



Alaska Regional Response Team Meeting

AGENDA Fairbanks, Alaska October 17, 2012

Time	Topic	Speaker
07:30	Arrival / Sign-In	
8:00 a.m.	Welcome / Safety Brief/Introductions	ARRT Coordinators
8:15 a.m.	Co-Chair Updates	ARRT Co-Chairs and State
8:30 a.m.	Federal Initiatives to Enhance Area Planning	Chris Field
9:30 a.m.	Break	
9:45 a.m.	Science and Technology Committee Report on Chemical Dispersants Policy Updates	CDR Bo Stocklin
10:45 a.m.	Update from the National Response Team	Mark Mjoness, Alternate NRT Chair, and CAPT John Caplis, NRT Vice Chair
11:45 p.m.	Lunch (not provided)	
1:00 p.m.	On-Scene Coordinator (OSC) Reports – Planning Progress	Captains of the Port, EPA Federal OSC's, and AK State OSC
2:30 p.m.	Break	
2:45 p.m.	Subarea Planning Update	Larry Iwamoto
3:00 p.m.	Biennial Work Plan	Mark Everett, Chris Field
3:30 p.m.	Reports from Wildlife Protection Committee, and Cultural Resources Working Group	Pamela Bergmann
3:45 p.m.	Shell Response Exercise After Action Review	Mark Everett
4:15 p.m.	Closing Remarks	ARRT Co-Chairs
4:30 pm	Adjourn	

Note: Time allocations are guidelines and may vary +/- 5 minutes.

10/17/2012

Name	Initials	Organization	Phone Number	E-mail
Bergmann, Pamela		U.S. Department of Interior (Office of Environmental Policy & Compliance - Anchorage)	907-271-5011	pamela_bergmann@ios.doi.gov
Bohl, Christy		U.S. Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement	907-334-5309	christy.bohl@mms.gov
Bornemann, Scott CAPT		U.S. Coast Guard (Sector Juneau)		scott.w.bornemann@uscg.mil
Carlson, Sam		U.S. Department of Agriculture (USFS)	907-231-7333	samcarlson@fs.fed.us
Carr, Matt		U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	907-271-3616	carr.matthew@epa.gov
Combes, Marcia		U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	907-271-6555	combes.marcia@epa.gov
DeRuyter, Tom		AK Dept. Of Environmental Quality	907-451-2145	tom.deruyter@alaska.gov
Duignan, Kathleen CAPT		U.S. Coast Guard (District 17)	907-463-2226	kathleen.a.duignan@uscg.mil
Everett, Mark		U.S. Coast Guard (District 17)	907-463-2804	mark.everett@uscg.mil
Field, Chris		U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	206-553-1674	field.chris@epa.gov
Flynn, Mel		U.S. Department of Labor	907-271-3538	flynn.melvin@dol.gov
Folley, Gary		AK Dept. Of Environmental Quality	907-262-4210	gary.folley@alaska.gov
Forgit, Robert		U.S. Department of Homeland Security (FEMA)	907-271-4301	robert.forgit@fema.dhs.gov
French, John		Prince William Sound Regional Citizen's Advisory Council	907-224-4429	pesa@gci.net
Hamblett, Kathy		U.S. Coast Guard (Sector Juneau)	907-463-2487	kathy.a.hamblett@uscg.mil

Name	Initials	Organization	Phone Number	E-mail
Hawkins, Benjamin CDR		U.S. Coast Guard (Valdez MSO)	907-835-7210	benjamin.j.hawkins@uscg.mil
Iwamoto, Larry	<i>LI</i>	AK Dept. Of Environmental Quality	907-269-7683	larry.iwamoto@alaska.gov
McNutt, Cecil		U.S. Coast Guard (District 17)	907-463-2208	cecil.d.mcnutt@uscg.mil
Mehler, Paul III CAPT	<i>PM</i>	U.S. Coast Guard (Sector Anchorage)	907-271-6606	paul.mehler@uscg.mil
Sarcone, Joe	<i>JS</i>	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (CDC-ATSDR)	907-271-4073	jsarcone@cdc.gov
Sonnenberg, Gary	<i>GS</i>	U.S. Department of Agriculture (USFS)	907-586-8882	gsonnenberg@fs.fed.us
Stull, Todd MAJ		U.S. Department of Defense (ALCOM)	907-552-7235	todd.stull@us.army.mil
Terada, Calvin	<i>TV</i>	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	206-553-4141	terada.calvin@epa.gov
Whittier, Bob		U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	907-271-5083	whittier.robert@epa.gov
Zagrocki, Bill	<i>BZ</i>	U.S. Department of Defense (ALCOM)	907-553-7187	william.zagrocki@us.af.mil
Mjones, Mark	<i>MM</i>	EPA HQ / NRET	202-564-1976	Mjones, Mark @ epa.gov
Erickson, Ryan	<i>RE</i>	USCG Sector Juneau IMD	907-957-9157	ryan.r.erickson@uscg.mil
SUPERDUT BARRON	<i>SB</i>	USCG SECTOR JUNEAU	432 732 4101	BRANDON.R.SULFRIDGE@USCG.MIL
SWANSON MARK	<i>MS</i>	PINEWILLIAM SOUND RCAF	907-834-5060	Mark.Swanson@pwsica.org
C. Lloyd	<i>CL</i>	Alaska Clean Seas	907-317-0915	GMC@AlaskaCleanSeas.org

