

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF EXHIBITS	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
PREFACE	vii
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	viii
INTRODUCTION	CHAPTER 1
1.1 Background.....	1-1
1.2 Purpose and Scope of this Document.....	1-2
1.3 Intended Audience.....	1-2
1.4 The NRDA Process	1-2
1.4.1 Preassessment Phase.....	1-2
1.4.2 Restoration Planning Phase.....	1-4
1.4.2.1 Injury Assessment.....	1-4
1.4.2.2 Restoration Selection.....	1-4
1.4.3 Restoration Implementation Phase.....	1-6
1.5 Basic Terms and Definitions	1-7
1.5.1 Baseline.....	1-7
1.5.2 Exposure.....	1-8
1.5.3 Incident	1-8
1.5.4 Injury	1-8
1.5.5 Natural Resources and Services	1-9
1.5.6 Oil.....	1-10
1.5.7 Pathway	1-10
1.5.8 Restoration.....	1-11
1.6 Injury Assessment Process.....	1-11

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

DECISIONMAKING FRAMEWORK FOR INJURY ASSESSMENT..... CHAPTER 2

2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Concept of Injury	2-4
2.2.1 Definition of Injury	2-4
2.2.2 Direct and Indirect Injury.....	2-4
2.2.3 Injury Causality	2-4
2.3 Concept of Restoration	2-6
2.3.1 Definition of Restoration	2-6
2.3.2 Primary Restoration.....	2-7
2.3.3 Compensatory Restoration	2-7
2.3.4 Relationship between Primary and Compensatory Restoration	2-8
2.4 The Decisionmaking Framework	2-11
2.4.1 Review Information from Preassessment Phase.....	2-11
2.4.2 Construct Inventory of Possible Injuries.....	2-11
2.4.3 Evaluate Possible Injuries for Strength of Evidence.....	2-16
2.4.4 Establish Preliminary Restoration Objectives.....	2-17
2.4.5 Evaluate Possible Injuries for Relevance to Restoration	2-18
2.4.6 Consider the Strength of Evidence on Injury and its Relevance to Restoration	2-20
2.5 Example Application of the Decisionmaking Framework	2-24
2.6 References.....	2-30

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

INJURY ASSESSMENT METHODS.....	CHAPTER 3
3.1 Introduction	3-1
3.2 Injury Determination and Quantification	3-1
3.3 Program Management	3-2
3.3.1 Overall Administrative Structure.....	3-3
3.3.2 Lead Administrative Trustee (LAT).....	3-3
3.3.3 Establishment of a Technical Team.....	3-5
3.3.4 Logistical Considerations.....	3-6
3.3.5 Litigation Requirements.....	3-7
3.4 General Assessment Considerations	3-7
3.4.1 Use Appropriate Expertise.....	3-8
3.4.2 Develop Explicit Questions.....	3-8
3.4.3 Develop Valid Study Designs	3-9
3.5 Quality Assurance	3-12
3.5.1 Quality Assurance Practices.....	3-13
3.5.2 Quality Assurance Project Plan.....	3-13
3.5.3 Quality Assessment.....	3-21
3.6 Assessment Methods	3-21
3.6.1 Review of Existing Literature	3-22
3.6.2 Field Studies.....	3-24
3.6.3 Laboratory Studies	3-26
3.6.4 Modeling Studies.....	3-30
3.7 References.....	3-35
CONCLUSION	CHAPTER 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDICES

Appendix A	NRDA Regulations under OPA.....	A-i
Appendix B	Related Guidance Documents	B
Appendix C	Oil Behavior, Pathways, and Exposure.....	C-i
Appendix D	Adverse Effects from Oil	D-i

