



## **Cape & Islands GRP Tactics Group Meeting**

**August 15, 2007, 1:00 p.m.  
MassDEP – Hyannis Office  
973 Iyannough Road  
Hyannis, MA 02601**

### **Attendees:**

Ben Bryant - Coalition for Buzzards Bay	Allison Miller – USCG MSD Cape Cod
John Joe Dec – USCG D1	Rich Packard – MassDEP
Elise DeCola – Nuka Research	Tim Robertson - Nuka Research (teleconference)
Brian Fay – Clean Harbors	Kevin Sheppard – Clean Harbors
Bill Gasperetti – USCG MD Cape Cod	Mike Whiteside – MassDEP
Lt. Keith Hanley – USCG MSD Cape Cod	Nicole DeBenedictis – Nuka Research
Steve McKenna – MA CZM	

### **Introductions and Opening Comments**

Elise DeCola of Nuka Research and Planning Group briefly introduced Nuka, the contractor hired by MassDEP to develop the tactics guide and facilitate the GRP development. She explained that the tactics group had been formed to bring together local oil spill response experts to develop a standard guidance document for the GRPs. She introduced the Spill Tactics for Alaska Responders (STAR) manual, which was used as the basis for the first draft of the Massachusetts tactics guide.

Tim Robertson from Nuka Research also joined the meeting from Alaska by phone. He explained the importance of determining and utilizing standardized tactics descriptions and terms for contingency planning, training, spill response and future implementation. Tim discussed the use of a classification system, for example applied to vessels as well as the levels of training and skills of responders. The Alaska “STAR Manual” will be used as a foundation to adapt and customize Tactics for the Cape and Islands, which will later become the basis for the other Massachusetts geographic response plans to follow.

Rich Packard of MassDEP referenced the personnel classification system within the Alaska manual, asking if there was interaction with OSHA in drafting the document and if in Alaska it was interrupted as 24 hours training minimum for response. Tim explained OSHA Hazmat training levels had played a part in the draft and in the proposed 24 hour minimum, mentioning that training had been an issue in Alaska.

### **Purpose of Meeting & Goals for Tactics Guide**

Packard then introduced the State's goal for the CIGRP tactics guide to be an easily understood and useable document, noting that Nuka Research's experience and resources will be used to help accomplish it. Packard mentioned the plan should be



tailored to a primary audience of first responders such as fire fighters, but needs to also be designed for secondary users, the non-local responders. He emphasized the importance of establishing common criteria for the 30-35 GRP sites to be developed for the Cape & Islands.

DeCola added that the outcome of the CIGRP Tactics guide would be applied to future GRPs in other parts of the state.

## **Reviewing Draft Tactics Guide**

The group then proceeded to review the draft tactics guide page by page.

On A-3, the legend of symbols, Packard pointed out there is no symbol for culvert drainage for blocking. Robertson noted that page B-12 mentions the concept, and that some more symbols could need to be added, and that could be one of them. John Joe Dec, from the USCG 1<sup>st</sup> District and Mike Whiteside of MassDEP both mentioned the term "outfall" and how it is often used interchangeably with culvert, as an example of the issue of term inconsistencies and confusion.

Lt. Keith Hanley of the USCG MSD Cape Cod suggested a definition page be added listing standard terminology and synonyms and descriptions to avoid discrepancies and to make it also understandable by the general public. DeCola explained that most of the term variations are addressed within the guide, but that it could be made into a separate section.

Ben Bryant, representing the Coalition for Buzzards Bay, reminded the group that the tactics guide will be used by non-regulators as well, for educational purposes. He agreed that terms should be better defined and added that another terminology issue arises in relation to boom classification.

Robertson suggested that commonly used tactics be identified as separate icons to provide greater clarity. The five pages of glossary in the STAR Manual can be used as a basis for Mass. GRP terms. To which the group agreed.

Then continuing the draft review, DeCola asked the group if "Dikes, Berms, and Dams" should be called out as different category. The group agreed it should be.

