

Upper Mississippi River Hazardous Spills Coordination Group

October 21-22, 2015

Meeting Summary

Participants

Roger Lauder	Illinois EPA
Joe Sanfilippo	Iowa DNR
Mike Rose*	Minnesota PCA
Lisa McMahon*	Minnesota PCA
Rick Gann	Missouri DNR
Tom Kendzierski	Wisconsin DNR
Greg Schweitzer*	NOAA
John Punkiewicz	USACE, Rock Island District
Frank Catalano	USACE, St. Louis District
Garrett Rogland	USCG, MSD Quad Cities
Jeffrey Weddle	USCG, MSD Quad Cities
Mark Razny	USDOT, PHMSA
Harold Winnie	USDOT, PHMSA
Steve Faryan	USEPA, Region 5
Barbi Lee*	USEPA, Region 5
Ramon Mendoza*	USEPA, Region 5
Ann Whelan*	USEPA, Region 5
Joe Davis	USEPA, Region 7
Annette Trowbridge	USFWS
Aleshia Kenney	USFWS
Nic Winslow	BNSF Hazmat
Chad Livingston	CP Rail
Brent Earley	Iowa American Water Company
Colin McWilliams	Kennedy/Jenks Consulting
Pat McCaffrey	Marathon Petroleum
Bob Baumgartner*	TransCanada
Chris Bieller	Seneca Companies
Matt Stokes	STARS Training
Dave Hokanson	UMRBA
Mark Ellis*	UMRBA
Matt Jacobson*	UMRBA
Molly McDonald	UMRBA

*Participated by phone.

Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. by Chair Rick Gann. Introductions of all participants followed.

Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

The summary of the April 21, 2015 UMR Spills Group meeting was approved without modification.

Agency and Partner Updates

Wisconsin

Tom Kendzierski said there have been no recent spills of note in Wisconsin which impacted the Mississippi River. He noted that the entities participating in bridge construction on the St. Croix River at Stillwater and on the UMR at La Crosse have been very diligent about reporting minor releases. Also in the La Crosse area there has been continuing citizen concern about the transportation of petroleum products by rail.

Illinois

Roger Lauder said no recent spills have occurred in Illinois which impacted the UMR. He did note that an 8 inch pipeline outside of Springfield had been punctured in a recent incident, but there was no impact to water. Lauder also noted continuing staff reductions at Illinois EPA, though the emergency response group has not had recent staff losses.

Iowa

Joe Sanfilippo said that, like Wisconsin and Illinois, there have not been any recent spills affecting the UMR in Iowa. He noted that avian flu has continued to be major concern for Iowa, adding that information from USDA indicates that the recent outbreak of avian flu did not originate from wild birds.

Missouri

Rick Gann described a recent, significant incident on the Lower Mississippi River near Columbus, Kentucky and affecting both sides of the river. In this event, two barges collided releasing approximately 120,000 gallons of slurry oil, which is typically used in making asphalt. When the product was released, it entered cold water and turned to a peanut butter-like consistency, sinking to the river's bottom. Due to this sinking and solidifying, the product was eventually removed effectively using a "clamshell" apparatus. Gann noted that the unique challenges and cleanup techniques involved may be of interest to the Group and suggested a future case study presentation on this incident.

Gann also commented on a number of incidents within Missouri that did not directly affect the Mississippi River including a release of glycerin and fire at a biodiesel facility, a spill of 1,600 gallons of sulfuric acid that caused a significant fish kill, and an oil spill in north central Missouri that was initially thought to be a pipeline release but turned out to be coming from a used oil storage drum. Joe Davis commented that he has also dealt with glycerin issues at biodiesel production sites in the past.

USEPA Region 7

Joe Davis said there have not been any notable spills recently in Region 7, aside from a few sheens observed on the Kansas River. He said the region has also placed new emphasis on facility response plan (FRP) review and is engaging OSCs in this review. While this should definitely improve the quality and completion of FRPs, it will impact OSCs ability to engage in other activities, including outreach.

USEPA Region 7

Barbi Lee said the next Region 5 RRT meeting will take place in Indianapolis on November 4-5, 2015.

USDOT PHMSA

Harold Winnie said there were no recent incidents affecting the UMR to note from PHMSA's perspective. Gann asked if Winnie was familiar with the upcoming pipeline replacement at Wood River. Winnie replied that he is only generally aware of the specifics of the situation, but his understanding is that the replacement is being done to address a scour issue.