Name	Initials	Organization	Phone Number	E-mail
Ron Hecking		ALASKA CLEAN SEAS	659 3202	rhecking@alaska-cleanscas.org
Matt Wilton	MM	PENCO	242-2186	matt@penco.org
Garden Brone	GB	North Slope Borough	882-2611	garden.brone@north-slope.org
Todd Nichols	TN	ADF&G	459-7363	todd.nichols@alaska.gov
Wes Wilson	WW	Alaska Pipeline	460-0612	wilsonw@alaska-pipeline.com



Alaska Regional Response Team

Meeting Summary

Alaska Fire Service

Fairbanks, AK (Fort Wainwright)

October 17, 2012

Members Present:

Chris Field, USEPA
Mark Everett, USCG
Gary Folley, ADEC
Pamela Bergmann, USDOJ
Sam Carlson, USDA (USFS)
Bill Zagrocki, USDOD (ALCOM)
Mel Flynn, USDOL (OSHA)
Robert Forgit, USDHS (FEMA)
Joe Sarcone, USDHHS (CDC-ATSDR)

Members Attending by Phone:

Brian Swanson, USGSA
John Whitney, USDOC (NOAA)

INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Nick Knowles, EPA Alaska Regional Response Team (ARRT) coordinator welcomed attendees and meeting participants. Meeting attendees, in-person and via teleconference, introduced themselves.

Phone attendees were Doug Mutter (USDOJ), LT Kion Evans (USCG/Sector Anchorage), Larry Dietrick (ADEC), Brian Swanson (GSA), Tom DeRuyter (ADEC), and John Whitney (DOC/NOAA), Nikos Pastos (Alaska Inter-Tribal Council [AITC]), and Delice Calcote (AITC).

ARRT co-chairs, Mr. Mark Everett (USCG) and Mr. Chris Field (EPA) offered opening remarks and welcomed meeting participants. Mr. Everett extended his thanks to the Department of Defense (DOD) for their increased ARRT involvement. The co-chairs summarized recent activities, initiatives and priorities at the state and national level which have an impact on the ARRT. These included planning for next year's Spill of National Significance (SONS) drill, reactivation of the ARRT Science and Technology committee; the enhancement of area planning efforts; revisions to the ARRT biennial work plan; CANUS North exercises; and the end of the first season of Shell Oil's exploratory drilling in the Arctic. One item of note is a change to how the ARRT communicates agency decisions prior to formal updates to the Unified Plan. Any documents recording changes to ARRT policy will be posted on the ARRT website (<http://alaskarrt.org>). These decisions will be incorporated into the Unified Plan during the next official update to the Plan. Co-chairs also noted that the ARRT should seek to improve ARRT

participation, outreach, and formal government to government consultation with Alaska's tribes. The goal of the ARRT is to draft and approve a standing policy for these efforts.

The co-chairs also mentioned the ongoing issue of Japanese tsunami debris. NOAA is the lead agency for non-hazardous tsunami debris. The ARRT is monitoring debris response and participating in periodic conference calls with EPA and NOAA Administrators.

Mr. Gary Folley (ADEC) was introduced and invited to provide updates from the State. He advised the visiting NRT representatives that Alaska is unique, and that what may apply to other states may not work here. Further, he emphasized that the State has a good working relationship with federal agencies.

FEDERAL INITIATIVES TO ENHANCE AREA PLANNING (MR. CHRIS FIELD, EPA)

Mr. Field addressed federal initiatives to enhance area planning in Alaska. He reviewed two Executive Orders that have been driving ARRT priorities. E.O. 13175 directs federal agencies to consult with tribes whenever the federal government takes action or makes a decision that may impact federally recognized tribes. E.O. 13580 directs the formation of an interagency workgroup to coordinate federal efforts to oversee safe and responsible offshore and onshore energy resource development in Alaska.

