

Preassessment Data Report #12

Potential Human Use Losses Associated with the
Selendang Ayu Oil Spill

COMMENTS OF THE RESPONSIBLE PARTY

Page 2; Paragraph 2; *Recreational Opportunities*

“The oil spill interfered with the ability of individuals and groups to undertake natural resource-oriented recreational activities which resulted in a loss of human use.”

We are not aware of any direct evidence to support this absolute statement.

Page 2; Paragraph 4; *Passive Use Loss*

“since the spill impacted unique wildlife and relatively pristine natural resources, individuals within and outside of Alaska likely experienced some passive use losses.”

We are not aware of any direct evidence to support this absolute statement.
Suggest replacing “likely” to “may have”.

Page 4; Paragraph 7; *Recreational Uses*

“Sport hunting, fishing and sightseeing are the dominant forms of recreation on Unalaska”

Add “Island.” to end of sentence.

Page 5; Paragraph 3; *Recreational Uses*

“Some of the recreational activities that utilized the Skan and Makushin area included kayaking tours (circumnavigate Unalaska), wildlife viewing of sea lions at haul-outs, and whale watching along 200’ fathom line along north coast of Unalaska Island from Unalga to Umnak Pass..”

The isobath would be either in feet or fathoms, not both. The North Coast as described, is not in the Skan and Makushin Bay areas.

“There was also limited viewing of marine birds, primarily east of Unalaska Island in the nearby Baby Islands...”

These areas are also not in the Skan and Makushin Bay areas.

Page 5; Paragraph 4; Impact of Spill/Clean up on Resource Utilization

“In and around Skan and Makushin Bays, public access was limited (i) by official closures (ADEC’s “impaired water body” declaration, ADF&G’s fishery closure, and Coast Guard restrictions on water and air access); (ii) by response activities (shoreline assessments conducted by helicopter/boat, initial clean up activities of targeted areas during winter of 2005, intensive clean up effort in spring and summer of 2005 and 2006, which deployed at its peak 22 vessels, 230 workers, and heavy equipment); and (iii) by public perception of the level of oiling.”

The Threatened Water Body Status required additional inspection of fishing vessels, tenders, and processors and did not restrict public access. Similarly, the limited commercial fishing closure did not restrict public access.

Item ii is subsumed by USCG restrictions in (i) above.

Page 5; Paragraph 5; Impact of Spill/Clean up on Resource Utilization

“Although there were no closures between Volcano Bay and Unalaska Bay, there were interruptive response activities such as frequent beach monitoring, tarball collection in Unalaska Bay, and clean up at Wide Bay (ADEC Situation Reports, Unified Command SCAT Reports).”

What does “interruptive response activities” mean? It is not clear how monitoring, or picking up tarballs by 1 to 2 people interrupted the public’s ability to utilize Unalaska Bay.

Page 5; Paragraph 6; Impact of Spill/Clean up on Resource Utilization

“The restrictions on access described above impaired the ability of residents and visitors to engage in recreational activities from Spray Cape to Unalaska Bay and south to Chernofsky Harbor.”

The USCG restriction on access did not extend to the area described here.