of this part, trustees may estimate the dollar value of the lost services and select the scale of the restoration action that has a cost equivalent to the lost value. The responsible parties may request that trustees value the natural resources and services provided by the restoration action following the process described in §990.14(c) of this part.

(4) Discounting and uncertainty. When scaling a restoration action, trustees must evaluate the uncertainties associated with the projected consequences of the restoration action, and must discount all service quantities and/or values to the date the demand is presented to the responsible parties. Where feasible, trustees should use risk-adjusted measures of losses due to injury and of gains from the restoration action, in conjunction with a riskless discount rate representing the consumer rate of time preference. If the streams of losses and gains cannot be adequately adjusted for risks, then trustees may use a discount rate that incorporates a suitable risk adjustment to the riskless rate.


§ 990.54 Restoration selection—evaluation of alternatives.

(a) Evaluation standards. Once trustees have developed a reasonable range of restoration alternatives under §990.53 of this part, they must evaluate the proposed alternatives based on, at a minimum:

(1) The cost to carry out the alternative;
(2) The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the trustees’ goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses;
(3) The likelihood of success of each alternative;
(4) The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident, and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative;
(5) The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service; and
(6) The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

(b) Preferred restoration alternatives. Based on an evaluation of the factors under paragraph (a) of this section, trustees must select a preferred restoration alternative(s). If the trustees conclude that two or more alternatives are equally preferable based on these factors, the trustees must select the most cost-effective alternative.

(c) Pilot projects. Where additional information is needed to identify and evaluate the feasibility and likelihood of success of restoration alternatives, trustees may implement restoration pilot projects. Pilot projects should only be undertaken when, in the judgment of the trustees, these projects are likely to provide the information, described in paragraph (a) of this section, at a reasonable cost and in a reasonable time frame.

§ 990.55 Restoration selection—developing restoration plans.

(a) General. OPA requires that damages be based upon a plan developed with opportunity for public review and comment. To meet this requirement, trustees must, at a minimum, develop a Draft and Final Restoration Plan, with an opportunity for public review of and comment on the draft plan.

(b) Draft Restoration Plan. (1) The Draft Restoration Plan should include:

(i) A summary of injury assessment procedures used;
(ii) A description of the nature, degree, and spatial and temporal extent of injuries resulting from the incident;
(iii) The goals and objectives of restoration;
(iv) The range of restoration alternatives considered, and a discussion of how such alternatives were developed under §990.53 of this part, and evaluated under §990.54 of this part;
(v) Identification of the trustees’ tentative preferred alternative(s);
(vi) A description of past and proposed involvement of the responsible parties in the assessment; and
(vii) A description of monitoring for documenting restoration effectiveness, including performance criteria that will be used to determine the success of restoration or need for interim corrective action.

(2) When developing the Draft Restoration Plan, trustees must establish
restoration objectives that are specific to the injuries. These objectives should clearly specify the desired outcome, and the performance criteria by which successful restoration will be judged. Performance criteria may include structural, functional, temporal, and/or other demonstrable factors. Trustees must, at a minimum, determine what criteria will:

(i) Constitute success, such that responsible parties are relieved of responsibility for further restoration actions; or

(ii) Necessitate corrective actions in order to comply with the terms of a restoration plan or settlement agreement.

(3) The monitoring component to the Draft Restoration Plan should address such factors as duration and frequency of monitoring needed to gauge progress and success, level of sampling needed to detect success or the need for corrective action, and whether monitoring of a reference or control site is needed to determine progress and success. Reasonable monitoring and oversight costs cover those activities necessary to gauge the progress, performance, and success of the restoration actions developed under the plan.

(c) Public review and comment. The nature of public review and comment on the Draft and Final Restoration Plans will depend on the nature of the incident and any applicable federal trustee NEPA requirements, as described in §§990.14(d) and 990.23 of this part.

(d) Final Restoration Plan. Trustees must develop a Final Restoration Plan that includes the information specified in paragraph (a) of this section, responses to public comments, if applicable, and an indication of any changes made to the Draft Restoration Plan.

§ 990.56 Restoration selection—use of a Regional Restoration Plan or existing restoration project.

(a) General. Trustees may consider using a Regional Restoration Plan or existing restoration project where such a plan or project is determined to be the preferred alternative among a range of feasible restoration alternatives for an incident, as determined under §990.54 of this part. Such plans or projects must be capable of fulfilling OPA’s intent for the trustees to restore, rehabilitate, replace, or acquire the equivalent of the injured natural resources and services and compensate for interim losses.

(b) Existing plans or projects—(1) Considerations. Trustees may select a component of a Regional Restoration Plan or an existing restoration project as the preferred alternative, provided that the plan or project:

(i) Was developed with public review and comment or is subject to public review and comment under this part;

(ii) Will adequately compensate the environment and public for injuries resulting from the incident;

(iii) Addresses, and is currently relevant to, the same or comparable natural resources and services as those identified as having been injured; and

(iv) Allows for reasonable scaling relative to the incident.

(2) Demand. (i) If the conditions of paragraph (b)(1) of this section are met, the trustees must invite the responsible parties to implement that component of the Regional Restoration Plan or existing restoration project, or advance to the trustees the trustees’ reasonable estimate of the cost of implementing that component of the Regional Restoration Plan or existing restoration project.

(ii) If the conditions of paragraph (b)(1) of this section are met, but the trustees determine that the scale of the existing plan or project is greater than the scale of compensation required by the incident, trustees may only request funding from the responsible parties equivalent to the scale of the restoration determined to be appropriate for the incident of concern. Trustees may pool such partial recoveries until adequate funding is available to successfully implement the existing plan or project.

(3) Notice of Intent To Use a Regional Restoration Plan or Existing Restoration Project. If trustees intend to use an appropriate component of a Regional Restoration Plan or existing restoration project, they must prepare a Notice of Intent to Use a Regional Restoration Plan or Existing Restoration Project. Trustees must make a copy of the notice publicly available. The notice must include, at a minimum: