



Boston Harbor GRP Site Review Meetings

Work Group Meeting: May 20, 2010, 10:00 am

Hough's Neck Maritime Center
137 Bay View Avenue, Quincy, MA 02169

Boston Harbor Islands Meeting: May 25, 2010, 1:00 pm

Hingham DCR Office, Shipyard Landing

Attendees

(* indicates attendance at BHI meeting 5/25; all others listed attended the 5/20 meeting only)

Mark Albert – BHI National Park*	PJ McCann-Save the Harbor/Save the Bay
Kurt Bornheim-Hull Harbormaster	John McKeown-EPA
Chris Bresnahan-MassDEP	Justin Myers-Weymouth Fire Dept.
Rich Bryan-Quincy Fire Dept.	Kingsley Ndi-MassDEP
Chris Busch-Boston Conservation Commission	Rich Packard-MassDEP
Richard Carroccino-Chelsea Fire Dept.	Karen Pelto-MassDEP
Abigail Childs-Hingham Conservation	Kelly Phelan-Braintree Conservation Commission
Ken Corson-Hingham Harbormaster	Caleb Queen-Nuka Research*
Dan Crafton-MassDEP	Tony Rodolakis-AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc.
Elise DeCola-Nuka Research*	Heather Sargent-Quincy Conservation Commission
John DePriest-Chelsea Planning Dept. & Chelsea Conservation Commission	Mary Ellen Schloss-Weymouth Conservation Commission
Mark Duff-Hingham Fire Dept.	Sanne Schneider-Nuka Research
Mike Foley-Quincy Police Marine Unit	Albe Simenas-MassDEP
Damian Guzman-Exxon/Mobil	Michael Townes-Boston Fire Dept.
Tricia Haederle-Massport	Heather Warchalowski-DCR*
Trevor Hughes-USCG Sector Boston	Brad Washburn-MA Coastal Zone Management
Susan Kane – DCR*	
Denise Sarno-Bucca – DCR*	
Margaret Laforest-Quincy City Council	
Jim Lally-Global Oil, Chelsea	
Ben Lyons-USCG Sector Boston	

SUMMARY OF MAY 20TH MEETING

Welcome & Introduction

Mike Foley of the Quincy Police Marine Department welcomed everyone to the Hough's Neck Maritime Center and Rich Packard of the MassDEP thanked everyone for coming. Packard noted that this is the second in a series of meetings to develop Geographic Response Plans (GRPs) for Boston Harbor. Nuka Research and Planning Group is working with the MassDEP on the Boston Harbor GRP Project after having completed GRPs for Buzzards Bay, the Cape & Islands, and the North Shore. Packard emphasized to the group that successful GRPs depend on local input. Elise DeCola of Nuka Research agreed that this is an important meeting and asked the participants to introduce themselves.



DeCola explained that the site selection meeting is held to delineate the sites, breaking up the coastline into manageable areas for the GRP tactics. An important goal of today's meeting is to identify environmental sensitivities within each potential site, building on the information in the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) maps. This information is important for prioritizing sites and tactics during a spill, and in selecting the booming tactics to protect the resources at each site. The ultimate objective is to get as much information as possible today and then start the process of surveying the sites.

For anyone that did not attend the kick-off meeting and has questions about what GRPs are, DeCola offered to speak with them in more depth via phone or email. She noted that the group is moving on to the second step now, which is to decide which areas are sensitive and then thirdly, to find locations where it is feasible to deploy equipment. DeCola mentioned the recent spill in the Gulf of Mexico and noted that here as well as in the Gulf, there is the need to prioritize areas for protection in order to allocate resources, because there is never going to be enough boom to protect the entire coastline.

Recent Activities

DeCola reviewed the copies of base maps, with letters denoting key areas that are marked with red outlines. These lettered, outlined areas were used to develop a site selection matrix. There are currently 12 sites, but this is merely a convention that could be changed as the project moves forward. DeCola encouraged the group to provide input on the areas they are most familiar with and stated that more sites can be added, if needed. Packard agreed, but reminded the group that the area has to be feasible to protect.

The group broke into smaller groups according to their areas of interest around Boston Harbor and discussed which locations and what resources were the most sensitive and most in need of protection from an oil spill.