Mark Razny noted the new hazmat high hazardous flammable train (HHFT) rule, wherein crude oil shippers must have a testing plan in place and carry out testing. He explained that one intent of the rule is to provide spill responders current information about the specific product being shipped, in light of the potential for varying characteristics among products shipped.

USFWS

Annette Trowbridge said there were no incidents or activities to report impacting the UMR from the USFWS perspective.

USACE

Frank Catalano and John Punkiewicz indicated that there were no incidents or activities to report from USACE perspective.

NOAA

Greg Schweitzer said he and NOAA had been quite involved in the spill on the Lower Mississippi River, as described by Gann. He indicated a presentation on this spill and resulting response would be given at the upcoming Region 5 RRT meeting in Indianapolis. Schweitzer said NOAA is also working with USEPA to create a shoreline cleanup assessment techniques (SCAT) training module that can be provided remotely to trainees.

Iowa American Water Company

Brent Earley said Iowa American has been working to familiarize the local hazmat team with their operations. He also reported that the Quad Cities water suppliers coalition continues to be quite active and has been building relationships with rail and other industries in the area. Earley said the coalition continues to emphasize the importance of communication during an event and between public water systems.

Seneca Companies

Chris Bieller said Seneca continues to be actively engaged in Siouxland Sub-area planning activities, and that this group has seen strong participation from industry including railroad, ethanol, and pipeline companies.

CP Rail

Matt Stokes said CP has been engaged in numerous training and exercise activities over the course of the summer, including events in Detroit and Minot, North Dakota.

Marathon Petroleum

Pat McCaffrey said there are not any spills to report involving Marathon Petroleum. He noted that a major exercise sponsored by Marathon Petroleum in the St. Louis area will be addressed later in the meeting.

In-Situ Burning

Issue Introduction

Hokanson provide a background and introduction to the discussion topic. He noted that in-situ burning (ISB) had been discussed at recent exercises, including the October 2014 La Crosse functional exercise, but there had been limited time and tools to explore the issue in depth at these venues. Subsequently,

there has been discussion of the potential value in developing further ISB decision support tools for the UMR and UMR National Wildlife and Fish Refuge (UMRNW&FR) in particular. As such, Hokanson explained, the purpose of the discussion today is to identify what, if any, steps the UMR Spill Group would recommend be pursued in regard to ISB on the UMR. He also mentioned the existing ISB decision-making tools available in the region (e.g., sections in Region 5 and 7 contingency plans, UMR Spill Plan), suggesting the Group consider whether these existing tools are sufficient or if additional tools are needed.

Hokanson explained that Pat McCaffrey of Marathon Petroleum would next provide an overview of the recently-released American Petroleum Institute (API) field operation manuals addressing ISB, and then the Group would have an opportunity to discuss the issue in depth. In particular, he asked that the UMR Spills Group members consider the following questions regarding ISB:

- What experience do you/your agency (or organization) have with in-situ burning? What lessons have been learned in these experiences?
- Where do you see potential advantages of in-situ burning on the UMR? For what places/situations on the UMR might it make sense?
- What concerns do you have in regard to in-situ burning? What are its likely limitations on the UMR?
- What would you like to learn more about? What are information gaps regarding in-situ burning, particularly as it applies to the UMR?

American Petroleum Institute (API) Field Operations Manuals

McCaffrey provided an overview of the API field operations guides for ISB. He emphasized that the type of product is key understanding what technique(s) can be applied in spill response. McCaffrey also noted that importance of decision-making tools in regard to the application of ISB, reviewing an ISB decision-making checklist included in the API documentation.

McCaffrey said one of the primary considerations for ISB application in open water is to be able to control the movement of the burn. Containment may involve the use of fire booms and/or fire breaks. Conversely, he commented that a spill on very still water, when burned, causes a concentration of the burn, a “mushroom cloud” effect. He added that cold weather/ice conditions can add additional considerations to burn planning and implementation. McCaffrey also emphasized the importance of safety planning for ISB implementation, as personnel are potential exposed to hazards/thermal stressors.

McCaffrey said an additional document, a decision-makers guide for ISB, will be available soon. He said this document will address topics such as OSC approval and the effect of endangered species on the approval process.

