolsky.

*- Major long-term commitment: wait for Restoration Plan.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTE 0**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	N	N	N	N	N

* Restoration Framework; 1992; pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Bird/Chick Restoration (93-021) - This project was not time critical. Permits would not be issued. **Con: This is a major long-term commitment and should wait for the Restoration Plan. The Restoration Team does not recommend this for inclusion in the plan.** The vote is 0-6.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Pilot feasibility study.
- Very experimental, technically feasible, but a little too much money.
- RFP might be most appropriate (Fry) (2 names were given - Podolski & ?).
- Direct restoration project for murres.
- Put dummy egg part into objectives (not consistent throughout write-up).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Murres: Enhancing Productivity and Monitoring Recovery (93-022)(93-049) - The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: There are very limited techniques which can be used to attempt to restore injuries to murres. This project is evaluating the feasibility of enhancing the productivity by using decoys, dummy eggs, and recordings of murre calls to help improve breeding success. This would be considered time critical because the breeding behavior is presently unsuccessful due to loss of breeding synchronicity.** Joe asked that the title be shortened for input into the data-base. The title is changed as follows: Feasibility of Enhancing Murre Productivity and Limited Recovery Monitoring.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (< 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- USFS, ADF&G & Aquaculture Assoc. have expended agency funds to do survey work and purchase fertilizer.
- Replacement Action.
- NEPA document completed.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Coghill Lake (93-024) - The vote was 5-1; DOI voted "no". **Pro: Replacement action for injured resources. Replacement activity is time critical because of severely depressed stock.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Replacement Action.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Montague Island Chum Salmon Restoration (93-025) - The vote was 5-1; DOI voted no. **Pro: Replacement of injured resources. This is consistent with the assumption of some limited direct restoration programs to be implemented. The RT expects the Restoration Plan to identify this as an action to be implemented.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) X MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Need to do NEPA documents.
- Does existing facility producing results outlined in this proposal (Hilbourn).
- Agency will pick-up out-year costs after construction (Montague).
- Replacement Action.
- Spies -- wants Peer Review of flies project (independent of agency people). Will not give recommendation for or against it until review.
- 1) Vote contingent upon Peer Review.
- 2) Phased approach with NEPA document first.
- 3) Meeting #1 & #2 then this is the project.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 4**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Fort Richardson Hatchery Water Pipeline (93-026) - This project proposes conducting a workshop with peer reviewers and doing the NEPA analysis only. Operation and maintenance costs for 1994-on were considered. Jerome stated there needs to be analysis of what the ecological damage is. Ken asked whether hatchery development is an appropriate restoration tool without a restoration plan being in place. Joe stated the issues are if there were no risks, would you want to do this project, or you want to do this project, but want to analyze the risks. If they are acceptable, you go ahead. Byron stated having NEPA review would provide better information on whether this project should go forward. Pam stated the RT should vote on the merits of whether the project should go forward and not the NEPA analysis. Mark stated the synthesis meeting will provide an opportunity to address future issues and is imperative to go forward. Ken proposed going forward with this project, pending the synthesis meeting. Art stated the 1983 EIS should be made available to the peer reviewers prior to the synthesis meeting. Jerome stated the project was based on legal opinion. Byron suggested voting on the full project and then NEPA. Dave stated the first step of the project is NEPA analysis. Ken stated if he votes "yes", it needs to go forward with NEPA analysis. Pam asked is this project worth Trustee Council consideration. Art stated he would have to vote on the concept before voting on the elements. The vote on concept is 4-2. The vote on NEPA analysis, contingent upon the synthesis meeting this fall, is 3-3. Dave proposed voting on the entire project, and a synthesis meeting will be held this fall to determine the merits of the issue of wild vs. hatchery stock. The vote is 3-3. **Con: The percent contribution attributable represents approximately 33% of the overescapement. There are contributions which can't be attributed to the oil spill. Only a third can be attributed to the oil spill. The problem in 1989 was due to a management decision by ADF&G and taking no other action that would have mitigated the overescapement. Pro: This project is absolutely essential. Damages will preclude a sport fishery in 1994 and 1995 on sockeye salmon on the Kenai. This would mitigate closure of the fishery. Production of fish is very cost effective.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

Bob provided comment on the following projects:

93-026 (Fort Richardson Pipeline) - Fish and Game is complaining about wild stock. A clear evaluation needs to be carried out. He is not entirely against this project; however, there is not enough information. Jerome asked if Bob and the peer reviewers need more time for digesting information. Bob stated there has to be some evaluation of the effects the hatchery would have on fish populations, and he cannot recommend the project as proposed without some planning evaluation. This may or may not be occurring outside the EIS process.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Replacement of oiled wetlands.

- Recreate wetlands (wet meadow) created by earthquake and now being lost three succession.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Wetlands Replacement (93-028) - Pro: This is the feasibility aspect of direct replacement for oiled wetlands which the Restoration Team feels will surface through the Restoration Plan. Vote is 5-1; DOI voted "no".

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) X MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- 2,500 total acres in PWS that have been cut in the 1970's.
- Benefit is long-range.
- $400/acre to thin.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 4**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Second Growth Management (93-029) - Pro: Before the work on second growth is done, the habitat needs to be linked to the injured resource and clear demonstration of a restoration endpoint for resources. This project is time critical and fits the assumption that something can be done now. Vote was 5-1; DOI voted "no".

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) X MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Contingent upon escapement of 150,000 fish in 1992 if get 150,000 fish, will not do study.
- Get results of fish escapement by 8/93. By this time, about 50% of project costs will be expended.
- Continuation of R-113.
-Peer Reviewer (Ray Hilbourn) verify method of enhancing sockeye fry through discussions with ADF&G to determine if we should do this project.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 4**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- See attachment
- Ray Hilborn recommends Canadian and Alaskan experts be brought together this fall to review all the sockeye projects.
- ADF&G egg take is scheduled for August 1993 so plenty of time to visit the project.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Red Lake Restoration (93-030) - Pro: This is contingent upon a sockeye synthesis meeting bringing experts together and upon escapement counts in 1993. The vote is 5-1; DOI voted "no."

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DIVISION OF FISHERIES REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT & DEVELOPMENT (F.R.E.D.)

Limnology Section
34828 Kalifornsky Beach Road, Suite B
Soldotna, AK 99669-3150
Phone (907) 262-9368
Fax (907) 262-7646
IGSCHMT@ALASKA

To: **Bob Spies FAX 510-373-7834**
Ray Hilborn FAX 206-545-7471

cc: Lorne White
Joe Sullivan

From: Dana Schmidt
Principal Limnologist
FRED Division, ADF&G
Soldotna, AK

Date: August 27, 1992

Subject: Red Lake Restoration

I have been asked by Joe Sullivan to provide you with a description of the procedures FRED division normally uses for Lake Stocking for systems that have deficient numbers of spawners. This process has not been identified in the Red Lake Restoration project (93030) which is under consideration.

Because the lake in question has been subjected to large escapements with subsequent poor production of smolt, it is likely that the food resources of the lake were adversely impacted. It is essential that these be evaluated and that if juvenile stocking were to occur, the level of stocking be based on available rearing potential of the lake which is present at the time the fish are added. Normally, FRED division undergoes three years of water chemistry and sampling of the zooplankton community of lakes to be enhanced. Based on models developed from multiple lakes in Alaska, a stocking rate is recommended for juvenile sockeye. Data used in making this determination include biomass of zooplankton including seasonal trends, euphotic volume of the lake, length/weight of fall rearing fry in the lake, and smolt age/size from previous years. Under the damage assessment project, a time series beginning in 1990 provides for zooplankton data and their seasonal and interannual changes.

Prior to the egg take and also prior to stocking, the historical data set will be used to determine the recommended fry carrying capacity of the lake. An estimate of natural stocking from the escapement will be completed and these numbers subtracted from the hatchery based stocking level. These procedures will insure the carrying capacity of the zooplankton community will not be

overtaxed by the fry stocking process. Survival of thermally marked animals will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the stocking program, if stocking does occur.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Proceed with hatchery modification necessary in advance of proposed 1993 take. Continued funding for the 1993 egg take is contingent upon insufficient 1993 smolt at migration to be reviewed by Chief Scientist and Restoration Team. ADF&G to cost out hatchery modifications.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Sockeye Salmon (93-031) - Dave asked if this is a third party litigation issue. The RT stated "no". The vote is 5-1 "yes"; DOI voted "no". This project is mitigation not compensation. **Pro: This project is cost effective and will be used to restore injured resources. 1993 work is contingent upon insufficient smolt out migration.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Describe matching elements. These pinks are primarily up stream spawning and so should use the fish pass. Chances are excellent that fish planting will not be necessary.
- A site-specific analysis is required to meet NEPA compliance requirements.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Pink and Cold Creek (93-032) - The vote is 5-1; DOI voted "no". **Pro: This project is part of the limited implementation package and is expected to be included in the Restoration Plan. It is cost effective and does not require long-term commitment of resources.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments: - Under $500,000 (93051 keep as is).
- Concentrate more on broods than nests outside PWS.
- Increase $ on blood chemistry (perhaps 20K) (Fry).
- A few broods found on periphery of oil spill area
* Population surveys or status work (objective #1) remove.
- Add radio telemetry.
* Eliminate nest boxes work.
- 8 nest sites in PWS.
* Reduce boat costs.
- Ground truthing of Harlequin portion of 93051 should be here. 93051 purely office exercise. Overlap of 93033 with 93051 eliminate this.
Focus: - No oiled mussel beds connection.
- Increase work on blood chemistry (20K).
- Do more fecal samples to verify use of mussels.
- Use local PWS residents to capture live birds in winter, put on radios and collect fecal samples.
Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTE 6** (Vote taken on concept. Budget to be reviewed when revised.)

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.
** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Harlequin Duck Restoration (93-033 A,B,C) - Art asked if elevated blood perimeters can be attributed to the oil. Byron stated you would have to look at control areas. Option A addresses current reproductive failure outside PWS. Option B addresses reproductive failure on the Kenai and Afognak. Option C addresses reproductive failure on the Alaska Peninsula. Dave asked if this project has changed. Ken stated this should be a continuation project. Should Harlequin Ducks be studied? The vote is 6-0 "yes". Byron stated Option A is responsive to our direction. Jerome stated that western PWS should be dropped and subtracted. The budgets need to be very closely scrutinized. The vote is: Option A - 6-0 "yes"; Option B - 1-5 "no"; Option C - no support. **33A Pro: This will help establish the linkage between Harlequin productive failure and continued hydrocarbon contamination and will provide habitat nesting characteristics outside of PWS. Both of which are important components for any habitat acquisition efforts relative to the species.** Pam stated that she would like to see habitat characterization done on the Kenai coast. Pam asked if there will be some savings on Afognak because of all the work being done there. Jerome stated the question is how big an area is the reproductive failure occurring in. Ken asked do we need to know if reproductive failure is occurring on the outer Kenai coast to affect restoration.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Cliff nesters.
- Eliminate objectives #2, #4 & #3.
- Statistics on populations bad - impossible to determine population but definitely injury to birds.

Focus:
- Do objectives #1 but add paper search using boat survey data to predict colony location and little ground truthing.
-Pigeon guillemot habitat is on cliffs (secondary effect not direct effect).
- Greatly reduce costs ($100,000 + reduction).
- Forage fish study necessary for objective #3 but forage fish study not going forward.

Combine:
- 1) 1 month pigeon guillemot work, then
- 2) Boat surveys (if approved to go forward).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6** (Voted on concept only. Budget to be reviewed when revised.)

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Pigeon Guillemot Colony Survey (93-034) - Art stated he has a problem with defining the restoration endpoint for this species. Ken stated it is habitat protection but may not be acquisition. Art asked if another set of comments will be received from Fry. Dave stated that Bob will get further comment from Fry. Mark stated Fry appears to be commenting on a previous version. Ken stated that past notes indicate a paper exercise was approved. This project contains only Objective 1 (survey). Art agreed with Jerome and stated that without a clear restoration endpoint, there is no point in doing a survey. Dave stated that he sees a restoration endpoint. Ken stated based on today's information, we are continuing some studies but we are willing to stop others. Art asked why this survey could not be folded in with the boat surveys. Dave stated the reason these can't be combined is because of the late start. The vote is 4-2; DNR and ADF&G voted "no". **Pro: Each year we keep saying we need to do something. We feel it is important to do additional work in 1992. We have not collected information on this species to make informed decisions on what habitat protection measures need to be taken to help the species recover. The majority of activity is near the intertidal zone. The subtle affects need to be understood to effectively manage the activities in that zone. It would help to identify marine habitat. Con: Traditional activities probably don't represent a threat. Existing regulations and management will probably protect them from any potential threat. It is not a high priority.** Mark stated we need to look at this species to see if anything besides habitat protection can be done.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

BOB SPIES REVIEW

Bob gave the following comments on 6-0 and 5-1 Restoration Team votes:

93-034 - Bob stated Mike Fry recommended against this because it provides very little for restoration and getting a handle on recovery. This project includes speculative techniques Ken stated that three objectives were eliminated and there was a $90,000 reduction. Bob will ensure that this gets revisited by Fry.

To: Dave Gibbons
Acting Administrative Director

Date: Sept.8, 1992

From: Marty Rutherford
Restoration Team Member/ DNR

Subject: EVOS 1993 Proposed Projects

Upon returning to work following my leave of 8/31 - 9/04 I reviewed the voting record of my alternate on the Restoration Team, Mr. Art Weiner. I am satisfied with his approach on all but four projects. In each of these instances he had some specific concerns that led him to vote no, resulting in their not being included in the Restoration Teams' recommended package.

Following further conversations with the Chief Scientist and either the specific projects' program manager or other staff from the applicable agency involved in the project, I feel that the misgivings Art had concerning the technical merits of the projects and/or a desire to see an agency involved in cost sharing these projects can be addressed adequately during the development and review of the detailed study plans. Additionally, concerning project #93-034 (Pigeon Guillemont colony survey), there is recent clarification that there is a greater opportunity for habitat protection than was previously understood.

Therefore, because these projects are in my opinion important elements of the 1993 Restoration package, I am changing DNR's vote on the following projects so they can go forward as part of the Restoration Teams' recommended package to the Trustee Council:

93-004/93-013 Pink Salmon documentation, enumeration, preservation of genetically discrete wild populations in PWS;

93-012 Kenai River sockeye: genetic stock identification

93-015 Kenai River sockeye: salmon restoration;

93-034 Pigeon Guillemont colony survey.

Your assistance is appreciated.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Continuation of R-103C work.
- Foraging of oiled vs. non-oiled sites funded in 1989, 1991 & 192 -- no results evident to-date.

