



South Shore Geographic Response Plan (GRP) Project

**April 28, 2011, 9:00 a.m.
Plymouth Town Hall
Plymouth, Massachusetts**

Attendees

Sean Baker – USCG Sector SENE
Dan Batchelder - MADEP
Jason Burtner – MA CZM
Neil Churchill – MA DMF
Elise DeCola – Nuka Research
Stanley Eldridge – Plymouth Fire Dept.
David Gould – Plymouth Environmental Mgr.
Joe Grady – Duxbury Conservation Commission
William Hocking – Marshfield Fire Dept.
Trevor Hughes – USCG, Sector Boston
Chad Hunter – Plymouth Harbormaster
Ross Kessler – MA DMF
Steve Lehmann – NOAA SSC

Douglas Mansell – USCG, Sector Boston
Kim Michaelis – Plymouth Environmental Dept.
Gregg Morris – Duxbury Oyster Farmer
Bob Murphy – MADEP, SERO
Rich Packard – MADEP
Les Perry – DCR, Ellisville State Park
Michael Pforr – Duxbury Harbormaster Dept.
Caleb Queen – Nuka Research
Sanne Schneider – Nuka Research
Elizabeth Sullivan – Plymouth Conservation Commission
Maureen Thomas – Kingston Conservation Commission

Welcome & Introduction

Rich Packard welcomed the group. Introductions were made.

Review

Elise DeCola briefly reviewed the process of developing the GRPs; beginning with assembling the work group, explaining the goals and uses of GRPs, delineating regions and receiving local input on selecting sites for protection, and then developing protective booming tactics for each site. After a review by the work group the GRPs will be presented to the Area Committee to be adopted into the Area Contingency Plan(s). DeCola then introduced Steve Lehmann, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Scientific Support Coordinator for the New England region.

Site Sensitivity Presentation

Steve Lehmann discussed the NOAA Environmental Sensitivity Index (ESI) maps, which delineate shoreline types based on their sensitivity to oil impacts. Once he had presented a summary of the shoreline, habitat and wildlife designations on the ESI maps, he then compared the concepts of sensitivity vs. priority. He stressed the importance of local input into the prioritization process, because setting priorities is a subjective, qualitative process. The most sensitive habitats are often the top priority, but sometimes priorities are less obvious.

There was some discussion of past oil spills in the New England region, and the variability of oil trajectories. There was a question about the use of GNOME



(General NOAA Operating Model Environment) modeling during the GRP process, and Lehmann clarified that the GNOME model is designed for use in planning for or responding to a specific spill event. It would not necessarily be informative for GRP training. He also emphasized that GNOME requires professional NOAA modelers to develop meaningful trajectories. The group discussed the fact that while GRPs are not developed in a vacuum, they do not necessarily anticipate a specific spill event or trajectory. However, when considering both protection priorities and response tactics, it is important to be cognizant of the potential routes of travel for spilled oil into a waterbody or sensitive site.

The group discussed how well boom works in a strong current and the potential use of chemical dispersants, which Gregg Morris noted were a concern to aquaculturists. Packard added that chemical dispersants would not be used in shallow water, close to shore. DeCola confirmed that dispersants are not used in GRPs, and Lehmann offered to provide more information on dispersant use in the Deepwater Horizon spill to anyone interested.

Review of Site Selection Delineation, Priorities, and Resources at Risk

The group reviewed the maps and charts for the 21 candidate sites (broken out by sub-region) and identified a variety of priorities in small sub-groups by marking up maps and site selection matrices.

Site Survey Teams

DeCola discussed the composition of the site survey teams, which typically include local representatives, and personnel from the USCG, MADEP, and Nuka Research. The site information collected during surveys includes: water circulation, tides & currents, resources at risk, recreational and commercial use, and seasonal charges. During the surveys, the teams discuss protection priorities, on-scene logistics, and potential response strategies. These become the basis for GRP tactics.

Packard concluded the meeting thanking everyone for coming and asking participants to continue to spread the word. DeCola asked anyone interested in participating in a site survey to talk to contact Caleb Queen and provide him with their sites of interest, contact information, and preferred survey dates.

Timeline and Next Meeting

May/June – Schedule site surveys

July - GRP tactics development and review

August – First draft of GRPs to be completed. Tactics sub-group formed to review tactics

August/September – Draft GRPs posted on project website for full work group to review

September – Full work group meeting to review/revise GRPs. Final review period to follow

November/December – Present GRPs to Area Committee for incorporation into Area Contingency Plans



Action Items

- Workgroup members interested in participating in site surveys notify Nuka Research
- Nuka schedule site surveys
- Nuka develop draft GRPs
- Workgroup members interested in Tactics Sub-Group participation contact Nuka Research
- Schedule Tactics Sub-Group meeting