During the last year, the co-chairs worked with FOSCs, ADEC, USDOJ, and FEMA to enhance area planning. One lesson learned from discussions this summer was that any barriers to enhanced planning are not the result of structure but of limited resources. Restructuring the process without an increase in resources will not achieve these objectives.

Mr. Field discussed a new paradigm, which would divide the state into four area planning zones: Sector Anchorage, Sector Juneau, MSU Valdez, and an inland zone. Additionally, he reviewed the recommendations of the Deepwater Horizon Incident-Specific Preparedness Review (DWH ISPR). He spoke of progress on issues addressed in a 2010 Memo from the NRT, and noted on-going work towards revising Annex F of the Unified Plan, developing a tribal and stakeholder outreach policy, and conducting consultation as required under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Mr. Field further discussed SONS issues with members present. It was noted that, given the current political climate, it is likely that a SONS would be declared for a spill much smaller than the general definition of a SONS would indicate. Ms. Bergman stated her concern that decisions captured in an SCP might not stand during a SONS response. Mr. Everett agreed that the concurrent development of national policy changes and SCP updates poses a greater likelihood of conflict between the two. CAPT Caplis addressed this concern, stating that the NRT has recognized the importance of the RRT, and that the RRT must be included in a SONS response. The next SONS drill will likely include an Arctic response, in which case the ARRT will be included in the exercise.

Initiatives of the ARRT will include a new RRT meeting schedule to include three (3) meetings per year. A proposed meeting schedule is captured in the draft biennial work plan (BWP).

Mr. Field also addressed the importance of continuing to pursue pre-authorization of the use of chemical dispersants. He emphasized that this is not intended to diminish the importance of incident-specific

collaboration. Mr. Everett agreed that having a dispersant use authorization plan is not enough. The ARRT needs to continue moving towards the goal of pre-authorization. Mr. Gordon Brower (North Slope Borough) commented that residents of the Alaska's North Slope have concerns regarding the use of dispersants; particularly the impact on bowhead whales. He emphasized that residents need to be involved in any decisions.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORT ON CHEMICAL DISPERSANTS POLICY UPDATES (CDR BO STOCKLIN, USCG)

CDR Paul "Bo" Stocklin (USCG District 17 Planning), presented recommendations from the Science and Technology Committee (STC) committee to the ARRT. A copy of a memo, dated October 10, 2012, from the STC to the ARRT was distributed to ARRT members, along with a copy of the current draft revisions.

CDR Stocklin introduced Dr. Whitney, to discuss the recent meetings and progress of the STC's dispersants working group. The focus of Dr. Whitney's review was the status of the development of decision-making guidelines for FOSC's. After consultation with the FOSCs, it was agreed that the current document does not constitute traditional preauthorization. The new draft document serves as a guideline for collaborative authorization of dispersant application. These guidelines maintain the FOSCs position 'in the driver's seat.'

CDR Stocklin provided an overview of the draft policy document. He emphasized the summary of the decision-making process for dispersant-use, on page 7 and 8.

Questions and Comments:

Ms. Bergman (USDOJ) expressed her concern that there appears to be a viewpoint in Washington D.C. that with preauthorization, an FOSC's authority to render a decision to use dispersants would be automatic and would not require the involvement of other agencies. However, she emphasized the importance of the FOSC working through the checklist and established ARRT process. Mr. Folley responded that pre-authorization would allow for the process to be expedited, and the time required to mobilize resources will allow for additional consultation and for logistical requirements to be determined prior to application. Ms. Bergman recounted the history of requests for dispersant use, and the approval that was granted for responses to the Exxon Valdez, Seladang Ayu, and Cougar Ace.

Ms. Delice Calcote, Alaska Inter-Tribal Council (AITC) noted that it is important to recognize that tribes are not stakeholders, but rather tribal governments and need to be listed separately from stakeholders.

Ms. Calcote questioned whether there is a recommendation to include tribes on the ARRT. Mr. Everett responded that according to the NRT, tribes are not members of the ARRT but there are a number of other means of tribal involvement.

Mr. Nikos Pastos, a consultant for the AITC, noted with approval that while consultation with the appropriate tribes is included on the decision checklist he is concerned that 14 tribes have passed resolutions opposing the use of dispersants, and have cautioned against quick decisions for the

use of dispersants. He believes that tribes need to be at the table for any decisions, and that ‘the appropriate tribes’ includes all of the tribes on the coast.

Mr. Field responded to Mr. Pastos that there are provisions to include tribes as voting members for regional response teams. Ms. Bergman reminded members that previous to the advent of the ARRT charter, the AITC was a member of the ARRT and she recommended that the ARRT identify tribes or tribal organizations that might appoint representatives as members in the future.

Mr. John French (PWSRCAC) cautioned that consultations with the tribes and stakeholders regarding dispersant-use may not result in the outcome desired by federal agencies.

Dr. Whitney noted that Mr. Nikos and Ms. Calcote were present at the workgroup meeting. Mr. Everett added that tribes were among other participants invited to the STC and Dispersant Working Group meeting.

Mr. Doug Mutter (USDOJ) stated that the goal of the RRT should not be pre-authorization but rather to have a method for effective decision making.

CAPT Caplis summarized that the NRT places the most importance on pre-planning and having a decision making process, rather than the production of a document. He also agreed that the best time to engage tribes is during the pre-planning period.

Ms. Bergman noted that the players most frequently involved in spill response are the same ones that will be involved in a dispersant use decision – with the addition of the EPA. She stated that the USCG FOSCs are already adept at notifying and consulting with tribes during spill responses.

CAPT Caplis commented that the NCP bias toward pre-authorization is in recognition that bringing together the whole RRT body during an emergency is a cumbersome process.

Mr. Doug Helton (NOAA) asked for clarification as to whether the USCG and industry are satisfied that this document is sufficient to require industry to stockpile dispersants in Alaska. CAPT Caplis responded that this document does not; however, he added that BSEE requires offshore drillers in Alaska to stock dispersants. That requirement, however, does not apply to shipping vessels or other operators in Alaska. Dr. Whitney added that industry has a history of storing dispersants in Alaska.

Mr. Everett closed this discussion, noting that he is pleased with the progress made toward completion of this document. Furthermore, he is pleased to see that lessons learned from the recent Shell exercise have been incorporated in the document. He noted, with Mr. Field’s agreement, that the co-chairs are not yet ready to present the document to ARRT, as a few revisions are necessary.

Mr. Brower shared his concern that the International Whaling Commission could shut down whaling activities in the event of a major spill due to the quota system utilized for determining the allowable number of whales to be taken. He requested that the process be revised to include stakeholders, such as the Alaska Whaling Commission, in any decisions. He also added that the

North Slope Borough is a subdivision of the state and that the borough does not represent the tribes.

Ms. Bergman asked for clarification of the next steps for completion of the document. She understands that the co-chairs are not yet ready to send it to the tribes. Mr. Everett stated he believes most of the changes are editorial in nature. Also, the document must be revised to reflect a spill with no responsible party (RP). Mr. Field added that there are some ambiguous passages that need to be clarified. Ms. Bergman stated that it sounds like it should be possible for these changes to be addressed on a short timeline so that the document can be sent out for review in the near future.

NATIONAL RESPONSE TEAM ACTIVITIES OF INTEREST TO THE ARRT (CAPT JOHN CAPLIS, USCG/NRT)

Refer to PowerPoint Presentation

CAPT Caplis provided an overview of key issues and concerns of the National Response Team (NRT) in regards to the ARRT. Among the key issues is the dire state of the federal budget, and although additional resources are needed and would be very beneficial, they are not coming.

The NRT needs to hear what that ARRT needs from the NRT. The NRT would like to offer to sponsor an Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) for offshore Arctic response strategies in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. As noted for other initiatives, the process followed to develop the ERA is equally, or more important, than the development of an ERA report. Increased stakeholder engagement and consensus building for response strategies are key goals.

CAPT Caplis also stated that while pre-authorization agreements are the “gold standard”, the development of executable strategies and protocols are important next steps. He then opened a discussion on what would be necessary to accomplish the development of such protocols or strategies and other goals. The following is a summary of that discussion.

Comments & Response:

CAPT Paul Mahler (USCG/ FOSC Western Alaska) asked what the goals were that CAPT Caplis was referring to. CAPT Caplis replied that he was referring to gap analysis.

Mr. Folley stated that building consensus on dispersant use is a hugely ambitious goal. CAPT Caplis replied that the goal of consensus is more about education and outreach than agreement on the issue.

Ms. Bergman commented that development of an ERA consistent with the way that the process is designed to function, would require travel for a significant number of people to Barrow for potentially two weeks (including travel time), at significant expense. Funding should be available to provide for travel for representatives from villages, as well as a number of subject matter experts from a variety of fields. For the Northwest Arctic ERA, there was not adequate travel budget for participants to attend both the Anchorage and Kotzebue sessions. As a result, in Kotzebue, it was very difficult for participants to effectively comment on the Anchorage development. Mr. Mjoness responded that it was his understanding from these comments, that

this process would be no less intensive than kicking off the subarea planning process. Ms. Bergman agreed and stated that the things that the Northwest Arctic Alaska ERA participants found most valuable were the background presentations, the information exchange, and the introduction of individuals who may be involved in a spill response. Completing the tables required for an actual ERA was less valuable. Focusing on the background and discussion rather than a full ERA might only require 1 week rather than 2 weeks.