Objectives:
- Eliminate #1 & #3.
- Do objectives #2 pending results from 1992 field work. Very close coordination is need din mussel bed study.
* Short study, do fecal samples, band chicks and look for last year's banded chicks at 3 sites (reduced scope).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.
** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Black Oystercatchers (93-035) - Dave stated the budget was not reduced very much. Objective 2 is being done. If there is no evidence of continuing injury, it won't be done. This is pending results of 1992. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: It is important to determine if you have persistent oiling conditions in mussel beds which are an important food item for this species. It is a surrogate for the Harlequin Ducks. The results can be extrapolated for other species that use the mussels. It is an indication of transfer to higher level feeders.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

X Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Project complements 93038 - monitoring component of cleaned oiled mussels.
- Do not have to do multi-year monitoring, would need to monitor cleaned sites and set asides for several years.
- Don't include oyster catchers and Harlequin ducks as benefiting (Byron).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Oiled Mussel Beds (93-036) - Art questioned if the budget for equipment is in line (another computer). The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: We still have persistent contamination of oiled mussel beds as evidenced from 1992 field work. Substantial recovery is not as far along as we would like it to be.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- NRDA Studies.
- No link to restoration.
- Work on non-oiled sites, comparing variability between control sites.
- Seems late to be doing work.
- Injury to intertidal area is pretty clear but if not then varied approach.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 1**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	N	N	N	N	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Intertidal and Subtidal Communities (93-037 and 93-055) - Byron stated the lawyers addressed this study in their letter and didn't think it should be done because of the validity of the methods used. This project appears to question the validity of the methods used to determine oiled and controlled sites in our damage assessment studies. The validity of these methods was tested before they were implemented; it doesn't seem wise to revisit this issue. The vote is 0-6 "no". **Con: There is no link to restoration. It seems to be litigation driven.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Technical Support

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project provides essential support to restoration, monitoring, and/or damage assessment projects.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Do a phased study: 1) survey, then take to RT, 2) clean up as appropriate.
- Inclusion of cleaning oiled mussel beds $150,000 with specific objectives for work.
- Total cost now about $482,000 ($332,000 + $150,000).
- Explain sequence (phases) of events (i.e., 1st survey, 2nd results of mussel bed study & 3rd clean mussel beds).
- Include all Trustees in Shoreline Survey.
- 40 beach segments survey (estimate for 1993 survey), this is a subset of FINSAP and also includes oiled mussel beds & private ID sites.
- 30 - 40 mussel bed sites can be cleaned for $150,000.
- Rewrite study to include comments.
- Fit oiled mussel bed study (#036) with this project.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Shoreline Assessment (93-038)(93-023)(93-027) - Mark stated his Trustee Council member stated the level of treatment work needs to be determined before funding is requested. Sandor is committed to shoreline assessment but does not want to presuppose the need for treatment. This allows putting contracts in place and expanding them later. Art stated a lot of the cleanup can be done manually. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: The project will assess shorelines to determine the extent of remaining hydrocarbons and the need for additional treatment. Funds would only be spent if necessary. Treatment of oiled shorelines, where necessary, will hasten recovery of injured resources and services and the services they provide.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Manipulation and/or Enhancement

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. Degree to which the proposed action enhances the resource or service.*
9. Degree to which the proposed action benefits more than one resource or service.*

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Fucus recovery slowest in upper intertidal.
- Testing seeded fabric to understand propagation process, not as restoration activity is appropriate.
- Doesn't make sense to use fabric on ecological scale, may be useful locally as a restoration activity.
- We don't want to get into fucas hatchery project.
- Delete last sentence on Objective 5.
- Objective 4 added to original proposal by RT. No field component.
- Delete UAF as cooperating agency.
- Form 2A needs to show out year costs for final report.
- CH 1A will provide objective 4 information therefore delete from this project.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Intertidal Communities (93-039) - This is a combination coastal habitat project. Jerome stated it appears all the changes were dealt with. Art questioned if Objective 4 was dropped. Dave stated this is a different Objective 4 and the old one was removed. Art stated there appears to be a lot of in-state travel. Dave stated that this is not unusual. Art questioned the use of a charter boat as opposed to a barge. Dave stated that the cost may be about the same because the price of the barge was reduced. Art suggested having a bid for this service to obtain the best cost. Mark stated the Financial Committee may need to review the contractual items. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: The intertidal area is the most severely damaged habitat from the spill for habitat types. Injury to the intertidal appears to be continuing and its recovery is slow in many oiled areas.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Delete non-agency organizations from cooperating agencies.
- Project has value but duplicates other studies, this project started outside NRDA process (Spies). Project looks at treatment types on recovery rates. Project is receiving funding from other sources.
- Endpoint in information that helps determine type and cleanup in future spills.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 1**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	N	N	N	N	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Long-term Ecological Recovery (93-040)(93-054) - This is the HAZ-MAT proposal. Byron stated this was proposed as a cost share program; however, there is no funding beyond 1992. Byron stated that he had asked Bob for some input on HAZ-MAT but he has not heard from him yet. Art stated this would be very appropriate to fund under the civil restitution funds because of the language. The vote is 1-5 "no". Byron voted yes. **Con: This project seems more appropriate to be funded under the restitution budget. It appears that this should be looked at in terms of an overall long-term monitoring program developed as Project 41, which is the appropriate place for it. This is not time critical for 1992. Any appropriate pieces could be picked up when the Restoration Plan is in place.** Byron stated there was additional injury from cleanup and the recovery should be monitored.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Coordinate with existing monitoring programs (i.e., RCAC).
- NRC report on monitoring be used as guide (Boesch) (also*EPA look at guidance program examples of programs).
- What are the bounds of monitoring (magnitude of effort) (Boesch).
- Have contractor prepare detailed strawman for use at the workshop. Challenge people to improve document "response to a model" rather than develop. (Applicable to phase II)
- How does the $60,000 allocated to RPWG in 1992 fit into this budget?
- Eliminate phase 3 discussion since phase 2 will define this.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Restoration Monitoring (93-041) - This project focuses on a conceptual plan for monitoring. Phase I was funded by carryover money from EPA. Dave asked if EPA would ask for reimbursement. Ken suggested footnoting in section 2A or 2B that this was EPA money given to the agency. Art also questioned if another computer is necessary. Dave stated this was presented as Phase I to be funded by the $60,000 on hand and Phase II needs to be funded. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: This planning needs to be conducted to develop the monitoring component of the Restoration Plan for next year and is time critical. It also defines the schedule for monitoring in the future.** Dave questioned if the money should be double counted under RPWG. Mark stated we have approved money so it goes in the approved column. Mark stated the remaining money has been obtained from the court and we have approval to spend it.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- NOAA present more than link to injury in write-up to stress restoration/enhancement.
- Work being conducted in 1992 on Killer Whales by private citizen.
- Killer Whales were injured by link to oil is questionable. We cannot say if they were injured or not by oil.
-Spies questions link to injury due to oil.
- Why doesn't the agency monitor whales on their own funding? (Fry)

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Killer Whales (93-042) - Dave requested that RT members read the attorney comments which stated the basic question still remains whether we are able to link the missing whales to the spill, and these missing whales do not appear to meet the definition of injury as proposed in the Restoration Framework Document. Spies maintained there is no link to injury. The vote is 4-2; DNR and DOI voted "no". **Con: The Chief Scientist does not believe there is a link to injury. While there is demonstrated injury to killer whales, there is no definitive link to injury according to the Chief Scientist. Injury to killer whales does not meet the definition of injury in the Restoration Framework. Pro: Despite the lack of a definitive link to injury, the project is justified in terms of enhancement. It is important to understand what recovery is occurring to the those pods that suffered a loss during the time of the oil spill. Because of the importance of the killer whale population to the people in the spill area, we need to monitor the recovery of this species even though the link to injury is equivocal.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

BOB SPIES REVIEW

Bob gave the following comments on 6-0 and 5-1 Restoration Team votes:

93-042 - Bob maintains that there is no link to injury and this species is being treated differently from the others.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: _ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments: - Possible overlap concerning development of population model (Spies). Garrett & Eberhart have conducted a lot of work to develop population recovery model (this work done in conjunction with litigation).
- This study does aerial surveys vs. boat surveys in project #45 (no overlap).
- Bob Spies to fax this proposal out for quick turn-around Peer Review. What have we done in modelling so far?
- Eberhart still under contract to DOJ and they expect model in several months (Saari).
- USFWS did aerial feasibility study in 1991 by EVOS but no convincing results.
- It is believed that no radio telemetry pup work is proposed this year by USFWS (USFWS funded pup work in 1992).

Propose:
- Defer until Friday p.m.:
  - Question - Relationship to weanling study to oiled mussel bed study (perhaps add this component to this study).
  - Question - Close look at existing population model for soon to be developed models.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES** _ (Postponed pending peer review comment.)