McCaffrey noted that real-time air monitoring is needed when a burn is executed. He also noted that residues will remain after a burn is completed, so there may be a need to consider how residues are recovered (or left in place if that creates less impact), adding that while these residues are typically less hazardous than the original products, their impacts still need to be considered.

Hokanson asked McCaffrey to clarify the distinction between the “on-water” operations manual and the “inland” operations manual. McCaffrey explained that the “on-water” manual addresses ISB where the product is entirely on water, and boats and boom are involved in managing the burn. He said the “inland” manual covers any situation where there is contact between the product/burn and land.

McCaffrey asked Ann Whelan if there is anything she wished to add to the discussion of the ISB operations manual. Whelan observed that, in the eyes of federal and state agencies, reduction of product volume is not a compelling reason to pursue ISB. Rather, it is seen more as method of controlling a spill, of keeping it from spreading to sensitive areas. She also clarified that, at least in Region 5, states can approve ISB in cases of smaller burns/where a federal OSC is not engaged. Joe Davis added that, if no burning agent is added, the burn can be approved by the OSC but if a burning agent is to be used, then RRT approval is required. Whelan and Davis also noted that endangered species must be identified in advance of a burn proceeding.

Davis stated that, in most cases, he is usually reluctant to approve a burn, given issues such as potential air impacts and safety issues. He added that there is more to consider than just when to start a burn by simple lighting or when start using a burning agent – also important, and perhaps more common, is the case where a fire is already burning and a decision must be made as to whether to allow the burn to continue. Additionally, public perception must be considered as a component of making a decision in regard to burning.

Roger Lauder said Illinois has not approved an ISB recently, and the use of it as a response tactic has been declining – concurring with Davis' observations and saying that overall it has become more challenging to approve a burn. He explained this did not mean Illinois would never approve a burn but rather that there would need to be a specific convergence of circumstances in order for ISB to be seen as the preferred tactic, with buy-in from the players involved in the response.

Joe Sanfilippo described a case where burning was used to address a relatively small (50 gallon) spill in Dubuque approximately 20 years ago, in which the product could not be easily accessed due to ice conditions. In this case, the local fire chief conferred with the state in deciding to burn, and USEPA was not involved, with public safety being a primary consideration in this situation. He added that the burn was completed in approximately 20 minutes. Joe Davis commented that this decision making process does not raise issues for Region 7, as this is the type of small-scale case where it makes sense for the local and state authorities to make a decision regarding burning. Sanfilippo added that what is perhaps most instructive about this example is that it illustrated how quickly a decision about burning will often need to be made.

Chris Bieller said public safety is often a major element of making an ISB decision, and that it is often a matter of balancing public safety considerations with the potential advantages in executing a burn. This includes considering questions such as whether the spill and burn can be controlled and whether a greater overall impact is expected from burning or other cleanup methods. In his view, Bieller said, burning is a last resort tactic. He added that cost savings alone won't drive a decision to pursue burning. Davis added that the argument that burning is less costly probably isn't as valid as it used to be, since costs associated with burning have increased, due to factors such as the need to conduct air monitoring.

Tom Kendzierski concurred that Wisconsin's experience is that ISB has been used much less in recent years, though the state would still approve it under the right circumstances. He noted that local air regulations can come into play. Further, he suggested that a tabletop exercise may be one way to explore the issues associate with ISB.

Rick Gann said he has not personally had a lot of experience with ISB, noting one case in the late 1990s where burning was considered in a pipeline incident, but it ultimately was not pursued after the possibility was considered by the RRT. He added that he could not see burning being used on the flowing Mississippi River, but that it could potentially be used in backwaters.

Annette Trowbridge said if a release was to a wetland, then USFWS would potentially like to see ISB considered if it could aid in preventing the spill from reaching other areas. As an example, she said the

Weaver Bottoms area (which was impacted by recent rail-based incident) could be a candidate for ISB as there may be greater damage caused to the area by invasive removal tactics.

Sanfilippo asked how quickly USFWS could make a decision on the appropriateness of the use of burning. Trowbridge replied that it would likely be dependent on the particular circumstances and location of the spill. She suggested that one potential way to get at this issue may be to map out areas where burns would not be considered an appropriate choice under any circumstances. Kendzierski agreed that mapping out “no burn” areas could be a potential way to start working through the issue. Davis observed that this type of burn decision-making and management is much different than what USFWS more typically deals with in a wildland burn.