Mr. Mjones also commented that getting potential participants interested in being involved is potentially more important than an actual ERA document.

Ms. Bergmann noted that, while a traditional ERA model looks at biological resources, in Alaska, an ERA needs to address trade-offs for cultural use, historical properties, and subsistence.

Mr. Cecil McNutt (USCG/D17) added that the ERA model was designed for a port, not hundreds of miles of coast, as it is being applied in Alaska. CAPT Caplis added that a focus of this concept is the off-shore environment, not a long stretch of coast.

Mr. Mark Swanson (Prince William Sound Regional Citizens Advisory Committee [PWSRCAC]) cited the need to acknowledge that mechanical recovery options are not effective and attention needs to be given, at the national level, to determination of appropriate and effective methods. Estimated potential recovery volumes (EDRC) need to be reassessed to reflect reality.

Ms. Marcia Combes (EPA) asked whether there is some way to incorporate ARRT outreach efforts and public involvement, to include training, to enhance participation. In addition to improving involvement, this would enhance preparedness for spill response.

Mr. Brower (NSB) noted that one of his duties with the borough is to coordinate the monthly planning meetings on North Slope and local involvement is a perpetual challenge.

CAPT Mehler agreed that outreach and local involvement are important, however, these efforts require a large time and budgetary commitment. The USCG is already facing a 30% decrease in next year's travel budget, and currently they are not able to complete all required tasks. In this light, it is difficult to justify additional travel for outreach. He supported Ms. Combes's suggestion to link outreach with training opportunities. This would serve to encourage participation.

Bark Lloyd (Alaska Clean Seas) stated that ACS would be willing and able to provide Incident Command System (ICS) training.

Mr. Mjones noted that necessary and valuable training includes overviews of planning, response and organization, similar to what was provided at the previous day's meeting (October 16, 2012 Interior Alaska Planning Meeting). He added that the target audience would be village leaders, not actual responders.

LARRY DIETRICK COMMENTS TO THE ARRT:

Mr. Dietrick stated that safe energy development is Alaska's priority. The State has developed standards assuming that a response cannot come in from outside fast enough. Regulated facilities are required by the State to have adequate resources to respond themselves. The regulated facilities pose the highest threat, and they have the most stringent requirements. The State has a very high standard for regulating

potential threats. Alaska's subarea plans are as good as or better than any elsewhere in the United States. The plans do not equate to the ability to respond – the ability to respond is based on the regulation requirements of high risk facilities. Rather than pursuing a government-led ERA, or new subarea planning process, Mr. Dietrick recommend having it be industry led. He stated that Unified Command needs to be supported, not undermined by the federal government. There are not adequate equipment, personnel, or other resources to support existing Federal plans. He asked why the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund cannot be utilized by FOSCs for planning and preparedness. He further recommended that, if the NRT finds Alaska's area planning to be lacking, then it they should amend the regulations to provide specific guidance on area planning.

ALASKA RRT ESA CONSULTATION IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP (MARCIA COMBES, EPA)

Ms. Combes presented an overview on the status of the Endangered Species Workgroup and the draft biological assessment for the Unified Plan and Subarea Contingency Plans. A revised draft biological assessment (BA) is expected to be completed in late October 2012, with a final BA expected in December 2012. The BA will then be submitted to the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service (the Services), who will then be responsible for completing a Biological Opinion (BO). The BO is expected to be complete sometime between March and September 2013.

A decision on whether to prepare documentation as required under the Magnusson-Stephens Act will be made once the BA is completed and will be dependent on the remaining budget for such activities.

Comments & Response:

Mr. Everett asked Ms. Combes what the timeline would for making any necessary changes to the Unified Plan per the ESA consultation process. Ms. Combes responded that it will need to be determined once we receive BO.

Mr. Everett also questioned whether there will need to be any additional consultation on the subarea contingency plans? Ms. Combes response was that a goal of this process that additional consultations would not be necessary, unless there are changes in the tactics and strategies included in the plans that carry the potential to impact threatened or endangered species, or their critical habitat.

Mr. French asked whether the BA was looking at critical habitat as they are addressed in Recovery Plans. Ms. Combes responded that Recovery Plans were outside the scope of this process.