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
PLEASE	**SEE**	**NEXT**	**PAGE FOR**	**MORE INFO**	

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- See attachments
- See attached votes
- 4 pieces of project
    1. Aerial Surveys
    2. Reproductive Success - No
    3. Population Model
    4. Sea Otter Habitat

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Additional Information on Sea Otters 93043 & 93044

Portion of Study*

1. Aerial Surveys

- Feasibility study funded in 1991/ USFWS did surveys in 1992 on own funds. Don Siniff believes need to complete data analysis before consider funding.
- 120 - 140K
- 1993 work contingent upon findings & Peer Review.

2. Reproductive Surveys

- Don Siniff believes it does not have to be done.
- Delete
- $24.2K cost removed from 8/24/92 draft project description.

3. Population Model

a. Eberhardt/Garrat - Generic model
b. Include more parts into model

- RFP cheaper?
- USFWS stressing very strongly that they want to do modelling
- 97K cost is total allocation.
- Eberhardt/Garrat assist USFWS in population model.

4. Sea Otter Habitat

- Marine habitat, not terrestrial habitats
- Only fund data analysis (Don Siniff). No new data collection.
- $45K estimated cost
- Why not funded in close-out 1992 funds? = not part of 1989 - 1991 Damage Assessment analysis (USFWS) surfaced during Restoration discussions.

Total cost - 291.9K

*Bob Spies related discussions with Don Siniff. Carol Gorbics also expressing conversation with Don Siniff.

USFWS personnel present:
Carol Gorbics
Karen Oakley

EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Number: 93-043, 93-044

Project Source:

Project Title: Sea Otter Population Demographics and Habitat Use in Areas Affected by the *Exxon Valdez* Oil Spill

Project Category: Restoration Monitoring/Restoration Habitat Protection

Project Type: Marine Mammals

Lead Agency: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Cooperating Agencies: None

Project Term: **Start Date:** 1 April 1993 **Finish Date:** 31 March 1994

INTRODUCTION:

Background.--The sea otter (*Enhydra lutris*) is a well-known marine mammal species in Alaska. They historically occurred throughout coastal waters of the Pacific, but as a result of fur harvests in the 18th and 19th centuries, they came close to extinction. They have since increased in abundance and distribution, and presently are found in most coastal areas of southern Alaska. Sea otters prey on a variety of invertebrate species, including mussels, clams, crabs and sea urchins, and may have a strong influence in structuring prey populations.

Summary of Injury.--Immediate losses of sea otters due to the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill probably ranged from 3,500 to 5,000 animals. Current sampling of sediments and sea otter prey items indicate exposure of otters to hydrocarbons may be continuing. The results of several NRDA studies indicate that this exposure, at a minimum, may be affecting sea otters at an organismic level and, at a maximum, may be affecting survival and therefore recovery of the population. Comparisons of post-spill sea otter surveys found no change in abundance between July 1990 and July 1991, with significantly lower densities in the oil spill area compared to non-oiled areas. The age distribution of sea otter carcasses recovered in oiled areas of Prince William Sound continues to reflect elevated mortality in prime-age sea otters, and a 1990-91 study determined the survival rate of weanling sea otters was significantly lower in oiled than nonoiled areas of PWS. This evidence, together with results from blood and contaminant analyses, suggests that the sea otter population within the spill zone may still be compromised by exposure to oil and that recovery to pre-spill levels is not occurring.

Location.--The major focus of this project will be on sea otters in Prince William Sound.

WHAT:

Goals.--The overall goal of this project is to restore sea otter populations affected by the Exxon Valdez oil spill by determining what is limiting their recovery and identifying areas with high value for sea otter habitat within Prince William Sound for possible protection.

Objectives.--

1. Monitor the recovery of sea otters in oiled areas by determining their abundance, distribution and mortality
2. Construct a population model to evaluate the potential recovery of the sea otters
3. Identify patterns of habitat use
4. Identify and evaluate areas with high value of sea otter habitat within PWS for possible protection

WHY:

Studies to date have determined that initial damages to the sea otter population were severe (a loss of 3,500 to 5,000 sea otters), and suggest that chronic damages to sea otters are also occurring, delaying recovery of affected populations. Through monitoring of affected populations and evaluation of patterns of habitat use, this restoration project will guide the development of strategies to aid in the recovery of the otters. The various project activities will enhance our understanding of the demographics of sea otter populations, and identify potential sites for protection of sea otter habitat. Protection of habitats important to sea otters (including foraging, pup rearing, pup weaning and haulout areas) will promote population recovery over the long-term as well as provide protection for other members of the nearshore marine community.

HOW:

Methodology.--In order to evaluate recovery of the sea otter population affected by the oil spill, annual monitoring will be undertaken. Since the spill, detailed data on population size has been collected primarily in the Prince William Sound portion of the spill area. Efficient standardized survey techniques to increase precision and accuracy of population estimates were being developed through RESTORATION FEASIBILITY PROJECT #3, which was conducted in 1991 but not in 1992. The project evaluated the feasibility of using a small float equipped airplane (Piper P-18 super-cub) as a survey platform in a strip transect survey of sea otters. The design involves counting otters along transects according to a strict protocol and conducting "intensive searches" at pre-determined intervals to estimate the proportion of animals that remain uncounted (e.g. due to diving) during the strip count. Through the information gleaned in the feasibility project and subsequent work by the USFWS, this census technique can be implemented within Prince William Sound in 1993. Survey methodology will be field tested outside Prince William Sound in 1993, and an extended monitoring program may be implemented in subsequent years. In addition to aerial surveys, mortality surveys (recovery of beach-cast carcasses) will be continued as part of this project. The mortality surveys will build on data collected over a decade in PWS.

A population model will be developed based on age structure and age specific reproduction and survival rates estimated from the carcasses recovered following the oil spill. Model parameters will be modified to reflect available information on post-spill population size, reproduction and survival rates (including data from a 1992-93 USFWS study on juvenile sea otter survival in PWS) to predict recovery rates under a range of assumptions, including those related to potential restoration or management strategies. Data collected in subsequent years will be used to refine and update the model and predictions.

The habitat evaluation component of the project will 1) utilize data from a 1992-93 USFWS juvenile survival study to develop a data base on sea otter movements and patterns of habitat use, 2) integrate this information with other sea otter data on distribution and abundance (pre- and post-spill), and 3)

evaluate available data on commercial, recreational, and subsistence uses of PWS. Continuing efforts (planned for 1994-95) will utilize the data base compiled on habitat use patterns to identify and evaluate potential areas of high habitat value in PWS for protection.

Coordination with Other Efforts.--To date, aircraft and boat surveys have not been conducted concurrently. Collection of survey data by both methods in 1993 would complement both projects by providing a basis for comparison of methods and continuity of data collection in subsequent years. Data from both surveys will contribute to the analyses of habitat use patterns.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE:

This project does not involve capture or handling of sea otters, or any other methods that are intrusive. It appears to qualify for categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act.

WHEN:

The first year of the project will be April 1, 1993 to March 31, 1994. The population and reproductive surveys will be conducted in the summer of 1993. Mortality surveys will be conducted in the late spring of 1993. The population modelling and evaluation of habitat use patterns do not involve field work. Data compilation and analyses for these components of the project will occur throughout the year. Progress reports for all components of the project will be produced by January 30, 1994, and "final" reports on 1993 activities will be produced by March 31, 1994. The identification of potential sites for habitat protection would occur in 1994-95. Monitoring of population recovery (through abundance, distribution, reproduction and mortality, and continued modelling) is planned as a long-term activity, extending through 2001 (pending availability of continued funding), or through recovery.