Davis asked whether it would be possible to look at potential ISB locations on a pool-by-pool basis. Hokanson said UMR pool-based spill response planning could allow for the identification of particular burn or no-burn areas, with habitat type being considered in making such distinctions. Davis suggested that additional ISB information could be appended to the existing habitat fact sheets.

Davis said an additional limitation in the potential implementation of ISB on the UMR is that there are not many experts on ISB in the region. McCaffrey commented that often this expertise resides refinery firefighting teams.

Mark Razny observed that, in his experience, the opinion of local fire departments is critical in decision-making. He said the RRT would not override the opinion of a local fire chief in regard to ISB.

Joe Davis asked whether there are regionally-relevant case studies available which may help the Group in further examining the issue. McCaffrey commented that there are a limited number of case studies available. He noted that burning is less common in populated areas, such as along the East and West Coast, and somewhat more common in remote areas, such as the Great Plains states.

Hokanson asked the Group whether, in light of the discussion, they saw any particular actions to be taken regarding ISB on the UMR. Gann replied that there do not appear to be river-wide actions to pursue, but perhaps there are elements that can be addressed through pool-specific planning activities. Lauder agreed, adding that per Davis’ earlier comment, one of the most important things for the Group to think about is situations where a decision is made to let a fire continue burning (rather than starting a burn), as had been the case in the recent Galena-area derailment.

Hokanson then offered a summary of the ISB discussion as follows:

- When to let burn may be biggest consideration, rather than lighting per se.
- No modification needs to be made to the UMR plan at this time, as decisions will likely be more localized.
- Some actions that could be explored include:
 - Case studies, if any that are regionally relevant can be identified.
 - Working ISB discussion into pool planning process.
 - Mapping the “no-go” areas, perhaps starting with a single pool to explore the idea.
 - Possibly enhancing ISB discussion on habitat fact sheets.
 - Exercising ISB decision-making at the pool level.

UMR Spill Plan Update/MOA Signature Process

Hokanson said the memorandum of agreement (MOA) governing the UMR Spill Response Plan and Resource Manual had been signed by six of the nine member agencies of the Group, including all five

states and was now at USACE – Mississippi Valley Division awaiting the signature of MG Michael Wehr. He suggested that the Group members consider whether they/their agencies would like have any particular publicity/press release to occur when all signatures have been made to the MOA. Hokanson noted that the initial execution of the Plan MOA (in 1989) had been accompanied by a press release and that given recent attention to spills along the UMR it may be an opportune time for the member agencies to demonstrate their commitment to collaborative action. He also noted that contact names and phone numbers can be updated in the Plan on an ongoing basis, so members should be sure to share any changes of this nature as soon as they become aware of them.

Marathon Petroleum/St. Louis Area Exercise

Pat McCaffrey gave a brief report on the recently completed exercise lead by Marathon Petroleum in the St. Louis area. He said a highlight of this exercise was broad participation across a number of agencies and entities, including fairly high level agency engagement. McCaffrey also said past efforts to push participants through ICS are beginning to pay off in exercises such as this. He also noted that slowing down the pace of exercise play helped individuals in identifying how they fit into the ICS structure and process. In terms of future goals, McCaffrey said it would be beneficial to exercise how volunteers/volunteer management is integrated into a response.

Other Updates

Hokanson briefly highlighted the following for the Group’s general awareness:

- Release of a “report card” for the Mississippi River Basin by America’s Watershed Initiative (AWI) available at <http://americaswatershed.org/reportcard/>. Hokanson noted that UMRBA’s Executive Director Dru Buntin serves on the AWI Steering Committee.
- Completion of an economic profile for the Upper Mississippi River. This economic profile resulted from a collaboration among the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), The Nature Conservancy, and UMRBA, with USFWS staff performing the technical work on the profile. The profile was formally released at the meeting of the Mississippi River Cities and Towns Initiative (MRCTI) on September 16, 2015.
- UMRBA is in the process of developing its strategic plan priorities for calendar year 2016. Hokanson explained that Spill Response Planning and Mapping continues to be a focus area for UMRBA and that 2016 priorities in this area include supporting the UMR Spills Group, sharing the recently updated UMR Spill Plan and Resource Manual, and ongoing work under contract with USEPA Region 5, including pool-specific plans, habitat fact sheets and the Illinois Inland Sensitivity Atlas update.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 4 p.m. and reconvened at 8 a.m. on October 22nd.