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1.1	NRDA Process under the OPA Regulations	1-3
Exhibit 1.2	Injury Assessment Process	1-12
Exhibit 2.1	Decisionmaking Framework	2-3
Exhibit 2.2	The Relationship between Primary and Compensatory Restoration	2-9
Exhibit 2.3	Examples of a Few Baseline Forms	2-10
Exhibit 2.4	Inventory of Potential Injuries	2-12
Exhibit 2.5	Questions to Evaluate Strength of Evidence.....	2-16
Exhibit 2.6	Questions to Evaluate Relevance to Restoration	2-19
Exhibit 2.7	Considering Injuries Based on Strength of Evidence on Injury and Relevance to Restoration (table).....	2-21
Exhibit 2.8	Considering Injuries Based on Strength of Evidence and Relevance (figure)	2-22
Exhibit 2.9	Considering Injuries After Additional Assessment Efforts	2-24
Exhibit 2.10	Example Inventory of Potential Injuries	2-26
Exhibit 2.11	Example Oil Spill Injuries	2-28
Exhibit 2.12	Example Oil Spill Injuries After Additional Assessment Effort	2-29
Exhibit 3.1	Description of the Suggested Subject Areas of a Quality Assurance Project Plan	3-15
Exhibit 3.2	Example of Measurement Quality Objectives	3-17
Exhibit 3.3	Chain of Custody Form	3-20
Exhibit C.1	General Oil Properties	C-6
Exhibit C.2	Schematic of Oil Fates and Weathering	C-7
Exhibit C.3	Relative Importance of Weathering Processes	C-8
Exhibit C.4	Estimated Mass Balance for the <i>Mega Borg</i> Incident.....	C-10

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals reviewed earlier versions of this document and provided valuable comments and draft material. In particular, the authors extend their appreciation to:

Peter Albers	NBS, Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Stickel Laboratory
Paul Boehm	Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Linda Burlington	NOAA, Office of General Counsel Natural Resources, Headquarters
David Chapman	NOAA, Damage Assessment Center, Headquarters
William Conner	NOAA, Damage Assessment Center, Headquarters
John Cubit	NOAA, Damage Assessment Center, Southwest Regional Office
Marion Fischel	Woodward-Clyde Consultants
Deborah French	Applied Science Associates
Ingrid Hansen	Texas General Lands Office
Nick Iadanza	NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service
John Kern	NOAA, Damage Assessment Center, Southeast Regional Office
Josh Lipton	Hagler Bailly Consulting, Inc.
Eugene Mancini	Atlantic Richfield Company
Garry Mayer	NOAA, Restoration Center
Norman Meade	NOAA, Damage Assessment Center, Headquarters
Alan Mearns	NOAA, HMRAD
Pat Primi	New York, Environmental Protection Bureau
Scott Robertson	Atlantic Richfield Company
Cheryl Scannell	NOAA, Office of General Counsel Natural Resources, Southeast Regional Office
Gary Shigenaka	NOAA, HMRAD
Ralph Stahl	DuPont Chemicals, Inc.
Harrison Stubbs	Harrison Stubbs Consulting, Oakland, CA

PREFACE

Given the numerous and varied oil spill incidents that have occurred to date, it is abundantly clear that such incidents are difficult to characterize. Therefore, a universal assessment strategy for all incidents is inappropriate. The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA) recognized this fact, and the regulations implementing Natural Resource Damage Assessments (NRDA) under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA) provide for a logical, flexible, and cost-effective approach that can accommodate such varied circumstances.

In accordance with OPA and the NRDA regulations under OPA, the guidance provided in this document serves to describe the approach that trustees may apply to injury assessments. This document does not direct the user in the selection of specific procedures (or methods) and should be viewed only as a starting point for the design of injury assessments for NRDAs under OPA.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended
EMAP	Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program
GC	Gas Chromatography
LAT	Lead Administrative Trustee
MFO	Mixed Function Oxygenase
MS	Mass Spectroscopy
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NRDA	Natural Resource Damage Assessment
NRDAM/GLE	Natural Resource Damage Assessment Model/Great Lakes Environment
NRDAM/CME	Natural Resource Damage Assessment Model/Coastal Marine Environment
OPA	Oil Pollution Act of 1990
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
PSEP	Puget Sound Estuary Program
RP	Responsible Party
RPI	Research Planning Institute
SAV	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
USCG	U.S. Coast Guard
USDOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
USEPA or EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency