

RPWG
U

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WORK GROUP
FEBRUARY 22, 1993
10:30 A.M.**

Attendees

Sandy Rabinowitch
Ken Rice
Peg Kehrer
LJ Evans
Marty Rutherford
Barbara Iseah

The following items were distributed:

Restoration Plan Schedule

AGENDA

- 1) Preparation for April Draft Restoration Plan Public Meetings for Advance Materials for R.P.
- 2) Costing - out public Participation Elements for RT Presentation to TC
- 3) Other?
- 4) PAG Field Trip

Meetings held in May and March

Seldovia
Homer
Kodiak
Juneau
Tatitlek
Valdez
Seward
Whittier*
Chenega Bay
Anchorage
Cordova
Fairbanks

*did not go to in March

Other Possible Meeting Sites

Kodiak villages
Port Graham
Nanwalek (E.B.)
Chignik
Kenai
Soldotna

Chignik Lagoon
Chignik Lake

BROCHURE

Sandy stated that the focus of the brochure will be the alternatives. Peg stated the tendency has been to focus on injury. If you put something bad at the beginning, lots of people are turned off. Sandy stated RPWG is discussing how to get information across to the public. The brochure will be in newspaper format. It will be distributed by mail and by handouts. Peg stated that the mailing list alone might not be enough. The target printing number is 5,000 copies. Sandy asked for feedback from PPWG on distribution.

Questions to be answered?

HPWG element?

Single note taker?

Brochure distribution: mail list only?

boxholder?

all agency offices?

PAG? (available to their constituents)

Use PAG?

Contact community organizations

phone call, meetings

Publicity: radio talk shows? (LJ will do: news release, PSA's and flyers)

newspaper ads - more than just meeting notice?

Overnight in small communities?

Team members/composition/number of teams?

Juneau is the legislative contact meeting?

LJ suggested having presentations in some of the schools. Sandy stated that RPWG hopes to have an answer on the schedule for summer meetings so that it can be printed in the brochure. Ken stated that if the RT is comfortable that another set of public meetings are not necessary, then you might not need to do public meetings. There are other ways of getting information to the public.

Marty stated that the RT feels HPWG should have a component in the April meetings. As a result of this, a subgroup of HPWG will meet with RPWG to discuss whether a component is added. The presentation would be done after the draft restoration plan elements are presented and would not detract from it. Peg stated she feared in some communities, a discussion by HPWG would detract. Marty stated she is biased that the habitat protection option needs to be dealt with in the plan but that you don't let it drive the discussions. If there is a component, then a member of HPWG would also attend the public meetings. Marty stated we are trying to have the habitat protection process be as specific and accurate as possible.

Ken stated we need to focus on what are our objectives and how to accomplish those. Also we need to focus on what type of feedback we are looking for from the public. He is skeptical about dividing the meeting into two distinct parts.

Public Meeting Series Objectives:

1. present/convey information to public to educate public about Restoration Plan process and approaches (i.e., where they can have input and influence). Approach includes alternatives, variables, options, i.e., the building blocks. Process includes what is restoration, terms of settlement.
2. Collect public opinion on #1. List of specific questions generated by RPWG et al.

Peg suggested taking a copy of "Restoration 101" to the meetings. LJ stated that it could be refined and made clearer. Ken stated we need to flush out what questions we want answers to. Marty stated we need to make sure that the information is understandable. Sandy stated that the pie charts appear to be a useful tool in conveying information. LJ suggested another objective might be to raise the credibility of the process in the public's eyes. Peg stated it depends on the community and could be addressed by staying longer, making sure you talk to the person who has concerns and directly trying to address the problem. Marty stated she felt this objective was captured in other ways.

Marty spoke with Ken Castner in an effort to make him feel better about the process. She stated the Restoration Plan will be the context in which the work plans will be driven. She asked that his experience in the past with the work plan will not jaundice any future participation.

The RT felt the PAG should be aware of what the goal is and should also be involved informally in the public meetings.

Sandy stated because of the end of February sunset date for PPWG, he is concerned whether everything will get done. Marty stated the script needs to include process as well as content. PAG members need to be included in the process in their areas. The script also needs to include the differences between the work plans.

TASKS/ASSIGNMENTS AND TIMELINE

- . Write and distribute news releases & PSA's: LJ - arrive by one week before meetings start
- . Newspaper ads - get out: LJ - published 1 to 2 weeks prior to meeting
- . Newspaper ads - write: LJ must complete at least 3 weeks prior to meetings (weekly papers - limit)
- . Schedule halls (arrange for payment if necessary)(check accessibility)

- . Create one page flyer to post in post offices, markets, etc. and distribute - Graphic artist and LJ
- . Schedule charter flights - Tatitlek, Chenega
- . Mail brochure - Ron (LJ getting info)
- . Scripts - RPWG
- . Team Compositions
- . Schedule radio shows
- . Schedule local clubs
- . Develop school presentation - Peg
- . Schedule schools - Peg
- . Letter: do you want us to come? time frame parameters - dates when, name a contact person, best meeting place? where could meeting be held - LJ - ASAP

Peg suggested that for organizational mailings, groups could be requested to provide their mailing labels. Sandy stated there are a lot of organizations which have a very large membership because they have national interests. Peg's idea would work for inside Alaska, but outside Alaska would create a problem. Peg stated that the brochure would be appropriate for a national audience.

LJ asked if the presentation will be done for schools and stated she could do it. Peg stated every community might not be interested. Sandy stated he likes the idea but is concerned about the amount of time to prepare. Sandy added that doing the school presentations might also generate good press. LJ suggested calling the school districts to determine interest and also stated that Peg would be a good lead person for this task. Barbara will provide Peg a list of communities which requested school presentations during the May public meetings. This issue will be discussed further. Sandy stated the school presentations are a good idea because 1) kids are the future and 2) it will get good press coverage. Sandy stated the TC members should be informed in advance about the school presentations. Peg stated that the club and school presentation information needs to be obtained as soon as possible. LJ stated you need to find out when the halls are available.

Barbara is available to take notes; however, Ken stated that several notetakers should be available due to the number of possible meetings. Sandy raised the issue of communities we should offer to go to. Ken stated that if you double up on communities, you limit the amount of presentations which could be done, such as school presentations. Sandy questioned if 12 communities is enough. Marty suggested that we send out a letter now to village councils and cities asking them whether they want us to come or if a teleconference is sufficient (Tatitlek, Whittier, Chenega). LJ will find out the cost of a newspaper flyer, get a letter out to the communities and determine when is a good time to come and who is the contact person.

Sequence

1. Contact/schedule town/hall
2. Schedule school presentation
3. Schedule club gig/radio talk shows

Meeting adjourned until 3:00.

Sandy suggested going back through the questions and making decisions. Ken stated there probably won't be closure today on the HPWG presentation issue.

NOTETAKERS

Sandy stated that if the schedule works for a single notetaker fine, but if not, several should be available. Marty stated that a court reporter might be considered. Ken stated that cost might be prohibitive. Sandy suggested recording the meetings. Sandy also suggested having additional people from CACI available to take notes. Peg asked who are possible alternates. Ken stated that he will speak with Ron regarding alternates.

BROCHURE DISTRIBUTION

Sandy stated an option is to have the printer do the mailing. Sandy also recommended LJ speak with Bob regarding the cost of printing. LJ will explore options for distribution.

PAG

Sandy stated that a meeting needs to be scheduled with the PAG as part of the public meetings. This could probably be done as an agenda item at their meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ken stated the input for change comes when the draft is out and stated this needs to be the focus. We don't want to project that comments received will be reflected in the draft plan coming out in June. Sandy stated that RPWG proposed emphasizing a longer comment period.

Marty stated that agenda item #2 might not need to be discussed today.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

Ken stated we can't move on this until we have dates for the community meetings. LJ will revise the letter which goes to the communities.

SCHOOL MEETINGS

LJ stated you might be able to do this in conjunction with a radio show. Sandy stated it might be possible to fit in four presentations at a site, depending on scheduling. Peg suggested the PAG could assist with targeting interest groups and volunteered to explore options for these presentations.

PUBLICITY

LJ will do news releases, PSA's and flyers. Sandy suggested LJ speak with the graphic artist Debra Dubac. Bob will be the contact person for Debra.

PPWG MEETING

Marty asked when the next meeting is scheduled. Sandy stated we need to determine what are the critical elements to be discussed. Because there won't be immediate feedback from all the sites, the next PPWG meeting is scheduled for March 8th at 10:00. Marty requested someone prepare an agenda for the meeting. Marty also suggested that agenda item #2 regarding cost be included on the 8th.

Ken asked if RPWG has discussed visual graphics. Sandy stated not beyond the brochure. Marty suggested the alternatives pie chart would be a good graphic presentation.

COMPOSITION/NUMBER OF TEAMS

LJ stated it might be more efficient to have two groups.

RADIO TALK SHOWS

LJ stated the benefits for attempting to do additional public outreach would be worthwhile.

SITES

The list of "other" sites was discussed. LJ will send a letter to all the sites asking if they want a meeting and when. Sandy suggested adding "do you want a meeting" to the letters to the "other" sites. LJ asked Peg if she would provide assistance in contacting sites. Peg agreed.

The tentative date for the public meetings is April 12-30.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30.

RPWG
U

TO: Restoration Team
FROM: John Strand, Co-Chair
Bob Loeffler, Co-Chair
Restoration Planning Work Group
SUBJECT: Restoration Plan Schedule

DATE: January 12, 1993

By February 20, 1993, the Restoration Planning Work Group intends to complete the following segments (Key Elements) of the Draft Restoration Plan. By March 1 we intend to complete a draft of the Alternatives Information Package (referred to as a brochure in earlier correspondence). These items will serve as the basis of public meetings which we intend to conduct during April 1993. A schedule is attached.

By the end of January we will submit to the Public Participation Work Group a detailed request for assistance in preparing for public meetings.

The following is an abbreviated outline of the Key Elements and Alternatives Information Package. It is an except from the full outline which you have reviewed.

KEY ELEMENTS OF THE DRAFT RESTORATION PLAN

- III. Injured Resources and Services **Rabinowitch/Loeffler**
 - A. Background: Guidance, Definitions and Criteria
 - 1. Explanation of settlement guidance for injury
 - 2. Definitions of natural resources and services
 - 3. Definition of injury to natural resources
 - 4. Definition of injury to services
 - 5. The criteria
 - B. Conclusions **Loeffler/Spies/Strand**
 - 1. Marine Mammals
 - 2. Terrestrial Mammals
 - 3. Birds
 - 4. Fish
 - 5. Shellfish (as described above)
 - 6. Intertidal/Subtidal (as described above)
 - 7. Services

IV. Restoration Options

A. Development of Restoration Options **Klinge/Strand**

1. Definition of restoration options
2. Development of restoration options

B. Evaluation Process

1. Settlement Guidance
2. Purpose and use of the criteria

C. Application of criteria

1. Development of alternatives

V. Restoration Plan Alternatives **Loeffler**

A. Definition of an alternative?

1. Description, policies, goals
2. Options
3. How options will change as we get more information

B. Why or why not a preferred alternative?

C. Overall Management goals (and, if appropriate, objectives) for the Spill Area

D. Alternatives **Loeffler/Gorbics/Klinge/Gilbert**

Alternative 1: (title)

1. Theme, including basic goals and objectives of the alternative.
2. Resources Addressed and options proposed that address each resource
3. Services Addressed
4. Monitoring Program
5. Evaluation
 - a. Effect on recovery or service (time and extent)
 - b. Ecosystem effects
 - c. Geographic distribution
 - d. Cost
 - e. Certainty of the above factors
 - f. Timing and priority

Alternative 2 (same as above)

Alternative 3 (same as above)

Alternative 4 (same as above)