Milestones

April 93 data compilation and entry; preparation for field work
April-November 93 compilation and analysis of existing data for habitat and population modelling work
May - September 93 - field activities for population, reproductive and mortality survey work
September 93 - January 94 - data entry, analysis, report preparation
January 30, 94 - Annual Report due on progress to date
March 31, 94 - Final Report on 1993 activities due

Project Description: Sea otter recovery evaluation, population assessment and synthesis of habitat information to determine geographic areas of high value to sea otters including foraging, pup rearing, pup weanling and adult haul-out areas.

Budget Category	Approved 01-Oct-92 28-Feb-93	Proposed* 01-Mar-93 30-Sep-93	Total FY 93	FY 94**	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	Sum FY 98 & Beyond
Personnel	0.0	172.5	172.5					
Travel	0.0	14.5	14.5					
Contractual	0.0	32.2	32.2					
Commodities	0.0	17.1	17.1					
Equipment	0.0	27.5	27.5					
Capital Outlay	0.0	0.0	0.0					
Sub-total	0.0	263.8	263.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
General Administration	0.0	28.1	28.1					
Project Total	0.0	291.9	291.9	423.9	305.5	195.8	170.0	170.0
Full-time Equivalents (FTE)	0.0	3.6	3.6					

Amounts are shown in thousands of dollars.

Budget Year Proposed Personnel: FY 93

Position	Months Budgeted	Cost	Comment
Supervisory Biologist	1.2	7,800	
Biostatistician	3.6	20,100	
Program Manager	3.0	15,000	
Wildlife Biologist (2)	9.6	48,000	
GIS Support	3.6	17,000	
Biologist	3.6	12,600	
Biotechnician (2)	9.0	27,000	
Clerical	3.0	9,000	
Biotechnician	6.0	16,000	

*FY 93 is a transition year from the previously used oil fiscal year to the federal fiscal year. This new project also includes proposed funding for January and February, 1993.

**The total shown in FY 94 to closeout work started in FY 93 is $147.5.

		FY 93	FY94
Travel:	To Prince William Sound	5.5	0.0
	Outside Prince William Sound	6.0	0.0
	Per diem	3.0	0.0

Total travel: FY93: 14.5; FY94: 0.0

		FY 93	FY94
Contractual:	Aircraft charter:		
	in Prince William Sound (100 hrs @ 170/hr)	17.0	0.0
	outside Prince William Sound (80 hrs @ 170/hr)	13.6	0.0
	Tooth reading	0.6	0.0
	Shipping	0.5	0.5
	Necropsies	0.5	0.0

Total contractual: FY93: 32.2; FY94: 0.5

		FY93	FY94
Commodities:	Fuel (1800 gal @ 3/gal)	5.6	0.0
	Field camp supplies & food	4.5	0.0
	Office supplies, books	2.0	1.0
	Computer training (Arcinfo)	3.0	0.0
	Publication costs	0.0	2.0
	Miscellaneous	2.0	2.0

Total Commodities: FY93: 17.1; FY94: 5.0

		FY93	FY94
Equipment:	Safety gear	4.5	0.0
	Radio equipment	8.0	0.0
	Vessel maintenance	10.0	0.0
	Computer hardware/software	5.0	2.0

Total equipment: FY93: 27.5; FY94: 2.0

Project Number: 93-043, 93-044
Project Title: Sea Otter Demographics and Habitat
Agency: US Fish & Wildlife Service

FORM 2B
PROJECT
DETAIL

Filename: OTTER2B Revised: 25-Aug-92

APPLIED
marine
SCIENCES

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671	# of pages ▸ 3
To Dave Gibbons	From Bob Spies
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone # 510 373-7142
Fax # 407 586-8781	Fax # 510 373-7834

August 19, 1992

To: Dave Gibbons, Interim Director, *Exxon Valdez* Restoration Team

From: Bob Spies, Chief Scientist

Re: Review of proposed restoration projects 93-043 and 93-044 on sea otters

In the August 12-15th Meeting of the Restoration Team in Anchorage I promised to have these two proposals peer reviewed. Bob Garrott and Lee Eberhardt have not been available to review these, but our other peer reviewer for sea otters, Don Siniff, was able to take some time out of his busy summer schedule to write the attached review. As you can see from the Don's letter, he has serious reservations about the proposals in terms of the ability of the projects to produce the kind of data that will support application to a population model, the track record of the USFWS in publishing the results of past studies and the number of man-years proposed for the work. On the basis of these comments I feel that I cannot recommend support for these projects on the basis of the submitted proposals. On the same basis it would be equally difficult to recommend a project that combines the goals of this present proposal with those of other projects.

cc: Bergman
Broderson
Montague
Morris
Rice
Rutherford

2155 Las Positas Court, Suite S Livermore, CA 94550 510.373.7142 FAX 510.373.7834

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior
109 Zoology
318 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 625-4466
Fax (612) 625-4490

19 August 1992

Dr. Robert Spies
Applied Sciences
2155 Los Postias Court, Suite 5
Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Bob:

As we have discussed on the phone, I have reviewed the FWS Project No. 93-043, 93-044 on sea otters, for which they are requesting funding under Restoration Monitoring/Restoration Habitat Protection. The following are comments I would make about this proposal, along the lines that would be expected if I were considering it a submission to NSF, DOE, NIH, or other funding agencies.

It is difficult to obtain a good idea of what has been done, and thus it is difficult to understand what will be done. Let me suggest a few problems I see.

As I understand it, the data will be collected via air, and with spring beach walks. With these techniques and considering how they will help obtain their objectives, I am doubtful they match very well. Some notion of abundance and distribution might be obtained, but certainly not mortality estimates one could put into a model. The age data from the oil kill I do not think will be useful for what they are proposing. Further, pup/adult ratios will not give sufficient precision to obtain reproductive data that will help in a model. Patterns of habitat use I would think are fairly well documented from previous studies. Have these previous data been considered? Who is going to monitor the pups being put out now? This study is not mentioned here but I would think could give some good data that would assist with the population model. Which brings up the question of who will do the population model? The model that Bob and Lee did for recovery is somewhere and could be updated as data from the telemetry studies become available. Has this been considered?

This is a difficult task for me to do because we have had (and continue to have) excellent cooperation from FWS on our projects and thus I do not want to be overly critical. But, I really do not understand how this proposal fits with their other work. They have a lot of data that needs publication so we can see where we are going. The effort they have in this project for the first year (April 1, 1993 to March 31, 1994) is 6.35 full

time equivalents. I just cannot imagine this project, as described, will take that kind of effort. Further, if the people listed in the budget are current FWS employees, I would think they already have enough to do without taking on more.

I am sorry to sound so negative about all this, but this is simply not a complete enough prposal to judge very well. Maybe the FWS feels we do not need to worry about effort and personnel but, as you know, this is a major part of every NSF grant, to make people account for their time and to see who will do the work. I hope these remarks help you ask a few questions. Call if I can discuss any of this on the phone.

Sincerely,

Donald B. Siniff
Professor
Ecology, Evolution and Behavior Dept.

DBS:dkb

Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council
Restoration Office
645 "G" Street, Anchorage, AK 99501
Phone: (907) 278-8012 Fax: (907) 276-7178

August 21, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dave Gibbons, EVOS Interim Administrative Director

FROM: PB Pamela Bergmann, Department of the Interior, EVOS Restoration Team Member

SUBJECT: Review of Brief Project Description for Sea Otters

This correspondence is in response to the memorandum dated August 19, 1992 from Bob Spies to you regarding "Review of proposed restoration projects 93-043 and 93-044 on sea otters". The Department of the Interior (DOI) was very surprised and concerned to learn through this memorandum that Dr. Spies is recommending that no sea otter projects go forward for consideration in the draft 1993 Work Plan.

As you, members of the Restoration Team, and Dr. Spies know from the discussions on this project during our Restoration Team meetings, the brief project description is comprised of more than the development of a population model. Nonetheless, the population model seems to be the focus of Dr. Donald Siniff's and Dr. Spies' comments. It appears that Dr. Siniff's review and Dr. Spies' recommendation were made on incomplete information.