Site Selection

When the group reformed to discuss their findings, DeCola began by saying that the people that are invested in the Boston Harbor Islands are attending a break-out meeting on May 25th and the islands' priorities will be reviewed then. (See meeting summary at the end of this document).

DeCola started with the Chelsea/Everett and southern areas in Boston Harbor. DeCola prefaced the site survey discussion by reviewing the process. She explained that during the site surveys, which is the next step, a small sub-group will physically survey the coastline and though this is more effective by boat, it may be done from the land as well, or using some combination of the two. She asked that work group members volunteer to participate in surveys for areas where they have local knowledge. She also asked that local vessel operators participate and noted that the project would look to the towns to provide vessel support where available. Several participants volunteered for certain areas. DeCola noted that



coordination and scheduling of site surveys would be done in late May/early June and communicated by e-mail and on the project website.

Chris Bresnahan of MassDEP, Emergency Response brought up areas on the maps that weren't included in the lettered areas but that might need to be surveyed. He suggested widening some areas already selected on the maps to include other areas. He noted Nantasket Beach and areas north and east of Quincy. DeCola confirmed that the initial site delineation was a draft and that the goal is to ensure that there are enough sites and they are drawn in a way to capture all priorities.

Abigail Childs of Hingham Conservation brought up the Neponset River, which contains Rainbow Smelt, River Herring, and other fishery resources. Childs suggested contacting Brad Chase with the Division of Marine Fisheries. Karen Pelto of the MassDEP NRDA program also volunteered to send DeCola follow up information regarding Rumney Marsh, Back River, and Weir River.

Mary Ellen Schloss of the Weymouth Conservation Commission asked if the Natural Heritage Program had been contacted. DeCola asked for clarification regarding their endangered species mapping and Pelto said that there are maps that show locations within the areas marked on the GRP maps. Albe Simenas of the MassDEP Emergency Response said that those locations are not public knowledge but that we could include general information in the GRPs regarding species that may be present within a larger geographic area. Schloss offered to contact the town of Weymouth and they would talk to Natural Heritage to communicate the threatened species and critical habitat information.

The group then discussed site surveys. DeCola plans to send an email to the group to ask for volunteers to go on site surveys and provide boats. She would like to group BH-1-3 together; BH-4-6 together; BH-8-10 together and BH-7, 11, 12 together. (Note that these site numbers have been changed since the meeting). This would consolidate the surveys into four trips. The next round of work from Nuka Research will be cleaner-looking maps, more numbered sites, and expanded boxes. Johnston recommended not using boxes, but overlapping areas, to which DeCola agreed.

After reviewing some site selection criteria and noting that the site surveys will focus on the shoreline areas, DeCola switched gears to talk about the methods used to protect these areas. She listed items like where to anchor boom, drive a vacuum truck, and place sorbents. DeCola also noted that they would measure culverts and note boat ramps, including their feasibility of use at different tides or seasons. Schloss mentioned that each town has GIS data for storm water outfalls and Johnston agreed that to have all that information on one shape file would be a great advantage. DeCola suggested getting that information after the site surveys, but Johnston suggested getting it first so that survey crews are aware of any culverts or outfalls within site boundaries. Nuka (Caleb Queen) will follow up on acquiring this information.



After the surveys are completed Nuka Research will work with the Coast Guard and other spill response experts to draft strategies and tactics. As there is quite a bit of work involved in developing the GRP tactics maps and tables, the next meeting of the work group will be in the late summer or early fall. The drafts will have captured the resource information and prior to the meeting the work group will have a month or so to review them and send feedback. The fall meeting will be used to review the GRP tactics site by site, and to identify any final revisions or changes prior to finalizing the GRPs.

Johnston asked about booming tactics and DeCola explained that during the field surveys, tactics are discussed based on the shoreline features, water circulation, and possible scenarios for how oil could get into a given area. Sometimes rollovers and other incidents on highways can put oil into the water from an entirely different direction. Packard broke in to say that DeCola had covered many issues and asked that people volunteer to be involved with the site surveys, during which tactics would be discussed at greater length.

Ken Corson, the Hingham Harbormaster said that they would like to be part of the process, now that they have trailers. DeCola mentioned the GRP Testing Program and that perhaps some Boston Harbor sites could be tested next spring. Kingsley Ndi of the MassDEP Emergency Response spoke about completing the trailer training for towns that haven't done it yet. Packard said that training was provided when the trailers were delivered, but that the MassDEP is trying to offer additional training for those who weren't able to participate. Currently they are doing training on the North Shore for some communities. Foley asked if Quincy would get more training if they requested it. Packard replied that the MassDEP would try to fill their needs. He explained that it might not be with the same contractor because many resources are assisting with the spill in the Gulf.

Johnston asked about how the oil spill equipment fits into existing mutual aid programs. He suggested somehow providing contact information for each town. Foley talked about an existing agreement regarding moving trailers as needed and Packard followed up, explaining the standard operating procedure (SOP) for small, localized spills. He said that each town has the authority to use its trailer, but that the MassDEP just needs to be notified. If it's regional (more than one town) the policy is that there is a Unified Command (federal agency, USCG, state agency, and responsible party) and decisions will be made by that group. Johnston reiterated that it would be useful to the towns to have contact lists regarding sharing trailer resources. Packard directed him to the 24-hour MEMA hotline number.

There was some additional discussion about the role of MEMA and coordination of towns, and the need for the towns to have information about other towns' resources, not just trailers but also vessels. Ndi handed out placards with the MassDEP/MEMA 24-hour reporting number.

Simenas noted that contacts would be good to include in the GRPs and Packard replied that there is a contact list on the last page of every GRP.



Johnston asked at what point the USCG gets involved and Hughes answered, saying the second oil hits the water. He stated that if there is no responsible party (RP) the USCG can access the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to pay for the response, but that regardless of who pays, the USCG has a command role. He explained that every response should have at least three parties: state, USCG, RP. Decisions are made using the Unified Command structure.

Foley asked if there is list of resources on the map. DeCola replied that there is information on each GRP for how much equipment and how many trailers are needed to deploy all the tactics. Johnston asked again that contact information be included in case there is a need for more boats, etc. There was some discussion about how much information to include in the GRP contact list and DeCola suggested that this item be discussed at the fall meeting when the GRPs have been drafted, since the group will have a better sense then for what the GRP does and doesn't contain.

Schloss asked if we are using Coastal Zone Management (CZM) information that may not be in the Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI), to which DeCola replied that it can be obtained. DeCola brought the discussion to a close, emphasizing the importance of group participation in the surveys. Johnston said that collaborative effort is familiar to the towns that are involved with homeland security and agreed that working as a group is important.

Hughes asked to speak briefly about the response to the oil spill in the Gulf. He said that the National Strike Force Coordination Center is concerned that with the amount of resources being shipped to the Gulf, they are not clear on what level of response resources are remaining in other regions of the country. The demand for boom is so great that they are now getting boom directly from manufacturers instead of storage. Hughes said that the USCG would appreciate receiving a data call if a community has been asked for equipment and if they have sent it so the USCG can keep track of how much equipment remains in the area. Johnston asked if the USCG has a MSST (Maritime Safety and Security Team) in Boston. Hughes responded that there are MSSTs stationed in Boston and New York.

Pelto said there is a Milton Harbormaster who should be added to the work group list.

Next Meeting

DeCola said that the next meeting would be held in late summer or early fall, and that at that meeting the group would be discussing the draft GRPs for the sites selected today.

Action Items

- Nuka will revise the site delineation and post new base maps to the website.
- Nuka will add to the work group list as suggested.
- Nuka will revise the site selection matrix and will continue to seek data sources and input.



- Site surveys will begin in early June. Nuka will circulate a sign-up e-mail for volunteers to come along on the site surveys.

SUMMARY OF MAY 25TH BOSTON HARBOR ISLANDS MEETING

A less formal working meeting was held to review the environmental sensitivities for the Boston Harbor Islands. Attendees represented both the National Park Service and DCR. Attendees marked up base maps for their areas of concern to identify additional resources, and also provided copies of maps with information about the Harbor Islands.

The information from this meeting has been incorporated into an updated site selection matrix.