

Summary of Comments From the
Public Scoping Meeting Held in

Homer, Alaska April 18, 1990

Stan Senner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Sandy Rabinowich, National Park Service, and Kirsten Ballard, Environmental Protection Agency conducted the meeting, which was held at the Homer Senior Center from 7:00 pm to 9:10 pm. Fourteen people attended, including people from the State of Alaska Departments of Fish and Game, and Natural Resources, a member of the Cook Inlet Seiners Association, local fishermen, a local artist and Chairman of the Pratt Museum of Natural History, a staff member of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge, a local shop owner, and a member of a local subsistence fisheries citizens group.

Summaries of comments, questions and suggestions made by participants:

-The need for in-the-field research/monitoring vessels was expressed. It was suggested that this type of vessel could combine research, recovery and restoration and at the same time take steps to lessen impacts of a future oil spill.

-It was suggested that funds should be allocated for oceanographic research by enhancing existing facilities. This could be combined with enhancing or creating educational institutions and public ocean information centers (in conjunction with oil spill response centers).

-Long Term Ecological Research sites should be identified. This is a program sponsored by the National Science Foundation. Funds should be obtained to support on-going research at these sites.

-A system to guarantee funding for assessing the damage oil pollution imposes on the environment. This could be in conjunction with or in addition to a fund to continue research into the effects of EVOS. With the increase in tanker traffic, further research into cleanup techniques was discussed as applicable to inevitable future spills.

-A satellite communications system for research vessels was proposed. If such a system were in place, research/response vessels could be directed ASAP to remote spills.

-Expanding public education regarding oil spills. This could be accomplished by hiring a contractor to go to local schools for education and/or supporting museum exhibits throughout state and nation. These could be combined with another educational program to give people a sense of personal responsibility about energy use.

-Concern was raised regarding the areas which were impacted

by oil, then by cleanup efforts, and now possibly further cleanup. Further disturbances of isolated areas should not be encouraged. This may need to be combined with management options to reduce impacts. It was suggested that baseline data should be gathered now before projected increases in people use that the spill area will receive as a result of the spill. This data could be used regarding recreation so that good management decisions could be made to help ensure good visitor experience. Ways to minimize further impact should be explored--e.g. expansion of existing facilities rather than construction of new facilities or creation of further bureaucracy.

-This acquisition of timber rights was discussed at length. Ideas included:

- Buy up a 300+ foot buffer zone around streams and areas visible from the coast, etc. in areas which are selected for logging to reduce environmental and visual impact.

- Support tree planting efforts (construction of a new nursery/expansion of existing facilities, labor, etc.) in areas which have already been logged or which will be logged for restoration.

- Buy up in-holdings or timber rights which are within State and Federal protected areas (parks, refuges, etc.).

- Buy up Net Operating Losses (NOL) timber rights.

- Support a change in the law to prevent further sale of NOLs to protect areas.

- Several ideas regarding the enhancement of fishery resources in impacted areas were expressed. These included the construction of new salmon hatcheries. It was also suggested that rather than impacting the wilderness further, support for the expansion of existing hatcheries was a better way to enhance the fishery resource while minimizing recreational/aesthetic impact. In areas where wild stocks have been impacted, it was suggested that rather than changing the stock in those streams, available enhancement techniques for stream and stock enhancement should be used to expand/restore wild stocks without replacing them with hatchery stocks.

- Support/implement fisheries studies 9&10 from NRDA, which have been cancelled or discontinued.

- Support special cleanups in especially pristine areas was suggested as a restoration project. These cleanups would use techniques which have been demonstrated to minimize the impact on the beaches and enhance natural or enhanced restoration.

Acquisition of new lands came under favorable discussion. Among the ideas presented:

- To restore the wilderness experience, new, unspoiled areas must be acquired.
- Acquire seabird colonies currently in private holdings. This helps birds and creates public education opportunities.
- Protect timbered slopes to protect marbled murrelet nesting areas.
- Acquire habitat for migratory birds along the Pacific flyway, such as wetlands in California, and possibly monies to work out an international effort to protect habitat in South American countries. The idea of spending dollars outside of Alaska was met with initial objection until it was discussed that if the birds that we spend millions of dollars to restore here do not have a place to winter over, then the dollars here could be spent in vain. The participants then concurred that this could be an appropriate project.
- Support further studies to expand knowledge of other migratory birds to provide information regarding other wetlands/habitat for protection/acquisition.
- Review all sea lion and seabird colonies with respect to land status, the ultimate goal being acquisition or protection of these areas.
- Review Middleton Island for consolidation and acquisition.
- The concern regarding the need for future and long term studies was recurrent. Some say that the need for long term studies on the effects of EVOS has already been established. After "the thrill is gone" from this spill, the participants expressed concern that necessary studies would no longer be funded. The idea to establish a trust fund and manage it so that monies are perpetually available for funding research, restoration, recovery, acquisition and enhancement projects was met with enthusiasm by the participants.
- Cleanup as it relates to restoration was discussed at length. It was suggested that cleanup should be studied on an experimental basis, money for local research on cleanup and restoration techniques, and support for the development of an informational repository for cleanup technologies developed during this and other spills to avoid the "re-invention of the wheel". It was pointed out that such projects must be related to the restoration process.

-Plastics problem is synergistic with the oil, especially in low-energy areas. The plastics remain a persistent problem and tend to collect oil. It was suggested that areas could be restored by cleaning up plastics (nets, line, floats and other assorted flotsam). This could be combined with the support of solid waste options to cut down/eliminate debris at sea.

-The recent placement of sea lions on the threatened species list brought several ideas under discussion. Fisheries and tour boat operations will be feeling and impact. It was suggested that restoration funds should support studies to establish the amount of impact fishing and oil has had on sea lions. Funds could also be used to support research to identify the cause(s) of the sea lion's decline before establishing restoration procedures.

-The concept of removing introduced predators at bird rookeries to enhance recovery of these colonies (replacement) was met with a favorable response and supported by participants. Introduced predator elimination has been documented as a successful operation (literature available).

-It was suggested that previously logged/deforested areas could be reforested or replaced (planting) or new areas acquired/protected (e.g. Afognak Island).

-The participants seem unanimous in their frustration regarding the inaccessibility of NRDA results. Concern that potential restoration projects or need could possibly be overlooked was expressed. Participants felt they could not evaluate all subjects (cleanup, damage assessment, and restoration, among others) without the whole picture available.

To: Frankie
From: Sandra

D R A F T

FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT BY THE RESTORATION PLANNING WORK GROUP

Please return
w/ comments

RPWG
U

and Agency
**RESTORATION DATABASE
Public Comments**

Prepared by Sandra Cosentino
in consultation with Frankie Pillifant
DNR's Oil Spill Project Coordination Office
May 7, 1990

DNR's Oil Spill Project Coordination Office will set up and maintain a database (on IBM using D-Base III Plus software) containing public and agency comments on restoration of natural resources damaged by the Exxon Valdez oil spill. Following is an outline on the purpose, uses and structure of the database for review and comment by the RPWG.

Purposes of Database:

1. Record a summary of public and agency comments.
2. To be able to track the person or organization who submitted comments.
3. To be able to print reports by subject and/or community. For example:
 - a. summary of ideas for acquisition of equivalent resources
 - b. summary of public support and/or concerns for a certain type of restoration project in Prince William Sound.
4. To organize all of the comments by location and subject grouping for easy reference such as:
 - a. PWS, fisheries, replacement, hatcheries projects
5. To ^{be able} produce a summary chart as per attached NPS example.

Rules For Comments Received:

The Restoration Planning office maintains a sequentially numbered master list of comments which gives date received, name, affiliation, address, phone, written or oral.

Written

1. Stamp date received on item.
2. Assign number (write number in upper right corner of correspondance).
3. Record in master log.
4. Send copy to Frankie Pillifant, DNR, for D-Base and mailing list entry.

Phone or Interview

1. Summarize oral comments.
2. Date and identify who took notes.
3. Be sure to get commenters name, affiliation, address, phone.
4. Assign number & write in upper right-hand corner. If summary done by RPWG member who is not in the Planning Office, turn into Planning Office for logging in and assignment of number.
5. Copy to Frankie.

Data Fields

Log #

Location (area referred to in the comment)

oil impact
Prince William Sound
Kenai Peninsula
Kodiak
Alaska Peninsula
All

Natural Resource Category

Coastal habitat
Fisheries
Birds
Mammals
Recreation
Cultural

Type of Restoration Activity

Restoration
Replacement
Acquisition of equivalent resources

Subject (specific subject of the comment or portion of the comment)

***Need the RWPG to identify these; some will have to be added
as we receive comments***

Origin of Comment

Anchorage

Cordova
Valdez
Tatitlik
Chenega

Seward
Homer
Whittier
Kachemak
Seldovia
Kenai
Soldotna
English Bay
Pt. Graham

Kodiak
Akhiok
Larsen Bay
Old Harbor
Ouzinkie
Pt. Lions

Other Alaska location

Lower 48

Outside US

Commenter Category

General public

State or federal agency

Local government

Native group

University, other education, consultant, technical

Environmental group

Fisheries, seafood, or aquaculture group

Recreation or tourism group

Oil industry

Resource development (other than fisheries, tourism, oil)

Legislator

Other

Comment Type

Letter

Oral

sc5:a:database.out

Revised SEPT 15, 1987

ACTION REQUIRED	LETTER NUMBER NUMBER & SOURCE		ORIGIN	ERRORS/ OMISSION	NEW IMPACT TOPICS	PROCEDURAL CHALLENGE OR REQUEST	NEW ALTER- NATIVE IDENTI- FIED	ALTERNATIVE				LAW, REG & POLICY ISSUE(S)	QUES- TION/ CLARIFI- CATION
	F-Federal	L-Local Govt.						N-No Action	P-Proposal	N-Maximum	O-Other		
E-Errata	S-State	I-Interest Group	A-Alaska	A-Analysis	No	E-Extend	Y-Yes	N P N O	Y-Yes	Y-Yes	Y-Yes	Y-Yes	
S-Sub-	Individual	L-Late Comments	L-Lower 48	C-Conclusion	Y-Yes	Period	No		No	No	No	No	
stantive	Comments		R-Region	PARK UNIT		Comment							
comments						Lower 48							
--None	NAME	ORGANIZATION				Meetings							
-	1--	Naslund	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	E	-	-	-	-	-
-	2-F	Schiro	US COAST GUARD	L	YUCH, KEFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	3--	Kolb	-	L	BELA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	4--	Tronca	-	L	KEFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	5--	Glude	-	R	KEFJ	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	-
-	6--	Bacon	-	R	KEFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S	7-F	Hoekzema	US BUR OF MINES	A	BELA	A,C	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	8-F	Hoekzema	US BUR OF MINES	R	KEFJ	A:1-3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	9--	Tronca	-	L	BELA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	10--	Tronca	-	L	YUCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	11--	Vandevere	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	E, L	-	-	-	-	-
E	12--	Jong	MINING CLAIMENT	R	BELA	C,F	-	-	-	-	-	Y	-
-	13a-	Johnson	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	13b-	"	-	L	GAAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	13c-	"	-	L	WRST	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	14-N	Reindeer Herders Assoc.	-	R	BELA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	15--	Tellier	-	L	Batch 1,2	-	-	E	-	-	-	-	-
-	16--	Schneider	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	17--	Krohn	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	18--	Merrell	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	19--	Tendler	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	20--	Jensen	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	21--	Lein	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	22--	Suderman	-	L	BELA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	23-I	Uruhlich	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	24--	Peleck	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	25--	Rouch	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	26--	Rouch	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	27--	Johnson	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	28--	Emerson	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	29--	Brown	-	L	Batch 1,2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	30--	Suderman	-	L	KEFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	31--	Suderman	-	L	YUCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	32-I	DeVries AK WILDLIFE ALLIANCE	-	A	YUCH	-	-	E	-	-	-	-	-
-	32-I	DeVries AK WILDLIFE ALLIANCE	-	A	BELA, KEFJ	-	-	E	-	-	-	-	-
S	33-I	McVee AK MINERS ASSOCIATION	-	A	BELA	A,C	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-
E	34--	Kristenson	-	R	BELA	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	35-I	Kirk SIERRA CLUB-REDWOODS	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y
-	36--	Nilstein	-	L	BELA, YUCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	37--	Butliff	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	38--	Proescholdt	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	39--	Pettengill	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	40--	Strong	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	41--	Scholer	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	42--	Girdler	-	L	Batch 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

#24 & #25 object to same day
airborne hunting in preserves

RPWG
J

DRAFT

D R A F T summary
Prepared by Sandra Cosentino, DNR
Please review and comment.