Alternative 5 (same as above)

Alternative 6: No Action (same as above except for (3))

E. Comparison of alternatives **Rabinowitch/Gilbert**

VI. Implementation Process for Life of the Settlement

B. Funding mechanisms **Brodersen/Loeffler**

1. Current Mechanisms
2. Endowment

Appendices

A. Restoration options **Various authors**

Summary of options and suboptions

B. Habitat Acquisition Process **Weiner/C. Gilbert**

ALTERNATIVES INFORMATION PACKAGE - Loeffler

The Alternatives Information Package will accompany the Key Elements of the Draft Restoration Plan. The intent is to provide the public with a more reader-friendly summary (4-page newspaper insert) that can be read by those not inclined to read the entire document. The brochure will also be printed in greater numbers to facilitate a wider public distribution than the intended distribution of the Draft Restoration Plan. It also will have a tear-out, pre-addressed detailed comment sheet. The objective is to increase opportunity for public comment.

Public Meetings -- Where & When

I. Introduction

A. Background

1. The spill
2. Activities to date

B. The planning process

C. How you (the public) can be involved

D. Relationship to EIS

- E. What the plan will not do
- F. Summary of Implementation
- II. The Settlements
 - A. Criminal & Civil
 - B. Spending Guidelines
- III. Summary of Injury, Recovery, and What, if anything, can be done to help. For each injured resource and service, a description of injury by the spill, status of recovery, and what techniques are available, if any, to aid recovery, and the effectiveness of those techniques. Land acquisition will be included in this description (as a technique to aid recovery and avoid further degradation).
- IV. Alternatives
 - A. Introduction
 - 1. Options
 - 2. Evaluation, including cost and geographic distribution
 - B. Goals, objectives, and policies common to all alternatives
 - C. Description of alternatives (probably one newspaper page per alternative). One of which will be the no-action alternative; another will be the preferred alternative.
- V. Comparison of alternatives
- VI. Implementation
 - A. Annual Work Plans
 - 1. Implementation document
 - 2. Annual solicitation of ideas
 - 3. Annual public review of draft plans
 - 4. Timing of annual plans
 - B. Operations/Administration
 - 1. Settlement Guidance
 - 2. Organization (including organization) chart
 - C. Funding Mechanisms
 - 1. Current Mechanisms
 - 2. Endowment

SCHEDULE

01/22/93	Chapter III (Injury) draft due; in-house review ¹ begins
01/29/93	Chapter IV (Methodology) and V (Alternatives) due; in-house review begins
02/05/93	Revised drafts of Appendix A (Options) and B (Habitat Protection) due; in-house review begins
02/12/93	Close of In-House Review of Key Elements [Chapters III, IV, and V and Appendices A and B]
02/19/93	Revised draft of Key Elements
02/22/93	Submit Key Elements to editor
02/24/93	Complete draft of Alternatives Information Package (brochure); in-house review begins
03/01/93	Close of in-house review of Alternatives Information Package
03/03/93	Complete revision and submit Alternatives Information Package to editor
03/05/93	Edited drafts of the Key Elements and Alternatives Information Package returned from editor
03/08/93	Revisions completed
03/09/93	Begin preparing camera-ready copy of both documents
03/17/93	Camera-ready copies to the printer
03/24/93	Release both documents to the public
03/25/93	Issue public notice of meetings and begin other preparations for public meetings
April	Public Meetings
05/03/93	Begin drafting Chapters I, II, and VI.D-F.
05/10/93	Complete drafts of Chapters I, II, and VI.D-F.
05/16/93	Trustee Council approves Draft Restoration Plan and DEIS Close of Public Comment Period on Key Elements and Alternatives Information Package
June	Compile comments submitted during April and May
06/07/93	Release DEIS and Draft Restoration Plan

¹In-house review of Key Elements and the Alternatives Information Package will consist of a joint review by the RPWG member and RT member of each trustee agency. RPWG would resolve the conflicts and elevate unresolved issues to the RT.

c : ppwg/notes