

# Upper Mississippi River Hazardous Spills Coordination Group

October 16-17, 2012  
Moline, Illinois

## ""Meeting Summary

### Participants

Roger Lauder	Illinois EPA
Rodney Tucker	Iowa DNR/USCG
Alison Manz	Iowa DNR
Mike Anderson <sup>1</sup>	Iowa DNR
David Morrison	Minnesota PCA
Rick Gann	Missouri DNR
Tom Kendzierski <sup>1</sup>	Wisconsin DNR
Ross Fenwick	USACE, Rock Island District
Leo Keller	USACE, Rock Island District
John Punkiewicz	USACE, Rock Island District
Bryan Klostermeyer	USCG, Sector UMR
Tim Ross	USCG, Quad Cities MSD
Jason Hampton	USCG, Quad Cities MSD
Timothy White	USDA, APHIS Wildlife Services
Steve Faryan	US EPA, Region 5
Ramon Mendoza	US EPA, Region 5
Ann Whelan	US EPA, Region 5
Joe Davis <sup>1</sup>	US EPA, Region 7
Jeff Weatherford	US EPA, Region 7
Bob Baumgartner	Transcanada
Greg Swanson	City of Moline
Bob Bohannon	City of Moline
Chris Biellier	Seneca Companies/Illinois MABAS 39
Dave Hokanson	UMRBA
Megan Carlson <sup>1</sup>	UMRBA
Mark Ellis <sup>1</sup>	UMRBA
Katherine Stearns <sup>1</sup>	UMRBA

<sup>1</sup>By telephone

### Call to Order and Introductions

Chair David Morrison called the meeting of the Upper Mississippi River Hazardous Spills Coordination Group (UMR Spills Group) to order at 1:05 p.m. Introductions followed.

### Training Activities

*September 25-26, 2012 Training at Montrose, Iowa*

Joe Davis gave a presentation summarizing the recent training event held on the Upper Mississippi River (UMR) at Montrose, Iowa. He said a total of 79 individuals participated in the training representing a wide variety of state, federal, and local agencies, as well as the private sector. Davis described the structure of the training, including a classroom-focused first day and a field-focused second day, noting that the field component included both a response track and a wildlife track.

Overall, he said the training was very successful and thanked the City of Montrose in particular for the support it provided to the training.

Ann Whelan asked whether there had been sufficient current in the river on the training's second day to effectively demonstrate the effects of fast water on response. Davis replied that there had been about a ½ knot of current and that a little more would have been optimal for demonstrating fast water impacts. He added that, generally, the training had been very successful in covering a lot of topics in a short period of time and that the addition of the wildlife component had been valuable. Davis suggested that a potential extension for future training would be to test interagency communication.

Whelan explained that the wildlife component of the training had given participants an opportunity to play out various roles in the Wildlife Branch within ICS. She noted that a particularly beneficial component was for individuals to practice responding to reports where the impact on wildlife has been significantly over- or under-estimated and then to allocate people and resources effectively.

Whelan observed that simply learning how to operate a relatively large number of boats in a congested area was important experience that is relevant to actual response situations. Davis concurred that this is a very valuable lesson for real-world response.

Davis described the costs associated with the training session, noting that there had been many important in-kind contributions which resulted in very minimal out-of-pocket training costs. In particular, he thanked participating oil spill response organizations (OSROs) for their contributions of boats and equipment and again thanked the City of Montrose for hosting. Davis cautioned, however, that these very low costs may not be replicable in other situations, so that others considering such training must take into consideration what potential costs might be.

Steve Faryan thanked Davis for all his contributions in leading the training, adding that Montrose's mayor had commented in particular on the state-federal collaboration that took place during the training. He said Montrose had provided a very good training location that potentially could host similar events in the future. Roger Lauder concurred that Montrose was good training location. He thanked Mike Coffey and Whelan in particular for their efforts in organizing the wildlife element of the training. Davis in turn thanked Coast Guard personnel for their aid in scouting the training location and bringing in first aid trailers for use during the event.

Alison Manz said it had been a great training and was very unique in bringing in the wildlife component. Rodney Tucker said that training, coupled with the Raccoon River spill, had led him to push for further training within the State of Iowa. Manz said that, while this training occurred subsequent to the Raccoon River spill, it was helpful pull out lessons learned from the spill in the context of the training, and that the training will aid in preparing for future spills.