Whiteside brought up another potential clarity concern, for the possible confusion regarding location names within the Cape since names and references sometimes vary between locals and non-locals. In regards to visual clarity issues, Bryant pointed out that not all tactics should appear on the map due to crowding and confusion but should still be listed in Glossary. For instance, "broken ice" is rare, but it should still be included within the guide just in case. Hanley reminded the group there would always be some reliance on the local knowledge of typical and past conditions to determine occurrence potential or likelihood (i.e. the probability of the canal freezing versus Buzzards Bay). The group agreed to include some information regarding just-in-case deployment configurations and include it as



suggested by Rich. In terms of ease of use and understanding, Whiteside noted that the plan should be written so that a harbormaster could read it and could tell him what specifically to ask for.

The group also discussed other issues that might arise in GRP implementation – for example, the effect of tidal changes and site access/permitting issues. DeCola proposed and the group agreed that the tactics guide would reference such issues in a general sense, and the actual GRPs would identify any site-specific considerations (i.e. ice, tide changes, land owners, etc.).

The group then discussed personnel needs for each tactic. Hanley suggested that the general amount of personnel (manpower) should be included but that actual staffing would be determined based on incident specifics. Bryant agreed, adding that the level of expertise required should also be included in the section, for example explaining what training a fire chief might need.

Packard expressed concern with the 24 hour tech. training requirement in the Alaska plan and said that it could not be reasonably met nor is it necessary here. However, the operational level of 8 hours can possibly be met. In spill response, local responders will likely put out boom before oil reaches that site. They react mostly to prevent further damage; it then it falls back on the fire guys who are already trained for Hazmat. The tactics guide does needs some explanation of what each level of responder is qualified to do, as well as some level of OSHA description.

DeCola added responders could be broken out into different groups such as vessel operators and spill response and that the guide should anticipate the basic numbers of each that would be needed. It should also have asterisks noting “job specific requirements apply” as well as other precautions and disclaimers. Brian Fay of Clean Harbors asserted that every place is different and depends on the situation as far as the number of responders in each category needed. For example a trailer of boom needs three to four guys to deploy but typically needs more to take out than put in. Packard agreed they need an estimated range for local responders for the different strategies; each strategy has manpower dependence, as well as strategy limitations based on available manpower. Keith added the numbers should be termed as “recommended”, because they can and have been possible with more, or less, people.

DeCola asked the group to what depth should vessel classifications be addressed and for any preferences of how to classify them. Packard explained that he was thinking they would be used more by locals and not so much by contractors or the Coast Guard, who would have access to larger vessels. Hanley noted that when hiring vessels there are potential issues, such as those pertaining to the speed of response and their availability. Also there can not be safety exceptions for responding vessels, crew, and the individual credentials for crew members. Dec added that vessels must also have the proper permits.



Packard continued that the tactics guide should be at a usable situational level to suggest for instance, if going to deploy boom, this is the vessel you will need to do it. A level of more advanced resources will typically come later from elsewhere. The CIGRP tactics guide should be a more narrowly focused document: concise, less instructing, but provide resource and situational overviews through references to what each generally means, located within the same document.

Whiteside asked about whether first responders would have a field guide like the example displayed at the meeting for the Alaska project, to be used by individuals since the fire chief would have the copy of large document? DeCola explained that a field guide would go beyond the scope intended for now, but that the idea is to have those with the authority to have access to the guides and be able to advise using them. For instance locals should be able to call up someone such as the fire chief, who can consult his copy of the guide and advise them what tactic(s) to utilize and what team and resources are needed. Hanley added down the road field guides would be a nice asset once people are familiar with the process and know how to use, but we need to start with the guide budget-wise.

The group reviewed the purpose of the guide. Hanley pointed out it should be the path laid out and suggested the first few hours following a spill to provide some direction for immediate response. Bryant included that it needs to reinforce and remind of resources that will be needed and Steve McKenna, of MA CZM, explained that it also be designed so the locals realize their limitations. Dec brought up that the plan will also need to address items such as the needed angles, velocity measures and the formulas for calculation of boom angles, etc.

The group also decided that water recovery be kept in guide and the discussion of fast water "beefed up". John also raised the issue that there is no backup boom or secondary boom recommendation noted within the section, for sensitive areas to catch entreatment.

After a brief break, DeCola pointed out that recovery and containment are usually done together and recommended that the different types of Boom be reorganized; the group agreed to the change. Fay noticed that some of the more specialized and larger boom included in the STAR manual he had never heard of being used in this area. For instance, Tidal Seal Boom hadn't been used in any of the jobs he has worked on or been aware of around here during his 25 years in the industry. However, Dec knew of it used in Maine for about 100' then using normal boom for the rest and in Tampa St. Pete about a 1,000', but noted that it is expensive and complicated to deploy. Fay suggested that the guide's focus should be on what is already available within the region, the greater region can be defined as the northeast or the Baltimore to Canada shoreline.

Packard said that even though it's absent now from their available resources its purchase is possible if there is a unique use or ability enough to justify it. Hanley answered that what is available now (using sorbents to back up nearshore boom arrays) is probably almost as good, if it gets the job done. Drafting the guide should take into consideration what is economical as well as available. What is



available should be briefly discussed, but more so explanation should be provided pertaining to each resource's use. The group agreed to "teach what you have".

DeCola addressed the open water (areas at least 6' waves) and other operating environments needed to employ each boom system. The standard ASTM classification for operating environments (which differs from the USCG OSRO system) has been applied to CIGRP tactics guide for consistency with the world oil catalog. She noted that the guide should explain that operating conditions are not static and can't be mapped to precise waterbodies, as the operating environment in any given area can change quickly and dramatically. Bryant asked is there a need to include setting up for 8' open water, because no one would respond in those conditions using common sense. Hanley suggested staying with the standard defining dimensions.

DeCola suggested and the group agreed to reorganize the guide into sections on containment & recovery, and to move all general information that is repeated in multiple places into one central introduction. Fay offered to provide pictures of different types of passive recovery systems for that section.

### **GRP Site Selection Update & Input**

DeCola asked the group that if anyone knows of other stakeholders that aren't involved in the tactics group, but who would be helpful to the process, please get their feedback. Involvement from the Cape and Islands Harbormasters, town managers, and leaders in the areas of the town's natural resources would be valuable to these revisions. She then briefly described the process of site selection and site surveys to develop the GRPs.

- The sites have been broken down into segments for mapping purposes not sequence, all four regions will be done at the same time.
- We'll probably be selecting 10% more sites or so
- After the meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> we'll work on planning trips to the field and will schedule aerial photography
- For Site surveys, it should take about one and a half to two weeks for site visits, which will consist of full days traveled by skiff or car, to analyze each and sketch maps.
- Anyone from the group interested in participating in any site visits is invited to do so.
- For each site visit teams will be scheduled and roles assigned (i.e. Spill responder, local knowledge, and resource person)
- Site visits will be used to define conditions, tidal shifts, and will get people out to decide anchor points and their degrees.

Packard mentioned that Sandwich has some aerials they have recently taken and own. DeCola pointed out that oblique angles, to show land relief, are important, as well as potential copyright issues in borrowing photos.



In reviewing the site maps used in the other plans, McKenna suggested further subgroups be made and colors adjusted to simplify ease of use and recognition.

DeCola discussed the GRP layout format, which should consist of four pages, each an 8.5"x11" format. The front of each would include GRP maps, with open tables and some site description; the back will be used for aerials. We can use Buzzards Bay basic icons as foundations linking symbology

### **Action Items reviewed and Closing comments**

DeCola made closing comments, summarizing action items discussed. The plan is to finish the draft's initial adaptations and revisions over the next few weeks. The revised draft will be posted on the website for further review, as well as the meeting summary; emails with both an attached draft and links will be sent out when they become available. DeCola asks that the group review the draft before the September 20<sup>th</sup> group meeting, follow-up with the action items, and contact her with any questions or feedback.

---

### **Action Items Summary**

- Nuka will make and finish the first round of revisions to the draft within the next few weeks.
- The Group should seek feedback from other local shareholders outside the tactics group and individual's directly related expertise
- The revised draft tactics guide and meeting summary will be posted on the website in the next few weeks and an email, with the link as well as a copy attached, will be sent to each tactics group member when available.
- Each group member should review the draft before the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Packard will sit down with spill contractors to discuss reasonable training requirements.
- Fay will provide pictures of the different types of passive recovery
- Packard will look into any town's recent aerial photographs as mentioned to see if they were shot at the desirable obliques and that they are town owned.
- After the meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> we'll work on planning trips to the sites for mapping and analyzing.
- We need volunteers with access to small vessels or other logistical support for survey trips.