New UMR Tools

UMR Spills Map and Spill Reports

UMRBA’s Molly McDonald gave a demonstration of the recently-created map of spills reported on the UMR. She explained that this map pulls in data from the National Response Center (NRC) for the ten year period of 2004 to 2013, noting that the data is brought in “as is” from the NRC (i.e., no refinements or updates are made to the information). Additionally, she noted that the map does not include entries where no amount was reported, but that this leaves out a significant number of incidents. Hokanson concurred saying that several of the largest incidents in recent years on the UMR did not have an amount reported to the NRC and as such would not be reflected on the map as currently designed.

The Group discussed potential modifications to the map, including adding additional years, making the map query-able, including “no amount” reports, and supplementing the data with incidents not captured in NRC reports. Mark Razny cautioned that bringing in other reports and data sets could potentially undermine consistency in the presentation of data. Joe Davis noted that for some larger spills, volumes are updated and assigned a new NRC number. As such, there may be multiple NRC numbers associated with a single incident. Roger Lauder concurred, saying that there can be repetition/redundancy in NRC reports at times.

The Group agreed to the following near-term modifications in the presentation of the UMR spill map:

- Including incidents with both known and unknown amounts.
- Providing the ability to separate out the data by year.

The Group agreed to then review the map again once these modifications have been made in order to identify any further additions or modifications needed.

UMR Spills Map and Spill Reports

UMRBA’s Matt Jacobson demonstrated the newly created online map of spill response equipment on the UMR. He illustrated the map’s functionality and contents, as well as the ability to edit map entries. Jacobson said feedback from the Group on the map is most welcome. Hokanson said he would provide the link to this map and the spill incident map to the Group to facilitate review.

Email Information System

Hokanson explained that, in light of recent incidents on the UMR and the interest among multiple agencies/entities in receiving information about these incidents, the email listserv initiated in 2011 had been re-activated and populated with a current list of UMR Spills Group participants. Hokanson said this listserv does not replace official notification channels, but provides an additional outlet for information flow to enhance situational awareness among interested parties. He said simply sending a message to umrspills@googlegroups.com allows information to be transmitted to the approximately 90 individuals on the UMR Spills Group distribution list. Hokanson noted that, since the reactivation of the listserv there have not been any major incidents impacting the river and therefore the system has not truly been tested as yet in a real situation.

Geographic Response Plans (GRPs)

Interdisciplinary Pool Plan Development

Mark Ellis of UMRBA reported that field work for the UMR Pool 5/5a/6 plan had been completed in September. He said data compilation for this plan is currently underway. Ellis said the next area of focus will be UMR Pools 11 and 12, and that this effort may also incorporate Pool 9 as this would then provide complete pool-level coverage from Pool 7 through Pool 13.

Rail Development of GRPs Through Pool 17

Nic Winslow provided a background on the development of GRPs by BNSF rail, noting that such GRPs have been developed for a variety of locations nationwide. He said rail-developed GRPs typically include an emphasis on source control and address the following objectives:

- Reducing the time emergency responders, key stakeholders, and regulatory agencies need to:
 - Review incident data
 - Prioritize response objectives
 - Develop safety plans
 - Implement response strategies

- Answering common incident command questions including:
 - Can a recovery strategy be identified and implemented in 3 to 4 hours?
 - With limited emergency response equipment, which critical resources need protection?
 - How to prioritize?
 - What are safety risks to response personnel and the public?
 - Who are key third party stakeholders?

Winslow next showed a number of examples to illustrate the components typically incorporated into a rail GRP, including:

- Railroad, Agency, and Stakeholder Contact Lists
- Emergency Response Contractor Lists
- Notification Protocol
- NIMS ICS Forms/Incident Action Plan
- Example Incident Objective Priority Ranking
- Key Waterbody Resources (e.g., intakes, parks, cities, rapids)
- Natural Resources Inventory (e.g., threatened and endangered species, rivers, streams)
- Site-Specific Booming Strategies

Winslow said one area of continued work is in developing a consistent format for the natural resources inventories included in the GRPs. He also explained how a GRP will typically cover a large area that is then broken down into sectors of approximately 30 miles in length, noting that rail strategies are oriented around railroad mile markers, with information then sorted spatially along the rail miles. Lastly, Winslow described the types of response equipment that BNSF is seeking to deploy along the UMR, the inventory of resources BNSF is compiling, and how he anticipates that this inventory would be tied together to the inventory in the UMR Spill Plan.