Summary Public Scoping Meeting

Anchorage
May 17, 1990

Restoration Planning Work Group members present:

Brian Ross, EPA
Stan Senner, ADF&G
Sandy Rabinowitch, NPS
Frankie Pillifant, DNR
Dave Gibbons, USFS

The meeting was held at the National Park Service headquarters from 7:00 - 9:30 p.m. 16 members of the public attended including a reporter from the Anchorage Times, representatives of Chugach Alaska and The North Pacific Rim and an environmental lawyer/sportfish representative. Most present identified issues, raised questions and offered suggestions. These are summarized by topic below.

Restoration Process

1. Should state that the restoration process is to enhance or speed up natural processes.
2. The effects of oil not yet ascertained; the logical first step is to assess different ecological communities for speed of recovery by different techniques determine the relative damage of clean up techniques.
3. Remove political constraints to making scientific decisions.
4. Questions about time frame and concern that work on restoration begin this season. By the time lawsuits are settled, it may be too late to take effective actions.
5. Questions about "clout" of the RPWG in implementing projects and directing agencies. Response was that RPWG role is advisory; that projects may take individual agency administrative decisions or legislative actions.
6. Concern that proceeds which may be derived from state lawsuit are not required by law to go toward restoration of damages. Is there any assurance that moneys from the federal damage assessment will go toward restoration since there is not a

federal lawsuit for damages under the Clean Water Act?

7. Dealing with intangibles re. damage values; litigants will be far apart on the monetary value. Best to settle out of court and get on with restoration.
8. The RPWG should make an effort to talk to tourism and recreation groups.

Funding for Restoration

1. When will restoration money be available? Are priorities being set for use of funds that agencies may make available prior to settling of lawsuits?
2. Suggest other funding sources for restoration such as a tax on state and oil producers. Resource agencies should spend money now and obtain reimbursement from damage assessment funds.
3. Buy back Bristol Bay oil leases with federal moneys received from the lease sales.

Involvement of Native Villages

1. Chenega people think the resource base is desolate compared to the past. The RPWG should go to Chenega and other affected villages; it is a bad error not to include them in scoping process. Lynn Vining of The North Pacific Rim volunteered to assist the RWPG in setting up village meetings.
2. Look for strategies to reduce dependency and vulnerability to future events. There are very few sustainable development opportunities. Village people are primary users who depend on natural resources as part of their economy. Important to get their ideas and for the restoration process to consider diversification of the economic base.

Cultural Resources.

1. Are cultural resources a natural resource under CERCLA?

Acquisition

1. Encourage acquisition of equivalent resources. Skeptical that there are many restoration projects that can be done. By the end of litigation, it may be hard to document damage beyond initial mortality. However, there is loss of intrinsic value and use which needs to be balanced. Thus, it is important to

acquire lost habitat, use and intrinsic value.

2. Do not, for example, acquire unthreatened high value habitat or scenic areas. Acquire threatened areas such as timber harvest buffers wider than the 66' requirement in the Forest Practices Act.
3. Think broadly, look outside affected area. Create an Iliamna Wildlife Refuge which has high value caribou herds, important wild rainbow trout-remote recreation values and sockeye salmon runs and more. However, there are 400,000 acres of private native land. Propose purchasing conservation easements on the private land. This would create a greater cash flow than selling off recreational lots and allow continued subsistence use by local people. Provide further protection by prohibiting state land disposals.
5. Purchase conservation easements, not full title, from willing Native land owners in the coastal areas and along streams. Consider timber rights in coastal swatch from Afognak to SE Alaska and recreational land sale rights from Kodiak west across the Alaska Peninsula.
6. In Prince William Sound, restrict exploitation of some resources: logging (e.g., Big Islands Plan), mining, fishing restrictions. Purchase some of the limited entry permit to reduce use.
7. The oil went somewhere; predicts long term impact to benthic organisms. Close or limit drag fishing due to incidental catch and habitat disturbance to allow healing the benthic organisms. This is particularly recommended in the Port Wells and Passage Canal area out of Whittier. Keep these areas as a stocking, natural area for the more damaged adjacent areas.
8. Retain upland old growth for deer so further loss of their food base does not occur.
9. Address long-term pollutants as part of restoration. Clean up Whittier toxic dump and tank farms. Need contingency plans for oil shippers and clean up problem with community sewage leaking into waters. Community waste management is a valid restoration activity; clean water is the basis for all the species in the impact zones.
10. Use active "hands off"--cut off human activities in some areas such as bilge dumping, recreation.
11. Ban hydroelectric development such as the Nellie Juan site.

12. Prevention of oil spills is part of restoration. Establish a harbor authority to regulate and monitor vessels and provide for safe transit of vessels.
13. Allow a tax write off in return for a conservation easement; call it a net operating loss. Require the spiller to purchase the easements soon after the spill.

Replacement

1. Be careful not to increase impact with replacement projects; for example, building new public use cabins in non-oiled areas.

Page
5

Summary of Comments From the
Public Scoping Meeting Held in

Homer, Alaska April 18, 1990

Stan Senner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Sandy Rabinowich, National Park Service, and Kirsten Ballard, Environmental Protection Agency conducted the meeting, which was held at the Homer Senior Center from 7:00 pm to 9:10 pm. Fourteen people attended, including people from the State of Alaska Departments of Fish and Game, and Natural Resources, a member of the Cook Inlet Seiners Association, local fishermen, a local artist and Chairman of the Pratt Museum of Natural History, a staff member of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge, a local shop owner, and a member of a local subsistence fisheries citizens group.

Summaries of comments, questions and suggestions made by participants:

-The need for in-the-field research/monitoring vessels was expressed. It was suggested that this type of vessel could combine research, recovery and restoration and at the same time take steps to lessen impacts of a future oil spill.

-It was suggested that funds should be allocated for oceanographic research by enhancing existing facilities. This could be combined with enhancing or creating educational institutions and public ocean information centers (in conjunction with oil spill response centers).

-Long Term Ecological Research sites should be identified. This is a program sponsored by the National Science Foundation. Funds should be obtained to support on-going research at these sites.

-A system to guarantee funding for assessing the damage oil pollution imposes on the environment. This could be in conjunction with or in addition to a fund to continue research into the effects of EVOS. With the increase in tanker traffic, further research into cleanup techniques was discussed as applicable to inevitable future spills.

-A satellite communications system for research vessels was proposed. If such a system were in place, research/response vessels could be directed ASAP to remote spills.

-Expanding public education regarding oil spills. This could be accomplished by hiring a contractor to go to local schools for education and/or supporting museum exhibits throughout state and nation. These could be combined with another educational program to give people a sense of personal responsibility about energy use.

-Concern was raised regarding the areas which were impacted

by oil, then by cleanup efforts, and now possibly further cleanup. Further disturbances of isolated areas should not be encouraged. This may need to be combined with management options to reduce impacts. It was suggested that baseline data should be gathered now before projected increases in people use that the spill area will receive as a result of the spill. This data could be used regarding recreation so that good management decisions could be made to help ensure good visitor experience. Ways to minimize further impact should be explored—e.g. expansion of existing facilities rather than construction of new facilities or creation of further bureaucracy.

-~~This~~ acquisition of timber rights was discussed at length. Ideas included:

- Buy up a 300+ foot buffer zone around streams and areas visible from the coast, etc. in areas which are selected for logging to reduce environmental and visual impact.

- Support tree planting efforts (construction of a new nursery/expansion of existing facilities, labor, etc.) in areas which have already been logged or which will be logged for restoration.

- Buy up in-holdings or timber rights which are within State and Federal protected areas (parks, refuges, etc.).

- Buy up Net Operating Losses (NOL) timber rights.

- Support a change in the law to prevent further sale of NOLs to protect areas.

-Several ideas regarding the enhancement of fishery resources in impacted areas were expressed. These included the construction of new salmon hatcheries. It was also suggested that rather than impacting the wilderness further, support for the expansion of existing hatcheries was a better way to enhance the fishery resource while minimizing recreational/aesthetic impact. In areas where wild stocks have been impacted, it was suggested that rather than changing the stock in those streams, available enhancement techniques for stream and stock enhancement should be used to expand/restore wild stocks without replacing them with hatchery stocks.

- Support/implement fisheries studies 9&10 from NRDA, which have been cancelled or discontinued.

- Support ^{for} special cleanups in ^{particular} especially pristine areas was suggested as a restoration project. These cleanups would use techniques which have been demonstrated to minimize the impact on the beaches and enhance natural or ^{enhanced} restoration.

^{human-assisted}

Acquisition of new lands came under favorable discussion. Among the ideas presented:

- To restore the wilderness experience, [?]ne, unspoiled areas must be acquired.
- Acquire seabird colonies currently in private holdings. This helps birds and creates public education opportunities.
- Protect timbered slopes to protect marbled murrelet nesting areas.
- Acquire habitat for migratory birds along the Pacific flyway, such as wetlands in California, and possibly monies to work out an international effort to protect habitat in South American countries. The idea of spending dollars outside of Alaska was met with initial objection until it was discussed that if the birds that we spend millions of dollars to restore here do not have a place to winter over, then the dollars here could be spent in vain. The participants then concurred that this could be an appropriate project.
- Support further studies to expand knowledge of other migratory birds to provide information regarding other wetlands/habitat for protection/acquisition.
- Review all sea lion and seabird colonies with respect to land status, the ultimate goal being acquisition or protection of these areas.
- Review Middleton Island for consolidation and acquisition. *of what?*
- The concern regarding the need for future and long term studies was recurrent. Some say that the need for long term studies on the effects of EVOS has already been established. After "the thrill is gone" from this spill, the participants expressed concern that necessary studies would no longer be funded. The idea to establish a trust fund and manage it so that monies are perpetually available for funding research, restoration, recovery, acquisition and enhancement projects was met with enthusiasm by the participants.
- Cleanup as it relates to restoration was discussed at length. It was suggested that cleanup should be studied on an experimental basis, money for local research on cleanup and restoration techniques, and support for the development of an informational repository for cleanup technologies developed during this and other spills to avoid the "re-invention of the wheel". It was pointed out that such projects must be related to the restoration process.

-Plastics problem is synergistic with the oil, especially in low-energy areas. The plastics remain a persistent problem and tend to collect oil. It was suggested that areas could be restored by cleaning up plastics (nets, line, floats and other assorted flotsam). This could be combined with the support of solid waste options to cut down/eliminate debris at sea.

-The recent placement of sea lions on the threatened species list brought several ideas under discussion. Fisheries and tour boat operations will be feeling ~~the~~ impact. It was suggested that restoration funds should support studies to establish the amount of impact fishing and oil has had on sea lions. Funds could also be used to support research to identify the cause(s) of the sea lion's decline before establishing restoration procedures.

-The concept of removing introduced predators at bird rookeries to enhance recovery of these colonies (replacement) was met with a favorable response and supported by participants. Introduced predator elimination has been documented as a successful operation (literature available).

-It was suggested that previously logged/deforested areas could be reforested or replaced (planting) or new areas acquired/protected (e.g. Afognak Island).

-The participants seem unanimous in their frustration regarding the inaccessibility of NRDA results. Concern that potential restoration projects or need could possibly be overlooked was expressed. Participants felt they could not evaluate all subjects (cleanup, damage assessment, and restoration, among others) without the whole picture available.

Summary of comments from the
Public Scoping Meeting Held in
Homer, Alaska April 18, 1990

4/30/90
\$
DRAFT

Stan Senner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Sandy Rabinowich, US Fish and Wildlife Service and Kirsten Ballard, Environmental Protection Agency conducted the meeting which was held at the Homer Senior Center from 7:00 pm to 9:10 pm. Fourteen people attended including representatives from the State of Alaska Department's of Fish and Game and Natural Resources, a member of the Cook Inlet Seiners Association, local fishermen, a local artist, a representative of the USF&WS Maritime _____ Refuge, a local shop owner and a member of a local subsistence fisheries citizens group.

Summaries of comments, questions and suggestions made by participants:

-The need for in-the-field research/monitoring vessels was expressed. It was suggested that this type of vessel could combine research, recovery and restoration and at the same time take measures to prevent impact of a future oil spill.

-It was suggested that funds should be allocated for oceanographic research by enhancing existing facilities. This could be combined with enhancing or creating educational institutions and public ocean information centers (in conjunction with oil spill response centers).

-Long Term Ecological Research should be supported. A system to guarantee funding for assessing the damage oil pollution imposes on the environment. With the increase in tanker traffic, further research into cleanup techniques was discussed as applicable to inevitable future spills.

-A satellite communications system for research vessels was proposed. If such a system were in place, research/response vessels could be directed ASAP to remote spills.

-Expanding public education regarding oil spills. This could be accomplished by hiring a contractor to go to local schools for education or by supporting museum exhibits throughout state and nation. These could be combined with another educational program to give people a sense of responsibility about energy.

-Concern was raised regarding the areas which were impacted by oil, then cleanup efforts and now possibly further cleanup. Further disturbances of isolated areas should not be encouraged. This may need to be combined with management options to reduce impacts. It was suggested that baseline data should be gathered now before projected increases the spill areas will receive as a result of the spill. This data could be used regarding recreation so good management

decisions could be made to help ensure good visitor experience. Ways to minimize or further impact should be explored—e.g. expansion of existing facilities rather than construction of new facilities or creation of further bureaucracy.

-The acquisition of timber rights was discussed at length. Ideas included:

- Buy up a 300+ foot buffer zone around streams and areas visible from the coast, etc. in areas which are selected for logging to reduce environmental and visual impact

- Support tree planting efforts (construction of a nursery, labor, etc.) in areas which have already been logged or which will be logged for restoration.

- Buy up in-holdings or timber rights which are within the State and National Parks.

- Buy up Net Operating Losses (NOL) timber rights

- Support a change in the law to prevent further sale of NOL's to protect areas

-Several ideas regarding the enhancement of fishery resources in impacted areas were expressed. This included the construction of new salmon hatcheries. It was also suggested that rather than impacting the wilderness further, support for the expansion of existing hatcheries was a better way to enhance the fishery resource while minimizing recreational/aesthetic impact). In areas where wild stocks have been impacted, it was suggested that rather than changing the stock in those streams, available enhancement techniques for stream enhancement should be used to expand/restore wild stocks without replacing with hatchery stocks.

-Support/implement studies 9 & 10 from NRDA which have been cancelled or discontinued.

-Support special cleanups in especially pristine areas was suggested as a restoration project. These cleanups would use techniques which have been demonstrated to minimize the impact on the beaches and enhance natural or enhanced restoration.

-Acquisition of new lands came under favorable discussion. Among the ideas presented:

- To restore the wilderness experience, new, unspoiled areas must be acquired.

- Acquire seabird colonies currently in private holdings.

- Protect timbered slopes to protect marbled murrelet

nesting areas.

-Acquire habitat for migratory birds along the pacific flyway, such as wetlands in California, and possibly monies to work out an international effort to protect habitat in south american countries. The idea of spending dollars outside of Alaska was met with objection until it was discussed that if the birds that we spend millions of dollars to restore do not have a place to winter over, then the dollars here would be spent in vain. The participants then concurred that this would be a viable project.

-Support further studies to expand knowledge of other migratory birds to provide information regarding other wetlands/habitat for protection/acquisition.

-Review all sea lion and seabird colonies with respect to land status, the ultimate goal being acquisition or protection of these areas.

-Consolidate Middleton Island for acquisition.

-The concern regarding future and long term studies was recurrent. The need for long term studies of the effects of EVOS has been determined. After "the thrill is gone" from this spill, the participants expressed concern that necessary studies would no longer be funded. The idea to establish a trust fund and manage it so that monies are perpetually available for funding restoration, recovery, acquisition and enhancement projects was met with enthusiasm by the participants.

-Cleanup as it relates to restoration was discussed at length. It was suggested that cleanups should be studied on an experimental basis, money for local research on cleanup and restoration techniques, and support for the development of an informational repository for cleanup technologies developed during this and other spills to avoid the "re-invention of the wheel". It was pointed out that such projects must be related to the restoration process.

-Plastics problem is synergistic with the oil, especially in low energy areas. The plastics remain a persistent problem and tend to collect oil. It was suggested that areas could be restored by cleaning up plastics (nets, line, floats and other assorted flotsam). This could be combined with the support of solid waste options to cut down/eliminate debris at sea.

-The recent placement of sea lions on the threatened species list brought several under discussion. Fisheries and tour boat operations will be feeling an impact. It was suggested that restoration funds should support studies to establish the

amount of impact fishing and oil has had on sea lions. Funds could also be used to support research to identify the cause (s) of the sea lion's decline before establishing restoration procedures.

-The concept of removing introduced predators at bird rookeries to enhance recovery of these colonies (replacement). This has been documented as a successful operation (literature available) was met with a favorable response and supported by participants.

-It was suggested that previously logged/deforested areas could be reforested or replaced (planting) or new areas acquired/protected (Afognak Island).