Whelan asked the Group what the members would like to see included in future training sessions. Davis reiterated his observation that including a communications component would likely be very valuable. He also noted the importance of bringing entities that are potentially responsible parties (RPs) into these training events. Along these lines, he suggested that future trainings might include a case study presented by industry, or a component of the training which comes from an industry perspective.

Bob Baumgartner said that, from perspective as an industry participant, he found the wildlife component particularly. He added that training is a good venue to build understanding between industry and response agencies, as it takes place outside of the regulatory context.

Dave Hokanson asked how successful the training had been in drawing in local industry, as one of the factors in choosing the training location had been a desire to make the event more accessible to local

industry. Davis replied that local Sinclair Oil personnel attended, along with some industry staff from the Quad Cities. Both Whelan and Baumgartner commented that the training had actually attracted attendees nationally. Tim Ross noted that barge and fueling companies were represented and were very appreciative of the training opportunity. Davis commented that, overall, the mix of attendees seemed to be what the UMR Spills Group had targeted in designing the training.

Hokanson said the training materials had been posted to the UMRBA website, under meeting summaries at [www.umrba.org/haz-minutes.htm](http://www.umrba.org/haz-minutes.htm).

### **Case Study: North Raccoon River Spill**

Alison Manz presented on the recent spill that had affected Iowa's North Raccoon River. This September 13, 2012 release of several thousands of gallons of used motor oil from a storage tank located in Jefferson, Iowa is among the largest spills ever to occur in Iowa. She described the specific source of the spill as an aboveground storage tank that had been converted from an underground tank and had essentially no containment in place. Manz said responders had traced the leak back about 1½ miles from where it was first observed to its source on a greenhouse property. She noted that the City of Jefferson fire department had been the first to respond to the release and had placed absorbent booms at Henderson Park, about 2 miles downstream from the point of release. Eventually, on the incident's second day, the spilled product made it past these booms and additional boom had to be set up further downstream.

Manz noted that the owner of the facility where the leak occurred had not reported the release, although Iowa requires spill reporting within six hours of a release. She said it appeared the release had started in the morning, but it was afternoon before the report of contamination in the River was made, so that several hours had likely passed before action was taken. In this light, Manz said one of the major messages emerging from this incident is that prompt reporting is crucial in minimizing the impact of releases.

Manz said the North Raccoon River is home to the federal- and state-listed endangered Topeka shiner and therefore USFWS became involved in the response. She said Mike Coffey of USFWS helped ensure that Topeka shiner's habitat was not disturbed during the response process. Manz noted that Coffey also observed waterfowl present along the river and decided to employ hazing techniques to minimize the oiling of these birds.

Manz said the response continued during the period of September 15 to September 18, but that state funding had run out on September 18, at which point Iowa DNR requested that US EPA provide assistance. She noted that contaminated sediment needed to be removed as part of the response and that some booms are still in place to capture residual oil. Manz said Iowa DNR expects to continue monitoring for the presence of oil through the spring.

Among the challenges noted by Manz regarding this response were the remoteness of the location and funding issues, particularly that the facility owner's insurance was not sufficient to cover the costs of the response. Chris Biellier observed that, in his work on the private side of response, the insurance issue noted by Manz is common – that companies may not have a pollution rider in place that will help cover the costs of response and clean up.

Faryan asked whether Iowa DNR pursues many Pollution Removal Funding Authorizations (PRFAs) to provide for reimbursement associated with the costs of response. Rodney Tucker replied that, in his experience, PRFAs are used on a very limited basis, perhaps once or twice per year. He added that, from his perspective, he would rather that the federal agencies simply take over a spill, rather than using the PRFA process.

Ann Whelan asked whether Topeka Shiner were actually observed to be present during the course of the response. Manz replied that, to the best of her knowledge, Topeka Shiner were not observed to be present.

Faryan asked whether any other product in addition to used motor oil was released during the incident. Manz said only the used motor oil had been released. Faryan also asked how the river's stage of flow had affected the response. Manz replied that low flow conditions at the time of release had likely made the response somewhat easier, but added that there was also some variation in flow condition during the response. Lauder asked how much soil had been removed in the response process and where it had been removed from. Manz stated that most of the soil removal took place at bends in the river and that it was done by hand using shovels.

