

Prince William Sound Places of Refuge

MEETING SUMMARY

December 8, 2004

PWS RCAC Conference Room

Anchorage, Alaska

Participants:

Joe Banta (PWS RCAC)

John Bauer (ADEC)

Cliff Chambers (PWS RCAC)

Mark Fink (ADFG)

Larry Iwamoto (ADEC)

John Kwietniak (Tesoro)

Anne Logan (USCG)

Sam Means (ADNR)

Doug Mutter (DOI)

David Phillips (Chugach Corp.)

Tim Robertson (Nuka Research)

Donna Schantz (PWS RCAC)

Jack Sinclair (State Parks)

Mark Swanson (USCG)

Rhonda Williams (PWS RCAC)

Steve Zemke (USFS)

Agenda: See website at <http://www.state.ak.us/dec/spar/perp/pwspor/wg.htm>

Meeting Notes: Cmd. Swanson opened the meeting and noted the good job done by Prince William Sound (PWS) Regional Citizens' Advisory Council (RCAC) in getting the public involved in the project. He is very please with the level of public involvement and wants the work group to address each substantial issue raised in the review. He noted that there was a perception that all the information is, or should be, in this document. Some do not realize that the other parts of the Subarea Plan and Unified Plan will be utilized with the document. Cmd. Swanson also noted that this process would necessitate more planning in other areas, such Geographic Response Strategies (GRS).

John Bauer reported to the work group that the statewide Places of Refuge Guidelines were submitted to the Alaska Regional Response Team (ARRT) for review. He posted the document on the website and received only one comment. The final revised document has been submitted to the ARRT coordinator for posting at their website.

Rhonda Williams reviewed PWS RCAC's efforts at disseminating the POR information to the public and other stakeholders in PWS. Highlights of their effort include:

- Sent over 140 letters and numerous emails to stakeholders,
- Attempted to locate all potentially effected land owners,
- Established a web page and posted each letter or response,
- Conducted meetings and personal contacts with stakeholders in all PWS communities,
- Compiled a summary and also posted that on the website.

Ms. Williams noted that PWS RCAC had not validated any of the facts or assertions in the letters.

The work group then addressed the General Comments compiled by in Ms. Williams summary and reached consensus on the following:

- All hatcheries should be identified on the POR maps and in the mariculture line of considerations table.
- The Site Assessment Matrix should be reviewed to make sure aquaculture is identified as a conflicting use for appropriate sites.
- Regarding the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill (EVOS), the spill and the Eastern Lion Spill will be shown on the risk map, footed noted to indicate that they are significant spills, but not contained in the current ADEC spill database.
- Nuka Research was directed to obtain a significant lingering oiling map from the National Marine Fisheries Service at Auke Bay Lab.
- Regarding showing sensitive resource information on the PPOR maps, the introduction will be modified to clarify that there are other map products, i.e. the ESI, GRD and MESA maps, that present this important information. The PPOR maps are intended to complement, not duplicate natural resource information.
- To further address the above problem, a footnote will be added to the map or table page referencing the sensitive areas section of the SCP and the natural resource map products. The new version of the sensitive areas section is available for review on the ARRT private website.
- PWS RCAC will prepare and send a document to thank all commenters and provide them with feedback on the work group's decisions.
- The introduction should clarify that historical properties are dealt with under a programmatic agreement in another section of the SCP.
- DNR Office of Historical Properties needs to review the PPOR maps and verify/provide the appropriate designations.
- Regarding upland landowner's rights, the work group suggests that the ARRT review the statewide guidelines to ensure that a *letter of understanding* document is utilized to insure the salvage and removal of the vessel.
- The work group also acknowledges that the designation as a PPOR by this process, should not in any way be used as a factor to preclude any usage of the upland or the rights of any landowner.
- The work group recommends that additional historical property surveys be conducted at PPOR site where not prior survey has been completed.
- The work group reviewed and affirmed its decision not to prioritize PPOR. There are too many factors that are incident specific to prioritize one site over another in advance.

The work group reviewed the draft POR documents provided by the contractor and directed additional changes to the materials.

It was agreed that the revised version of the POR documents would be posted on the web and an email notification would be sent to the work group. After that notice the work group would have two weeks to provide final comments and changes to the contractor. The final document will be submitted for incorporation into the SCP in January.