-The participants seemed unanimous in their frustration regarding the inaccessibility of NRDA results. Concern that potential restoration projects or needs could possibly be overlooked was expressed. Participants felt they could not evaluate all subjects (cleanup, damage assessment and restoration) without the whole picture available.

4/30/90

~~3~~

Summary of Comments from the
Public Scoping Meeting Held in
Whittier Alaska on April 19, 1990

Stan Senner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Kirsten Ballard, Environmental Protection Agency conducted the meeting in the Kittiwake room of the Begich Tower. The meeting lasted from 7:00 pm to 7:30 pm. Despite efforts at posting notices of the public meeting, and the effort made to hold the meeting in the building where almost everyone in Whittier lives, no one attended. Therefore there are no comments to summarize.

BRIAN

RWG
4/30/90
U

Summary of comments from the
Public Scoping Meeting Held in
Homer, Alaska April 18, 1990

DRAFT

Stan Senner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Sandy Rabinowich, US Fish and Wildlife Service and Kirsten Ballard, Environmental Protection Agency conducted the meeting which was held at the Homer Senior Center from 7:00 pm to 9:10 pm. Fourteen people attended including representatives from the State of Alaska Department's of Fish and Game and Natural Resources, a member of the Cook Inlet Seiners Association, local fishermen, a local artist, a representative of the USF&WS Maritime _____ Refuge, a local shop owner and a member of a local subsistence fisheries citizens group.

Summaries of comments, questions and suggestions made by participants:

-The need for in-the-field research/monitoring vessels was expressed. It was suggested that this type of vessel could combine research, recovery and restoration and at the same time take measures to prevent impact of a future oil spill.

-It was suggested that funds should be allocated for oceanographic research by enhancing existing facilities. This could be combined with enhancing or creating educational institutions and public ocean information centers (in conjunction with oil spill response centers).

-Long Term Ecological Research should be supported. A system to guarantee funding for assessing the damage oil pollution imposes on the environment. With the increase in tanker traffic, further research into cleanup techniques was discussed as applicable to inevitable future spills.

-A satellite communications system for research vessels was proposed. If such a system were in place, research/response vessels could be directed ASAP to remote spills.

-Expanding public education regarding oil spills. This could be accomplished by hiring a contractor to go to local schools for education or by supporting museum exhibits throughout state and nation. These could be combined with another educational program to give people a sense of responsibility about energy.

-Concern was raised regarding the areas which were impacted by oil, then cleanup efforts and now possibly further cleanup. Further disturbances of isolated areas should not be encouraged. This may need to be combined with management options to reduce impacts. It was suggested that baseline data should be gathered now before projected increases the spill areas will receive as a result of the spill. This data could be used regarding recreation so good management

decisions could be made to help ensure good visitor experience. Ways to minimize or further impact should be explored—e.g. expansion of existing facilities rather than construction of new facilities or creation of further bureaucracy.

-The acquisition of timber rights was discussed at length. Ideas included:

- Buy up a 300+ foot buffer zone around streams and areas visible from the coast, etc. in areas which are selected for logging to reduce environmental and visual impact

- Support tree planting efforts (construction of a nursery, labor, etc.) in areas which have already been logged or which will be logged for restoration.

- Buy up in-holdings or timber rights which are within the State and National Parks.

- Buy up Net Operating Losses (NOL) timber rights

- Support a change in the law to prevent further sale of NOL's to protect areas

-Several ideas regarding the enhancement of fishery resources in impacted areas were expressed. This included the construction of new salmon hatcheries. It was also suggested that rather than impacting the wilderness further, support for the expansion of existing hatcheries was a better way to enhance the fishery resource while minimizing recreational/aesthetic impact). In areas where wild stocks have been impacted, it was suggested that rather than changing the stock in those streams, available enhancement techniques for stream enhancement should be used to expand/restore wild stocks without replacing with hatchery stocks.

-Support/implement studies 9 & 10 from NRDA which have been cancelled or discontinued.

-Support special cleanups in especially pristine areas was suggested as a restoration project. These cleanups would use techniques which have been demonstrated to minimize the impact on the beaches and enhance natural or enhanced restoration.

-Acquisition of new lands came under favorable discussion. Among the ideas presented:

- To restore the wilderness experience, new, unspoiled areas must be acquired.

- Acquire seabird colonies currently in private holdings.

- Protect timbered slopes to protect marbled murrelet

nesting areas.

-Acquire habitat for migratory birds along the pacific flyway, such as wetlands in California, and possibly monies to work out an international effort to protect habitat in south american countries. The idea of spending dollars outside of Alaska was met with objection until it was discussed that if the birds that we spend millions of dollars to restore do not have a place to winter over, then the dollars here would be spent in vain. The participants then concurred that this would be a viable project.

-Support further studies to expand knowledge of other migratory birds to provide information regarding other wetlands/habitat for protection/acquisition.

-Review all sea lion and seabird colonies with respect to land status, the ultimate goal being acquisition or protection of these areas.

-Consolidate Middleton Island for acquisition.

-The concern regarding future and long term studies was recurrent. The need for long term studies of the effects of EVOS has been determined. After "the thrill is gone" from this spill, the participants expressed concern that necessary studies would no longer be funded. The idea to establish a trust fund and manage it so that monies are perpetually available for funding restoration, recovery, acquisition and enhancement projects was met with enthusiasm by the participants.

-Cleanup as it relates to restoration was discussed at length. It was suggested that cleanups should be studied on an experimental basis, money for local research on cleanup and restoration techniques, and support for the development of an informational repository for cleanup technologies developed during this and other spills to avoid the "re-invention of the wheel". It was pointed out that such projects must be related to the restoration process.

-Plastics problem is synergistic with the oil, especially in low energy areas. The plastics remain a persistent problem and tend to collect oil. It was suggested that areas could be restored by cleaning up plastics (nets, line, floats and other assorted flotsam). This could be combined with the support of solid waste options to cut down/eliminate debris at sea.

-The recent placement of sea lions on the threatened species list brought several under discussion. Fisheries and tour boat operations will be feeling an impact. It was suggested that restoration funds should support studies to establish the

amount of impact fishing and oil has had on sea lions. Funds could also be used to support research to identify the cause (s) of the sea lion's decline before establishing restoration procedures.

-The concept of removing introduced predators at bird rookeries to enhance recovery of these colonies (replacement). This has been documented as a successful operation (literature available) was met with a favorable response and supported by participants.

-It was suggested that previously logged/deforested areas could be reforested or replaced (planting) or new areas acquired/protected (Afognak Island).

-The participants seemed unanimous in their frustration regarding the inaccessibility of NRDA results. Concern that potential restoration projects or needs could possibly be overlooked was expressed. Participants felt they could not evaluate all subjects (cleanup, damage assessment and restoration) without the whole picture available.

4/30/90

~~3~~

Summary of Comments from the
Public Scoping Meeting Held in
Whittier Alaska on April 19, 1990

Stan Senner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Kirsten Ballard, Environmental Protection Agency conducted the meeting in the Kittiwake room of the Begich Tower. The meeting lasted from 7:00 pm to 7:30 pm. Despite efforts at posting notices of the public meeting, and the effort made to hold the meeting in the building where almost everyone in Whittier lives, no one attended. Therefore there are no comments to summarize.

Summary of Comments from the
Public Scoping Meeting Held in
Cordova, Alaska on April 17, 1990

Gary Ahlstand, National Park Service, and Judi Maxwell, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, conducted the meeting which was held in the cafeteria of the Mt. Eccles Elementary School from 7:00 to 9:30 p.m. Nine people attended including a reporter from the local radio station, a logger, an oyster farmer, a local businessman, a former Kodiak fisherman who is writing an article for Smithsonian magazine on the effects of the oil spill on the fishing industry, three employees from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and one representative from Alaska Department of Natural Resources.

Summaries of comments, questions, and suggestions made by participants:

- Concerns were raised that planning for restoration was premature given the dearth of data from the damage assessment studies. Dr. John Teal's comment "that the best thing we can do to restore coastal habitats is to do nothing" was raised with a concern that people may not be able to accept the "do nothing" option.
- Some proportion of restoration funds should be spent on long term monitoring and research. Several participants complained that there has been little money available to do this type of research even though the need has been recognized.
- Concern was raised over the hatchery programs in the Sound. One participant noted that we knew little about the interaction of hatchery stock with wild stock and that this information was important, not only from the biological standpoint, but also to determine how to maximize the economic investment in these hatcheries.
- Several attendees reported on the status of talks between local environmental groups and the major timber owners in the Sound regarding acquisition of timber rights. Their opinion is that agreement could be reached but that the lack of funds was a concern. They wanted to know if it would be possible to purchase certain tracts - particularly those that will go on the cutting block this year - before a settlement is reached with Exxon. There was concern that by the time the court case is settled all of the important tracts, from the standpoint of environmental quality, would have been logged.
- One respondent noted that the cleanup activities introduced many to the beauty of the Sound and that this may serve to attract more people which may ultimately have a more significant impact in the Sound than the oil

spill.

- Concern was raised over the loss of passive recreation sites - boat moorings - due to oiling. Since the same has occurred for many coastal areas favored by wildlife, it is likely that recreationists and marine mammals will compete for the few clean areas. One attendee said that the major source of degradation was people and poor management of same. He expressed the opinion that wildlife will re-establish itself and stabilize if people leave well enough alone.
- Recommendations on acquisitions included haulout/rookery areas for sea lions and seals and the buy back of gill net permits to both enhance fisheries and to protect marine mammals.
- Several attendees emphasized the need for comprehensive planning due to the potential to spend a lot of money on restoration while producing nothing to show for it. Restoration and replacement activities, in particular, are likely to be a waste of money if oil spill contamination and other sources of contamination were not removed. Therefore, it is likely that more will be achieved via acquisition.
- Regarding non-oil sources of contamination, one attendee recommended the removal of mine tailings and other mining and logging debris in and around the waters of the Sound, including old sheds which still contain dynamite. These are causing heavy metals to be released into the water column.
- One attendee also noted that since plastics cannot be recycled more than once that these should be eliminated altogether.
- Concern was also raised regarding peoples' livelihoods. Would restoration seek to return the Sound to some earlier state of biological diversity which may mean that fishermen could not expect to receive their traditional catch quotas...would it be possible to give special consideration to commercial species in the restoration program?

Other questions and concerns raised:

- Do the government agencies have enough money to do adequate damage assessment?
- What is the quality of Exxon's damage assessment? Shouldn't their field activities be monitored?
- Does the U.S. Department of Justice have the right to

divert monies received in private suits against Exxon to the U.S. Treasury? How will settlement money be spent - who will decide how it is allocated? If new resources are acquired which agency will manage them?

- The field officers of the trustee agencies expressed the desire to be more informed on restoration planning before the public is brought on board. They also suggested that the flyer be mailed to all area residents - a general mailing to all postal boxes.
- How can the new legislature mandate to open the Sound to mariculture development be accommodated given the damage from the spill?
- Several attendees recommended that the trust fund be managed so that funds will be available 20-50 years from now to undertake restoration and replacement projects when coastal habitats are healthy enough to support these activities.

JAM/mah

DRAFT

Summary of Comments from the Public Scoping Meeting
Held in Valdez, Alaska
on April 18, 1990

Gary Ahlstrand, National Parks Service, and Judi Maxwell, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, conducted the meeting which was held at the Valdez City Council Chambers from 7 to 9:30pm. Six people attended including two tour boat operators, a proponent of aquaculture from the state of Washington, a reporter from the local radio station, and members of the Prince William Sound Conservation Alliance.