We are disappointed that Dr. Spies would make a recommendation against funding any sea otter work in 1993 without affording FWS representatives an opportunity to provide both Dr. Spies and Dr. Siniff with additional information to clarify and expand upon the brief project description. This dialogue should have occurred during the August 4-7, 1992, Restoration Team meetings. However, as you know, there were no peer reviewers at the meeting with sea otter expertise. Since the initial discussion of sea otters during the August 4-7, 1992 meeting, DOI has continually asked, and has been continually been assured, that the FWS program manager be allowed to participate in a discussion with Dr. Siniff and Dr. Spies prior to any recommendations being made.

Following receipt of August 19, 1992 memorandum, I asked the FWS Program Manager, Carol Gorbics, to contact Dr. Siniff directly to discuss his questions and concerns. As shown in the attached report dated August 20, 1992, it appears that Dr. Siniff does support sea otter work in 1993. FWS is preparing a revised brief project description based on that conversation and will provide it to me, Dr. Siniff, and Dr. Spies by Tuesday August 25, 1992.

According to Ms. Gorbics, Dr. Siniff is willing to participate in a conference call at either 10:00 a.m. or 11:00 a.m. on August 27, 1992. Since the Restoration Team was prepared to discuss the sea otter brief project description on August 27, 1992, please ensure that arrangements are made to set up a conference call with Dr. Siniff at either 10:00 or 11:00 a.m. Thank you.

Please call me if you have any questions.

cc: Bob Spies
Restoration Team

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
OFFICE OF OIL SPILL
1011 E. TUDOR ROAD
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503
TEL NO: COM (907) 786-3520, FTS 869-3520
FAX NO: COM (907) 786-3625, FTS 869-3625

FAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXF

TO: Don Siniff DATE/TIME August 20, 1992

FROM: Carol Gorbics

SUBJECT: Phone Conversation of August 20, 1992

Don - I wanted to capture our phone conversation while it was fresh in my mind. We atttempted to provide you additional information on the proposed project since you felt you were making recommendations with a lack of information. The following are the points we covered:

Objective 1 - Aerial Surveys: You agreed that it would be useful to develop a long-term program of monitoring the recovery of sea otters in PWS. You weren't sure if this was the technique that should be used, however, you agreed that it should be left in with the understanding that you will provide the Restoration Team and Chief Scientist with final guidance on this after reviewing the results of the previous study. This will likely occur this fall and a final decision will be made at that time. This objective will stay in the revised project with the necessary caveat.

Objective 2 - Reproductive Surveys: You advised that this objective should be deleted. It is not useful to collect the reproductive data at this time for the variety of reasons we discussed on the phone. This objective will be deleted from the revised project.

Objective 3 - Population Model: A population model has not been completed by Garrott and Eberhardt, and, according to FWS conversations with Garrott, they have no obligations to complete it, and have not plans to complete it, at least in the near future. You agreed that a population model should be done using available information, including carcass information and data from the 1992/1993 weanling study. This objective will stay in the revised project.

Objectives 4 and 5 - Sea Otter Habitat: You agreed that, although no additional funding should be provided for the field collection of data, an in-house effort should be done, including GIS, to synthesize available data. These objectives will stay in the revised project.

The budget will be altered to reflect the lack of the reproductive surveys, however, it will not be a substantial change. We will also provide you with the budget information for the aerial surveys.

The revised project will be provided to you by Tuesday, August 25, for discussion at the RT meeting on August 26 or 27. I will pass this memo and your schedule on to Pamela Bergmann (Department of Interior Restoration Team member) and Bob Spies. I will also provide them with your schedule for August 26 and 27 to facilitate a conference call.

Let me know if this is not what you intended.

FAXFAXFAXFAXHAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAXFAX

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Sea Otter (93-043) (93-044) - The 1992 aerial surveys would have to be reviewed by the peer reviewers. The habitat information needs to be fast tracked. **Pro: There is significant evidence of injury and without this information, it will be impossible to determine the extent and rate of recovery. There were no restoration funds allocated in 1992 for sea otters, and the aerial surveys will provide the first overall population estimates for sea otters following the spill which will be used in restoration planning.** The vote is 5-1; ADF&G voted "no".

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Was not done last year.
- Close-out report for Damage Assessment study funded in 1992 due in fall, 1992.
- Final TC approval Contingent upon final report.

Voting Record: TOTAL YES VOTES 6

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Boat Surveys (93-045) - Art stated that the budget is way out of line, and outboards do not need to be replaced every year. The vote is 6-0. The cost of equipment was questioned. In the detailed budget, the range of gas cost needs to be addressed. **Pro: In order to understand the rate of recovery of these injured resources, it is appropriate to monitor these on an alternate year basis until a monitoring plan refines this. It provides information on multiple species which were injured.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Cooperating agencies should be Trustee Agencies only and no contractors or cooperators.
- Specify that a recommendation be made in report on restoration options/actions.
- Highlight agency contributions other than just this work in proposal.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Harbor Seals (93-046) - Jerome stated it was determined that this project would wait a year and be reconsidered this year. The data from surveys will be compared to post-spill data to determine recovery rate. This is proposed as a two-year project, 1993-1994, with a final report in 1994. Dave suggested adding "for a one-year period only" so that it does not imply funding for two years but for 1993 only. Art stated that regulation of take is necessary, and if not done, may promote self-regulation. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: The rate of the recovery of Harbor Seals is unknown. They were not monitored last year and it appears appropriate to monitor them this year to determine the rate of recovery. There is also some rationale for going forward with this study because it would provide a subsistence service. It is important to understand what is happening with harbor seals to help to manage the species for that service. It would be helpful to the regulators and subsistence users. It would also characterize habitat use as part of the habitat protection strategy.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Remove UAF from cooperating agencies category.
- Reflect budget changes (pg #4, item #3 - change 93 to 114K & change 94 to 12K).
    - Also change forms from 2A & B to 3A & B (Form 2A/part II - P.S. 7K/travel 0/C.S. 223/Com 0/Equip 0/Total: Same)
- Part I/NMFS/O'Clair - more $ spend on Microbiology (M. Brodersen) B. Spies, Jeep will make detail call. Bob & Jeep to tell her, Joan B. how many sites, etc. & she'll give specific budget figures w/ 50K the approximate.
- Make approval of the project contingent on a receipt of Close-Out Report.
- We are funding 1 year at this time and will address every other year vs. 2 years and out.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Subtidal Monitoring (93-047)(93-056) - This project is contingent upon the closeout reports. Byron stated the restoration endpoint is natural recovery. Dave stated the intertidal fish were dropped because there was no indication of absolute injury. Art stated that Spies did not have any adverse comments to this project. Mark had recommended adding microbiology. Dave questioned the cost for equipment. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: This study was postponed in 1992 to be conducted this year. Damage assessment information through 1991 showed continuing contamination and evidence of injury to subtidal environment resources. The purpose of the study is to determine and monitor the rate of natural recovery.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Technical Support

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project provides essential support to restoration, monitoring, and/or damage assessment projects.

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

X Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

Cost prohibitive (10-100 million) and alternative service will be available in 3-5 years (new information obtained).

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES**___

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	N	N	N	N	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Communication System (93-048) - The vote is 0-6. There was no support. **Con: This is not cost effective. The service will be available in 3 to 5 years at substantially less cost.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Restoration Monitoring

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that the injury to the resource and/or service is not restored, but the rate, and extent, and/or mechanisms are not yet understood.**

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Do limited amount of work in conjunction with decoy project #10 on Barren Islands (when out doing project #10 also do monitoring)
- Do not monitor this year other than above.
- Past years data in control for 1993 work>
- Long-term recovery for murres, so do not monitor every year.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

See 93-022 for Restoration Team Discussion

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

BOB SPIES REVIEW

Bob gave the following comments on 6-0 and 5-1 Restoration Team votes:

93-049 (combined with 93-022) - Mike Fry commented that it is important to do monitoring on three to five year intervals. Pam stated that Fry's comments appear to apply to the first round rather than the current.

Bob stated that he would generally recommend those projects receiving 5-1 and 6-0 votes. Mark asked Bob for comments on final recommendations. Bob asked if the package is going out on the 14th. Mark stated "yes" and there is difficulty in finding time to do proper review. Pam stated it would be helpful to go through Bob's comments on 4-2 votes.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Technical Support

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project provides essential support to restoration, monitoring, and/or damage assessment projects.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Cost not $9,449,600 but $9,499.

- If not completed by Preston, Thorgrimson etc., or OSPIC then we must do.

- ADNR to determine item #2.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 5**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Update: Restoration feasibility (93-050) - This project provides an annotated bibliography of all literature out there for use by the PI's. This project is proposed to update information and write abstracts of each citation. Ken asked how much the current version is being used. Art stated that logically the library should do this and write the abstracts so that all the information is in one place; having just a title is inadequate to most people. The vote is 3-3; DOI, NOAA, and Forest Service voted "no". **Con: This project will only provide slightly more detailed information than is currently being provided by OSPIC. It is fairly redundant with work which OSPIC is already doing. There is some question about how much use the current version is receiving. It is not time critical. Pro: It puts in one volume a listing of the available literature on oil spill. Interested parties can get copies without going to the library. It provides annotated information, i.e., an abstract of each citation and provides information regarding access to the literature, addresses and contact numbers for users to obtain papers and studies.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Land Inventory

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project inventories habitat important to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Re-do budgets to reflect comments below (get new budget numbers from each respective agency).
- Remove objectives #1, #7 & #3:
    1) Synthesis 8 existing information (goes to 93060 & 93061).
    7) Remote Sensing/GIS Technical Support (put into 93061).
    3) USFWS already has information GIS on Sea Bird colonies (put into 93060).

6) Wetlands - USFWS check wetland mapping status. (USFWS)
*4) M. Murrelets - Use dawn watch but also use some limited Radio Telemetry (Fry) USFWS lead with USFS cooperation on this component.
*5) Harlequins - 93033 overlap with this component. (ADFG) Reduce overlap.
- HPWG lead with cooperative agencies as co-leads.

*** Both are to key on habitat characterization (stands of vegetation).**

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

PROJECT NUMBER 93051A

VA ATION FACTORS

Inventory

ying best professional judgement to evaluate these
e project into categories of "high", "medium" and

ined restoration actions.*
e of recovery.*
ealth and safety.*
proposed actions to the expected benefits.*

from proposed actions, including long-term and

hin the next year.*
ant to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

l (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

3 Work Plan.

199 Work Plan.

elow (get new budget numbers from each respective

tion (goes to 93060 & 93061).
cal Support (put into 93061).
ion GIS on Sea Bird colonies (put into 93060).
mapping status. (USFWS)
ut also use some limited Radio Telemetry (Fry) USFWS
mponent.
his component. (ADFG) Reduce overlap.
es as co-leads.

rization (stands of vegetation).

ES 6

	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y

43-44.

These factors will be co
projects. The purpose
"low" priority.

1. The effects of any
2. Potential to improv
3. Potential adverse e
4. Relationship of exp
5. Cost effectiveness.
6. Potential for additio
   indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of start
8. The project inventor

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6

___ Recommended fc

___ Not recommende

Comments:
- Objective #1 needs
- Objective #2 delete
- Objective #3 delete
- Add Afognak.
- Include USFS comp

Voting Record:

NOAA	

* Restoration Fra

September 8, 19

193 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Land Inventory

ered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these
o simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and

er actual or planned restoration actions.*
ıe rate or degree of recovery.*
:ts on human health and safety.*
ed costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*

l injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and

) the project within the next year.*
s habitat important to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

ites) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

nclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

focus on stands and not individual nests.
st sentence. Combine second sentence into objective #1.

ent.

TOTAL YES VOTES NO VOTE TAKEN, SEE VOTE ON 93051A

DNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG

work, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Habitat Protection (93-051) - B was removed because it is built in as part of A. The correct total is $1,691,000. Art questioned the equipment for the stream habitat assessment portion. Jerome stated that some of this was last year's. Art stated there should be some way to review and consolidate GIS to get some cost savings. Dave stated when the detailed study plans come back, the budget should be closely scrutinized. Mark questioned the personnel costs. Byron asked if there should be a requirement to list out positions. Mark stated "yes", and he assumed this was an oversight which should be corrected. Art asked if some of the work can be piggy backed. Ken stated this project and stream assessment should be rolled together. Dave stated that some remote GIS technical support has not been done. Ken stated that some better direction and coordination needs to be provided on levels of precision required. Mark stated that coordination of the field work and data processing may reduce the budgets substantially. Ken stated the disconnect has been an insistence that objectives for stream assessment can not be incorporated into channel typing. Art questioned who will do the radio telemetry work. Byron stated that this project description is unacceptable to him. Dave stated there needs to be additional discussion. Ken stated that Ken Holbrook's work needs to be cleaned up and some more budget review done. Mark Kuwada was asked for some input. Mark K. stated there was direction to do channel typing which was based on a figure of $250,000 for one year's work. His impression was that channel typing procedures specific to the oil spill would be developed and would allow them to provide habitat information to be used to compare public vs. private lands. On the stream habitat assessment, there were three components: 1) documenting the number of streams and location, 2) putting together a GIS that portrayed them in digital format, and 3) channel typing to give some relative value to public and private lands. Ken stated that this budget was put together very fast. Pam stated that someone needs to spend some time today reworking the budget. Mark K.'s assumption was there would be a field crew out for only a few months. Ken stated that you want the information for the whole spill area so you can extrapolate. Pam stated you want to be pro-active. Dave stated that the cost for channel typing is very high. Dave asked Mark K. his view of coordinated logistics. Mark K. stated they can't carry anyone else on the helicopter so you would have to make double trips. Mark K. stated he doesn't understand why they can't take some of the measurements needed for channel typing. Mark K. stated he would need to get the information from Ken Barber to rework this budget. The Restoration Team provided direction to consolidate the logistics of stream habitat assessment and channel typing and significantly reduce the channel typing portion. Combination of the logistics for Marbled Murrelets also needs to be explored. Art stated the logistic support

is $340,000. Ken questioned the necessity of walking every stream on private lands. Mark K. stated that depends on whether you want just a guess. Pam stated the title is misleading and should be changed. The title was changed to: Habitat Protection Information for Anadromous Streams and Marbled Murrelet. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: This project supports the habitat protection process through collection of new information.** The channel typing and extrapolation portions need to be beefed up in the description. Art stated he assumed the choice of Katchemak Bay was for practical reasons. Pam stated it was.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Land Inventory (Habitat Protection)

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project inventories habitat important to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) X LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:
- Objectives:
  - #4 - Continuation of Damage Assessment which was not funded in 1992 so do not do in 1993.
  - #3 - Part of Habitat Protection Work Group, do not do.
  - #2 -
  - #1 -
- Dead birds but cannot measure continuing injury after bodies.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTE 1**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	N	Y	N	N	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Bald Eagle Habitat: Identification and Protection (93-052) - The vote is 0-6 "no". **Con: Bald eagles seem to have fully recovered. The Chief Scientist indicates there is no continuing injury.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Technical Support

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project provides essential support to restoration, monitoring, and/or damage assessment projects.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Necessary for data interpretation and data base management.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Hydrocarbon Data Analysis (93-053) - Art questioned that the PI is a biologist. Ken questioned the finish date of 2000. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: This is a technical support project that provides hydrocarbon data analysis interpretation to all other client restoration projects.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Technical Support

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project provides essential support to restoration, monitoring, and/or damage assessment projects.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments: - What has costal habitat requested for slope/aspect and terrain modelling?