OSC REPORTS

EPA FOSC REPORT (MR. MATT CARR AND MR. ROBERT WHITTIER)

Mr. Carr spoke to the preparedness and response activities that EPA has been involved with since the last ARRT meeting. The items highlighted included Fast Water Response training; a basic ordering agreement for air transportation charters; the North Slope industry mutual aid drill at Milne Point; the Alyeska Minton Creek drill; and the Apache Energy Aspen pad blowout exercise. The only significant response in the last year was the Respol/Q2 response.

Mr. Whittier addressed EPA capacity building. This project provides training to responders in rural and tribal/village communities. EPA is exploring the possibility of offering two training venues in 2013, dependent on available budget. He also provided an overview of Facility Response Plan (FRP) reviews and inspections of FRP and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plans (SPCC), for facilities in Southwest Alaska, the North Slope, and along the TAPS. Significant non-compliant conditions were reported at facilities in Southwest Alaska.

Comments & Response:

Mr. Everett asked whether the industry-led drills capture and follow-up on lessons learned. Mr. Carr responded that industry does create lessons learned reports. However, follow-through is dependent on many factors. Some issues are readily fixed or implemented. Others may require substantial planning, budget and permitting requirements.

USCG/ MSU VALDEZ FOSC REPORT (CDR BENJIMAN HAWKINS)

CDR Hawkins provided an overview of significant responses in Prince William Sound and lessons learned from these responses. Significant responses included an Eyak Lake heating oil tank spill; F/V Cape Kasilof; F/V Randi Lynn; and a tsunami debris response on Montague Island.

Lessons learned included recognizing that educational outreach for snow-load on vessels should to extend beyond the Port of Valdez to more remote locations, and should also address land-based facilities such as heating oil tanks. It was also realized during the response to potential tsunami debris that Air Station Kodiak is able to provide intelligence support through imagery collection and intelligence analysis. A difficulty, addressed as a lesson learned, was the internal challenges involved with making purchases very late in the fiscal year, while operating in a financially constrained environment.

CDR Hawkins reviewed exercises, drills, and training initiatives in Prince William Sound. Regarding area planning, the Prince William Sound subarea committee held a kick-off meeting in June 2012. Participation was higher than expected. The next steps include clarifying priorities and objectives for subcommittees, and determining tasks and projects for subcommittees. A review and update to the subarea plan is forthcoming.

Comments & Response:

Mr. Folley questioned whether the pollution fund will be available for responding to tsunami debris. Both USCG and EPA attendees agreed that the Oil Spill Liability Trust fund or CERCLA fund should be available if it debris is perceived to include HAZMAT.

Mr. Field asked whether the MSU's planning chief was drawing on previous experience in organizing the area committee for Prince William Sound. CDR Hawkins replied that it is not based on previous experience and he was unsure what references or resources were used to develop the structure.

Mr. Mark Swanson stated that the PWSRCAC is very interested in downstream planning. He asked whether there is any RRT or District 17 funding to address this issue. Mr. Everett agreed that downstream planning is important, however, stated that it is likely not a funding priority at this time. Mr. Swanson followed-up by asking whether the MSU Valdez planner could be available to attend an ICS training and downstream planning meeting they are funding in Homer, AK. Mr. Everett stated he would make inquiries regarding the ethics of such a venture.

CAPT Mehler clarified that MSU Valdez works for Sector Anchorage and notification and response to a cross-boundary/downstream, from PWS to Sector Anchorage, would be expected to appear seamless. Mr. Swanson replied that while USCG response might be seamless, downstream communities do not feel that they are part of the consideration in drills – or in the event of an actual spill.

USCG/WESTERN ALASKA FOSC REPORT (CAPT PAUL MEHLER)

CAPT Mahler provided an overview of Sector Anchorage's key focuses: partnering, education & outreach with communities; training and qualifications of both USCG staff and local responders; and plan review. Recent concerns include the recovery of oil on or in ice, political decisions, and training concerns. The Power Point presentation lists recent responses, and recent or upcoming drills and exercises.

CAPT Mehler presented lessons learned from recent significant events. During the response to the M/V Monterey grounding, USCG worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the responsible party. Among the challenges for the USACE was establishing a BOA for a response contractor. Additional lessons learned stemmed from the challenges of working in remote locations, such as Dutch Harbor. Travel availability is limited, especially in times of poor weather and there are limitations and difficulties exacerbated by a high rate of turnover of USCG personnel at Dutch Harbor.

Comments & Response:

Mr. Calvin Terada (EPA) asked how effective NOAA had proven to be for providing technical expertise in the event of an ammonia release. He stated that in the Lower 48, the EPA has had difficulty getting effective advice during a response to ammonia release. CAPT Mehler replied that NOAA's advice was both immediate and very good.

Dr. French reminded the ARRT that there are three layers of tribes in Alaska: federally-recognized tribes; incorporated cities that are predominately native in composition, and native corporations.

USCG/ SOUTHEAST ALASKA FOSC REPORT (CAPT SCOTT BORNEMANN)

CAPT Bornemann spoke to Sector Juneau's recent significant events and focuses. The primary focus has been on readiness, with an emphasis on training and qualifications. The significant responses included those to the F/V Evening Star, the Ryou-Un Maru (a.k.a. Japanese ghost ship/derelect). Lessons learned from responses include issues regarding travel, such as the high cost of travel, limited modes of travel and challenges of weather delays.

He also talked about the CANUSDIX 2013 drill, which will be Canadian-led. He advised the ARRT of a substantial (10-fold) increase in expected vessel traffic in the CANUSDIX area, largely due to the planned Enbridge terminal at Kitimat.

Haines, Alaska is also anticipating a significant increase in cargo traffic.

Comments & Response:

Ms. Bergmann requested that CANUSDIX planners consider the ferry schedule when scheduling the exercise to make travel less costly. Mr. Cecil McNutt advised that the exercise dates were set prior to the availability of the ferry schedule. However, USCG can look at chartering an aircraft for participants.

STATE OF ALASKA OSC REPORT (MR. GARY FOLLEY, ADEC)

Mr. Folley gave an overview of initiatives and priorities of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC). A major focus has been ongoing work on the Aleutian Islands Risk Assessment Project. Risk of Vessel Accidents and Spills in the Aleutian Islands, Special Report 293 was recently completed. ADEC is also looking at enhancing the Aleutian SCP. He noted that the workgroups on Sensitive Areas, Geographic Response Strategies (GRS), Potential Places of Refuge (PPOR) and the Emergency Towing System (ETS) have been active; however, a standing subarea committee has been absent. Other projects include a Southeast Alaska Vessel Traffic Study, which was also recently completed and is available online, and the ongoing Cook Inlet Maritime Risk Assessment.

He recommended that the ARRT stand up area committees for the Aleutians and Cook Inlet Subareas to address forthcoming Risk Assessments.

SUBAREA CONTINGENCY PLANS UPDATE (LARRY IWAMOTO, ADEC)

Mr. Iwamoto gave an update on the status of the Unified Plan, subarea contingency plans (SCP), and other related plan and planning initiatives. Updates to the Unified Plan have been drafted, and posted to the ARRT web site, but remain pending. Change 1 to the Bristol Bay SCP and Western Alaska SCP are expected in winter 2012. The Southeast Alaska SCP is expected to be final in early 2013. Revisions to the Interior SCP, Prince William Sound SCP and Aleutians SCP are anticipated to begin in 2013.

Future planning initiatives include the development of additional GRS's in Southeast Alaska, Northwest Arctic and the Aleutians (scheduled for FY 2013-2014); the Emergency Towing Systems (ETS) and Nearshore Operations Response Strategy (NORS).

The Nearshore Response Planning Initiative is designed to address the response strategies appropriate for oil or HAZMAT in the near shore zone, which are not currently addressed in existing industry spill contingency plans (C-plans). The objective of this initiative is to develop a NORS for each coastal subarea. A final strategy document is expected in spring 2013.

BIENNIAL WORK PLAN (MR. CECIL MCNUTT, USCG)

Mr. Field introduced the 2013-2014 Biennial Work Plan and introduced Mr. McNutt to provide an overview of the new work plan. A copy of the work plan was displayed on the screen. Mr. McNutt advised the ARRT that the draft plan may be viewed on the Alaska RRT website, at <http://alaskarrt.org>. He stated that in the work plan, outstanding issues and tasks have been updated with revised tasks and dates.

One of the major changes proposed in the draft work plan include moving from two to three meetings per year.

There was discussion on how the ARRT anticipates involvement in a functional or full-scale exercise and whether the ARRT will be part of an industry exercise or a SONS exercise. It was noted that it will likely be part of the 2013 SONS drill.

ARRT Members were asked to provide feedback.

WILDLIFE PROTECTION COMMITTEE UPDATE (MS. PAMELA BERGMANN, USDOJ)

Ms. Bergmann provided an overview and background of the WPC and the development of Revision 5 to the Wildlife Protection Guidelines for Alaska. She requested that the ARRT approve Revision 5 of the guidelines.

Mr. Everett questioned whether the state required a public review on the guidelines for incorporation into the Unified Plan. Mr. McNutt responded that the precedent has been to post guidelines revisions on the Unified Plan page on ARRT's website. Once the RRT is ready for a revision to the overall Unified Plan, the guidelines will be subject to public comment.

A vote was taken regarding whether to approve the revision to the Wildlife Protection Guidelines.

A quorum was present. Voting Agencies present at the meeting at the time of the vote: USCG, EPA, ADEC, DOD, USDOJ, DHHS, and DOA.

Yeas: 7 (USCG, EPA, USDOJ, DOD, DOA, DHHS, and the State of Alaska)

Nays: 0

Abstention: 0

CULTURAL RESOURCES WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Ms. Bergmann (USDOJ) provided an overview and background of the Cultural Resources Working Group, the national *Programmatic Agreement on the Protection of Historic Properties during Emergency Response under the National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan (Programmatic Agreement)* and the *Alaska Implementation Guidelines for Federal On-Scene Coordinators for the Programmatic Agreement (Guidelines)*.

Mr. Iwamoto recommended adding local communities to the list of potential information sources under the “Resources” section.

Ms. Bergmann requested that the ARRT approve the Cultural Resources Committee Charter.

A quorum was present. Voting Agencies present at the meeting at the time of the vote: USCG, EPA, ADEC, DOD, USDOJ, DHHS, and DOA.

Yeas: 7 (USCG, EPA, USDOJ, DOD, DOA, DHHS, and the State of Alaska)

Nays: 0

Abstention: 0

Motion passed. The workgroup will be renamed a committee.

SHELL RESPONSE EXERCISE AFTER ACTION REPORT (Mr. MARK EVERETT, USCG)

Mr. Everett provided a summary of the recent unannounced Shell response exercise, lead by Bureau of Safety and Environment Enforcement (BSEE). The ARRT had two objectives in the exercise: 1. Test the dispersant use application process, utilizing the new draft guidelines, and 2. Use the DOD Request for Assistance, (RFA) system. Regarding the dispersant use process, Mr. Everett provided a critical review and presented lessons learned as a result of the exercise. After the exercise, the draft guidelines were revised to reflect the lessons learned (mentioned above). He also provided a critique, including lessons learned, of the DOD RFA process.

Ms. Combes was in the Environmental Unit for the exercise. She commented that the RRT involvement was overly scripted and was not as realistic as would have been ideal. Mr. McNutt and others noted that it is in the best interest of the RRT to ensure valuable participation to get involved early in the exercise planning process to insert any RRT objectives and involvement.

CLOSING REMARKS

The next ARRT meeting will be held February 20 and 21 in Anchorage at the Federal Building Annex.

Mr. Field and Mr. Everett thanked the meeting attendees for their participation. Mr. Everett made a specific acknowledgement of thanks to CAPT Caplis and Mr. Mjones for coming to represent the NRT.

Ms. Bergmann also added her thanks to CAPT Caplis and Mr. Mjones and expressed her hope that they will bring what they have learned here to the rest of the NRT.

Mr. Everett adjourned the meeting.



United States Department of the Interior



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
1689 C Street, Room 119
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-5126

9044.2d
PEP/ANC

December 27, 2012
Via Electronic Mail

Mark Everett
ARRT Co-Chair
U.S. Coast Guard District 17
1200 Sixth Avenue
Juneau, Alaska 99802

Mr. Chris Field
ARRT Co-Chair
U.S. Environmental Protection, Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 90101

Dear Mr. Everett and Mr. Field:

This letter is in response to Mr. Nick Knowles' December 10, 2012, email in which he provided to Alaska Regional Response Team (ARRT) members for their review, the draft summary of the October 17, 2012, ARRT meeting. My comments are as follows:

Science and Technology Committee Report, Questions and Comments:

Pages 4 and 5, Paragraph 15, beginning, "Ms Bergmann asked for clarification..." This summary needs to be revised to reflect ARRT member agreement that Mr. Everett and Mr. Field would provide their comments on the revised dispersant guidelines/authorization process to the Science and Technology Committee as soon as possible so the comments could be addressed and the revised guidelines could be sent to Federally-recognized tribes and stakeholders for review.

Wildlife Protection Committee Update:

Page 11, Last line, reading "Abstention: 0." The following sentences needs to be inserted at the end of this section: "The motion passed. Revision 5 of the *Wildlife Protection Guidelines for Alaska* was approved by the ARRT."

Cultural Resources Working Group Update:

Page 12, Last line, reading "Motion passed. The workgroup will be renamed a committee." This information needs to be revised to read: "The motion passed. The Cultural Resources Committee Charter was approved by the ARRT."

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on these draft summaries. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Pamela Bergmann
Regional Environmental Officer – Alaska
DOI ARRT Representative

cc: Mr. Nick Knowles, EPA
Mr. Cecil McNutt, USCG