Summary of comments and suggestions made by participants on the subject of restoration of damages from the Exxon Valdez oil spill:

- In order for the community to be able to educate themselves regarding restoration, it was suggested that the Literature Review be made available to local libraries and that the most relevant publications be noted for possible acquisition.
- Expand the oil spill curriculum being developed by Belle Mickelson (Cordova) to include information on restoration and, in particular, to explain the need to prevent other hazards and spills as well.
- A number of participants at the meeting spoke of the gradual decline in environmental quality in the Sound and observed declines in wildlife numbers which they thought were directly attributable to marine pollution (i.e. dumping of oil, diesel fuel and garbage from boats) and due to boats disturbing wildlife.
- Clean-up garbage on beaches from sources other than the oil spill.
- Under the new Marine Pollution Act it will be illegal for boats to dump garbage and other wastes at sea - however, local governments do not have the resources to collect and recycle this garbage and will have to charge boat captains to pay for this service which will probably result in disposing garbage at sea in spite of the law. It was recommended that restoration funds be used to:
 - a) Educate skippers about the importance of not dumping refuse at sea and that trash compactors could be used to eliminate bulk (aluminum can compactors cost \$15).
 - b) Provide tenders to collect garbage directly from

boats at sea.

- c) Fund towns to initiate recycling programs particularly waste oil products.
- d) Set up small, local response teams to deal with small spills. There were 190 small spills recorded in Valdez in 1989 resulting in contamination of the Valdez Duck Flats. Alyeska currently does not have enough booms to protect this area from spills.
- e) A feasibility project which would handle/recycle oil and other marine garbage might be so successful that the state legislature may be willing to fund similar projects in the rest of Alaska.
- f) Also, communities need financial assistance to build wastewater and storm runoff treatment plants.
- g) The PWS Conservation Alliance will open an exhibit "Oil in the Marine Environment" next week and is seeking additional support to publish a brochure which could be distributed to boaters to educate them on the need to protect the environment and to eliminate these sources of waste.

The impetus for the above recommendations was the belief of several participants that restoration has little hope for success if the chronic and seemingly trivial sources of pollution in the Sound are not regulated. The group felt that a key component of restoration should be prevention of further damage so that the natural healing capacity of local ecosystems would be enhanced. In this regard, several participants also thought that it was important to curtail, at least in the short-run, human use impacts on the Sound. This would include changes in fish and game regulations, as well as, research.

- Study effects of boat distance from seal haulout/pupping areas, from eagles, etc. - then educate the public about these effects.
- Provide "talking guides" for captains to explain to passengers why it is important to view wildlife at a distance. In addition, supply captains with flyers to distribute to passengers explaining their responsibilities. This should reduce pressure on captains to get a little closer or to toot their horns in order to get action shots of seals jumping into the water.

The two tour boat operators said that the pressure on captains to take their boats in close proximity to wildlife areas was tremendous. Both have observed a 40 percent decline in the number of harbor seals prior to the spill while Dall porpoises and harbor

dolphins have been completely absent from the Sound since the spill. They felt that the tour boat business would not decline if all boats were restricted from disturbing wildlife areas and sea bird colonies.

- A marine report similar to the "Aviation Air Report" could also be used to educate the public on boater/passenger etiquette and responsibilities.

The need to change fish and game regulations was also discussed as was the desire to enhance the value of wildlife. In particular, it was recommended that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game stop referring to wildlife in consumptive use/harvest terminology and that the hunting and fishing seasons in the Sound be completely shut down for at least two to three years. One participant reported that a bush pilot operation from Anchorage had taken over 80 mountain goats in the nearby Port Fodagle area last year. It was also suggested that the river otter/mink trapping season be closed. Several participants favored designation of the Sound as a National Monument but thought this would not be politically feasible.

A number of attendees were concerned about the future of the Valdez Duck Flats. Certain parts of the Flats are owned by the local government and there has been discussion of developing this area including an extension of the public docks. It was recommended that ADF&G use AS Section 16.20 to declare this area to have "critical habitat status" - once classified, a permit would be needed before the area could be developed.

The Flats are the farthest ^{north} ~~most~~ winter range for the Canada goose and also host a large population of sandpipers. In fact, there are more birds at the Flats in the winter than in the summer. Protection of this area should be considered before acquisitions are done outside of the region. Given the preference for more development activities in Valdez, several participants recommended that a brochure be developed that would explain the importance of the Duck Flats to the public. One participant suggested that it might be appropriate to invite the National Duck Woodcarvers convention to come to Valdez as a way to enhance the value of the Flats in the eyes of the public.

Several other "acquisition" opportunities were suggested. These included:

- a) Protection of humpback and orca "rubbing" beaches (Perry Island, South end of Knight Island)
- b) Protection and acquisition of otter and mink denning areas which requires more than stream side habitat.
- c) Protect and acquire nesting and roosting habitat for lesser and greater yellowlegs, great blue herons, marbled murrelets and yellow billed loons. Research

may be needed to determine how best to protect these species.

There was also support for funding research on whales, Dall's and harbor porpoises, and on the impacts of hatchery fish on wild stocks. Several attendees were opposed to hatchery projects which would not enhance wild stocks.

There was also concern that restoration could lead to a number of undesirable changes in the Sound. Several participants suggested that physical restoration be avoided - that it was better to leave the area alone. In particular, they did not want to see any permanent research stations established nor permanent boat moorings which would only increase public use and encourage boaters to go out without adequate equipment. One person mentioned a U.S. Forest Service study which shows the adverse effects of intensive human use. It was felt that it was better to sacrifice some areas to heavy use so that other areas could be preserved.

Overall, most of the attendees expressed a desire to limit additional commercial development in the Sound citing that the Sound was already overused. However, these same people expressed concern over how to accomplish this while finding some way to provide more economic opportunities to the native communities.

One participant also suggested a need to find more efficient ways to use energy and supported the use of restoration funds to pay for research on alternative fuels.

On the subject of public involvement, one participant suggested that if people are chosen to serve on a public advisory board that they be chosen according to their interests (commercial fishing, subsistence use, recreation, etc.) instead of by geographic location. She suggested that these interest groups be asked to supply a list of those that they would recommend as participants. These should be checked carefully by seeking references. This method was used to select a public group to work on the state Forest Practice Act with excellent results.

Finally, the group recommended that a booklet be published entitled, "50 Sample Things You Can do to Save the Sound."

JAM/mah