Colin McWilliams next described the specific project jointly being undertaken by BNSF and CP Rail to develop a GRP for the commercially navigable mainstem UMR, from the Coon Rapids Dam near Minneapolis to Lock and Dam 17 near New Boston, Illinois. He said it is anticipated that a draft of the GRP should be available early in 2016.

McWilliams emphasized that the rail UMR GRP project is seeking to incorporate existing response resources, such as the UMR Spill Plan and pool-specific plans, while also adding information in areas not already addressed by a pool-specific plan. However, he explained that the rail GRP is not scoped to incorporate the extensive stakeholder engagement process incorporated in the multi-agency developed pool plans (though it could serve as a starting point and/or augment the more intensive process). McWilliams also explained that, by its origin, the rail plans focus on a single type of release (i.e., rail-based) as opposed to a broad spectrum of potential release points.

McWilliams said the rail GRP on the UMR will likely focus initially on locks and dams as potential collection points, but will then be modified to reflect the resources present in pools to guide the selection of areas for protection (e.g. exclusion booming) and areas for product recovery (e.g., contain and collect strategies). He said outreach to natural resources trustees is currently ongoing in an effort to best identify sensitive areas (beyond what is already documented in the Inland Sensitivity Atlas) and define strategies accordingly, particularly exclusion strategies around sensitive resources.

Hokanson asked whether the materials developed through the rail GRP process will be made available to the UMR Spills Group and other partners on the UMR. Winslow said he anticipates that the output will be made available to these partner groups and that the strategies developed may have utility beyond rail-based incidents alone. Chad Livingston added that the rail companies are viewing this effort as a contribution to the broader spill contingency planning efforts ongoing on the UMR.

Annette Trowbridge asked what the anticipated approach is for field work associated with GRP development, as this can be a very time-consuming portion of strategy development and verification. McWilliams said the exact process is still to be determined, with one of the challenges being how far to delve into field verification, given the fairly rapid timeline for the development of the rail GRP.

Aleshia Kenney suggested that rail contact USFWS' Sara Schmuecker, who has recently completed an update of the UMR Natural Resources Inventory, as this can be another data set to aid in the identification of sensitive resources.

Rick Gann asked whether it is anticipated that rail GRP work will be extended down river past UMR Pool 17. Winslow replied that the current priority is to complete the work through Pool 17, but that other areas could be considered in the future. Joe Davis asked whether the Missouri River might also be another area for future work. Winslow said it is rail's intent to also explore GRP needs on the Missouri. Livingston concurred, saying that CP is planning to develop GRPs in three additional areas, so that there is a lot of emergent work of this type ongoing. Davis said USEPA Region 7 has extensive data for the Missouri River that could be utilized in GRP development.

Mapping and Planning Updates

Quad Cities Sub-area

Ramon Mendoza said he has recently met with the Rock Island Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) and Quad Cities drinking water suppliers, as well as the Quad Cities Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC) to discuss planning in the Quad Cities Sub-area. He noted that the LEPC would like to see some updates to the contact information in the plan as well as to plan appendices, including the addition of specific information regarding Bakken region crude oil and ethanol.

Joe Davis said Region 7 has contractor support available to update the appendices as requested, as well as to update any GIS information associated with the Quad Cities Sub-area Contingency Plan.

Mendoza mentioned that USCG will be leading an exercise in the Quad Cities on February 24, 2016 utilizing a scenario of an anhydrous ammonia leak. John Punkiewicz said USACE's Rock Island District would like to be part of the planning for this event. Mendoza said others should let him know if they are interested in participating.

Greater St. Louis Sub-area

Adam Ruiz said the Greater St. Louis Sub-area Planning Committee (SAPC) is currently working on updating response strategies for the Missouri River within the sub-area. He added that the next meeting of the SACP will take place on November 12, 2015. Pat McCaffrey commented that one of the lessons learned from the Phillips 66 pipeline leak in early 2015 in the St. Louis area is that the product will move quickly and as such it is important to consider strategies significantly downstream of the release point.