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

GIS (93-057A) - Dave stated the price tag for damage assessment closeout is high. Ken stated the funding request for the remainder of the year is too high. Mark stated restoration will need a reasonable, cleaned-up database to utilize damage assessment data. Art stated that what is proposed is QA/QC, which is similar to writing a final report. Mark stated this is a damage assessment closeout project. Byron stated it is almost 100% personnel cost. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: the GIS Work Group will approve expenditure of funds which will only be expended as needed. This is a damage assessment closeout project to provide a QA/QC database.** Pam stated she wants to revisit the costs (base funding). Pam wanted an answer to the following prior to voting: Of the total budget, how much is available to respond to specific request versus how much is needed to have the system up and running?

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Technical Support

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project provides essential support to restoration, monitoring, and/or damage assessment projects.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments: - How many weeks of work is actually available? What percentage of the total is fixed overhead?

Correct FTE definition on spread sheets.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

GIS (93-057B) - This will be revisited.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

GIS: Restoration (93-057B) - We are showing $140,000 to do restoration GIS. The work done by DNR for that project needs to be reapproved by the GIS Work Group. If the GIS Work Group does not approve sufficient work to use up that money, the only fixed charge is contract maintenance, and the rest will be returned to us. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: The GIS support is needed for the 1993 restoration program. This level seems to be appropriate. We will only approve what is necessary.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Land Inventory

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project inventories habitat important to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

X Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- No funding request for 1993.

- "Grand Plan" for Habitat Protection.

- Remove 93058 because presentation rather than project.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 0**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
N	N	N	N	N	N

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Habitat/land Protection and Acquisition (93-058) - This is an overview which should be included with other projects. Pam recommended that this be deleted because it is not a project with its own budget but simply a description. Dave stated this should be deleted with discussion in the Restoration Plan. Ken stated that this should not be killed because the public will not know what happened to their proposals for habitat acquisition. Dave suggested putting all these under imminent threat. Ken stated the problem with that is willing sellers. Dave suggested stating this was a comment and not considered an idea. Joe suggested adding a comment that "all of these ideas were referred to the Habitat Protection Work Group for consideration". Art stated that not showing the public what was done would be a mistake. Byron stated this is a packaging problem. Byron suggested using this as an introductory narrative to habitat protection and acquisition. Joe suggested giving projects with A and B new numbers so that computer sorts will work properly. Mark suggested getting rid of the A and B and making it one project. The vote is 0-6 "no". **Con: There will be a write up in the introduction to the projects section which will track the public's ideas. A cover sheet will recommend that this discussion be included in the draft Restoration Plan. It is not the intent of the Restoration Team to vote against habitat protection.** (The dates need to be fixed.)

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Land Inventory

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project inventories habitat important to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Two parts:
  - USFS lead on $24,600 (do not show The Nature Conservancy (TNC) as lead agency)
  - O.K. TNC to collect data in near term (USFS)
  - TNC as cost-share agreement (both sides contribution to data collection) not sole-source contract.
  - $5,000,000 as cap on set-aside money - not part of 1993 Work Plan project budget.
  - Split 50/50 State & Federal.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Imminent Threat Habitat Protection (93-059) - Dave was concerned with Table 3A's general administration cost. Ken stated he will double check the calculations. Pam suggested showing the TNC ($42.2) contract and the $5m for possible imminent threat acquisition as separate A and B (93-059A and B). Dave will do the three-page write up. Renumbering will be addressed later. The vote is 6-0 "yes" on 59A. TNC (93-059A) - new title: Identifying and Categorizing Available Data Sets for Habitat Protection. Dave suggested adding "the lead agency for A will be determined by the Trustee Council," and Forest Service has the lead on B. There will not be a 3A. The vote on 59B is 6-0 "yes" for the $5m project to go forward to the Trustee Council. Pam questioned whether $5m is an adequate amount of money and stated the RT should suggest an amount which makes them comfortable. 59B is for imminent threat and not large scale acquisition or habitat protection. **Pro: We need to maintain our options on parcels that may be threatened or have lost opportunity. We need to be responsive to the needs of the resources injured by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill and to the people's concerns.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Land Inventory

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project inventories habitat important to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- 93060 initial data base collection.

- Assume no agency cost for providing data to TNC.

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoraticn Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Habitat Protection: Accelerated Data Acquisition (93-060). The cooperation involves giving up free data. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: We need to acquire certain pieces of information prior to making habitat protection and imminent threat decisions. We need to move along quickly on the imminent threat process which includes acquiring as much relevant information as possible and to identify data gaps and reformat data.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Land Inventory

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. The project inventories habitat important to the restoration of impacted stocks or species.

RANK: X HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Unanswered question from project 93051.

- Continues on after completion of 93061.

- By January 1, 1993, return to Trustee Council with detailed plan using 93060 & 93050 *portion) as basis for ID holes in database. (How, Who & What)

Voting Record: **TOTAL YES VOTES 6**

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Habitat Protection: New Data Acquisition (93-061) - The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: We need to move along quickly on the habitat protection process, and this information will enable us to make informed decisions and fill data gaps.** The lead agency is to be determined.

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

1993 PROJECT EVALUATION FACTORS

Damage Assessment

These factors will be considered when applying best professional judgement to evaluate these projects. The purpose is to simply rank the project into categories of "high", "medium" and "low" priority.

1. The effects of any other actual or planned restoration actions.*
2. Potential to improve the rate or degree of recovery.*
3. Potential adverse effects on human health and safety.*
4. Relationship of expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits.*
5. Cost effectiveness.*
6. Potential for additional injury resulting from proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts.*
7. Importance of starting the project within the next year.*
8. There is reason to believe that there is continuing injury to the resource and/or service, but the extent and/or mechanism is not understood.**

RANK: __ HIGH (5-6 votes) __ MEDIUM (4 votes) __ LOW (≤ 3 votes)

___ Recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

___ Not recommended for inclusion in 1993 Work Plan.

Comments:

- Previously project R105
- Funded as restoration implementation project in 1992
- Fund for Restoration close-out project until the sole purpose of removing field equipment needed for 1992 activities

Voting Record: TOTAL YES VOTES____

NOAA	ADNR	USDI	ADEC	USDA	ADFG
See	Attached	Note	For	More	Info

* Restoration Framework, 1992, pp 43-44.

** The 1991 State/Federal Natural Resources Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. 1991, vol. 1, p.1 (paraphrased).

Restoration Team Discussion 8/28 - 9/2/92

Survey and Evaluation of Instream Habitat and Stock Restoration Techniques for Anadromous Fish (93-105) - Ken stated that the PI's may have put in strong wording to justify this program. Pam agreed and stated it may be confusing and not supported by the RT and Chief Scientist. The vote is 6-0 "yes". **Pro: This is Trustee Council equipment and we need to get it back. This is money to remove field equipment that was funded in 1992, and this project is not being recommended for funding in 1993.**

Note: The agreed upon justification statements are highlighted.

RESTORATION TEAM VOTING RECORD

August 28, 1992

Project #	ADF&G	ADNR	ADEC	USDA	NOAA	USDI
01*	N	N	N	N	N	N
02	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
03	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
05	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
08	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
14*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
15*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
16	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
18	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
21*	N	N	N	N	N	N
24	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
25	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
28	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
29	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
30	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
32	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
43,44	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
45	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

September 1, 1992

	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
48*	N	N	N	N	N	N
50*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
37,55*	N	N	N	N	N	N
57A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
57B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
58*	N	N	N	N	N	N
59A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
59B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
60	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
61	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4,13*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
10*	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
11	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
17	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
19*	N	N	N	N	N	N
20*	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
22/49	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
38,23,27	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
26 (full)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
26 (NEPA)	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y

26*	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
33A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
33B	Y	N	N	N	N	N
33C	No support for this level (option)					

September 2, 1992

R105	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
34*	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
35	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
36	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
39	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
40,54	N	N	N	N	Y	N
41	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
42*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
47,56	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
51	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
52	N	N	N	N	N	N
53	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

*Projects not moved forward for now