Heath Smith offered comment on the recent Marathon Petroleum-lead exercise in the St. Louis area, adding on to the perspectives offered by McCaffrey the previous day. He said the exercise was very successful overall and noted that some of the lessons learned from the exercise include:

- The need to continue joint exercises involving industry and USEPA, particularly in light of the difference in response cultures between these entities.
- The importance of verifying response strategies for the sub-area.

Great Rivers Sub-area

Heath Smith described the work which has been completed in the Great Rivers Sub-area, including the completion of its sub-area plan in 2013. He said the large geographic scope of the sub-area has proved a challenge and as such the sub-area planning committee has chosen to break down the sub-area into smaller pieces to pursue specific areas of work. In particular, Smith said two places – the Metropolis/Paducah area and the Ohio River/Mississippi River confluence – have been targeted for the development of geographically-specific response plans. He noted that UMRBA may be involved either directly or indirectly in work in these areas.

Lauder questioned whether UMRBA really had much of a geographic interest/presence in these areas. Hokanson said UMRBA had initially been approached by USEPA Region 5 to work on response plans for these areas, though he said his understanding is now that the lead work will be done by a contractor with UMRBA likely acting more in a supporting/consulting role (e.g., offering templates, suggestions for process, etc.).

Region 5 Inland Sensitivity Atlas

Mark Ellis reported that UMRBA staff is wrapping up work on the update of the Minnesota Inland Sensitivity Atlas and that this should be available soon.

Training and Exercises

Winter Response Training

Matt Stokes said rail companies are interested in working with the UMR Spills Group to host jointly-sponsored training sessions. In particular, he said CP Rail is looking to collaborate with the Group on a winter response training early in 2016. He described a potential training scenario as including a first day that has a field component for contractors only and a classroom component for UMR Spills Group participants and other interested parties. Then on a second day, those who participated in the classroom training would have an opportunity for a field-based awareness level training. He noted that registration for the course could be run via the TRANSCAER website.

Tom Kendzierski and Steve Faryan suggested that a portion of the training address monitoring considerations in cold weather, as this can have significant impacts on instrumentation and results. Faryan also suggested that perhaps John Punkiewicz could offer the “Cold Weather Boot Camp” training module. Stokes proposed that the UMR Spills Group could perhaps provide some of the instructors for the course and could aid in publicity and logistics.

Rick Gann asked how many individuals could participate in such a training. Stokes said attendance would likely be capped at approximately 50 individuals.

Overall, the UMR Spills Group expressed interest in working with Stokes and CP Rail on this training event. Hokanson and Stokes agreed to stay in communication and bring members of the Group into the planning process as arrangements evolve.

Future Training Ideas

Stokes suggested there may be benefit in integrating shoreline cleanup assessment technique (SCAT) training into future training sessions on the UMR. Kendzierski concurred, saying there has been

significant interest in SCAT training among Wisconsin DNR staff. Faryan said it could be possible for USEPA to support a SCAT training that would reach Wisconsin staff and other interested individuals.

Annette Trowbridge concurred that SCAT training would be valuable, as would the opportunity to exercise new pool-specific planning tools, such as the plan soon to be completed for Pools 5, 5a, and 6.

Joe Davis agreed with the idea of exercising planning tools and in particular proposed response strategies to determine their success in the field. Gann observed there would also be benefit to holding training/exercise further down river in areas where response strategies have been developed. Davis said locations including the Quad Cities and Montrose, Iowa could be areas in which to hold upcoming training.

In terms of timing, Stokes suggested it may be valuable to have a training not in a low water period such as August-October, but rather look for a higher flow month to truly test out the ability of strategies and equipment to be successful in a faster water environment.

Mark Razny said PHMSA is very open to participating in and leading training sessions. He described the likely focus of PHMSA-led training sessions as being on crude oil and ethanol. Razny said as long as there is a host location and public agencies may attend, PHMSA will seek to provide training for interested parties in up to six workshops per year. In particular, he said PHMSA is looking to hold a workshop in Des Moines in federal fiscal year 2016 and is looking for a host entity. Chris Bieller said he would be happy to work with Razny in finding a host location for this workshop. Gann and Hokanson also suggested that Razny could potentially be on the agenda to do training as part of a future UMR Spills Group meeting.

Next Meeting

Hokanson said the next meeting of the Group would be scheduled for Spring 2016, with likely location being the Quad Cities. He said he would contact the Group in a follow up email to confirm meeting schedule.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m. on October 22, 2015.