Hokanson asked whether the oil had become dispersed in the water column. Manz said this was the case and the oil became more dispersed in the water column over time. As a result, she added, it was not clear how much oil was actually removed by the use of a skimmer, though it appeared that mops and sorbent pads were more effective. Morrison asked whether sorbent boom and pads worked well, even though they were positioned fairly far downstream from the source of the spill. Manz said sorbent pads and booms appeared to be effective, with sorbent socks being somewhat less effective.

Whelan asked whether a Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) would be completed for this incident. Manz said she is not sure and that is something she would need to confirm with Coffey.

Recalling Tucker's comment regarding the use of PRFAs, Morrison said this mechanism is not one that is used by Minnesota PCA. However, he suggested, the UMR Spill Plan should note the mechanism so that responders are aware of it as a potential tool. Whelan said the purpose of the PRFA is not that the federal government will take over a response, but rather to provide funds to a state, local, or other federal agency when that agency has run out of funds for a response. She added that, for a response to become federalized, there is not paperwork to complete per se. She said in this incident, the PRFA was between federal agencies, as USFWS requested a PRFA in order to complete its work.

Faryan suggested that, if the Group is interested in learning more about PRFAs, this could be a topic of discussion at the next UMR Spills Group meeting. Morrison agreed this is a worthwhile topic for UMR Spills Group discussion. Whelan said it is necessary, when utilizing a PRFA, to document expenditures and have a mechanism in place in order to receive funds, adding that this mechanism is available to a variety of agencies, including local agencies. Faryan said a third party claim is also an option for local agencies and in this case might be available to the City of Jefferson Fire Department if the responsible party is not able to pay for the response. Rick Gann said Missouri, like Minnesota, has a state fund for pollution response and as a result does not frequently utilize PRFAs. He added that Missouri typically is successful at recovering costs for response and cleanup.

### **Jackson, Wisconsin Pipeline Release**

Steve Faryan presented information regarding the July 18, 2012 release of gasoline from a West Shore pipeline in Jackson, Wisconsin. Faryan described the cause of the release as a break at a seam in this 60-year old, 10-inch pipeline. He said the release was detected by the company due to a pressure drop in the line, and that no pooled product was observed on the surface. Faryan said West Shore notified the NRC and then set up an incident command post at a terminal near Milwaukee. He described that, under a unified command, an incident action plan (IAP) was created using incident objectives to guide the response. Faryan said he had been the federal on scene commander (OSC) for the response, which included West Shore Pipeline (and its parent company, Buckeye Partners) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Faryan commented that the lack of product showing up on the surface or in nearby surface waters had been puzzling at first, but it turned out the product had moved downward into the bedrock. As such, groundwater contamination was a concern and monitoring wells were installed and nearby private wells were sampled. A total of 296 wells were eventually sampled, 14 of these with benzene detections, 11 of which revealed concentrations greater than the maximum contaminant level. Faryan said the product moved quickly through the Karst bedrock, with Wisconsin DNR estimating that the plume traveled approximately 150 feet per day. Eventually, a total of 83 groundwater recovery (remediation) wells were installed in the area to help remove the product.

Faryan said another issue in this incident was benzene vapors, as benzene volatilizes and can become an air/combustion hazard during gasoline spills. He noted that this was a concern both for local residents and for responders. Faryan described how air monitoring was employed both at the incident site to establish exclusion zones and in the surrounding community more generally. He displayed maps of air monitoring conducted at the point of release, at the perimeter of the site, and in the larger community.

Regarding public communication, Faryan said an initial public meeting was held, followed by meetings with smaller groups in more localized areas. He said this was accompanied by the release of information via a dedicated website, [www.jacksonwisconsinresponse.com](http://www.jacksonwisconsinresponse.com). [Note: This link is no longer operational.]

Morrison asked if there had been any issues with vapors building up in residents' basements. Faryan said this had not been observed to date, but that this will continue to be a potential issue to be tracked going forward. Morrison asked whether US EPA will continue to oversee the response in the long run. Faryan replied that Wisconsin DNR has taken over the response, adding that US EPA's role in this specific incident is limited because oil was not involved and because there has been no release to the waters of the United States. Therefore, he explained, after the initial release, US EPA is limited to its emergency response program and mechanisms such as PRFA do not apply.

Jason Hampton asked whether the pipeline company had compensated homeowners impacted by the release. Faryan replied that this had not happened to date, but that if loss of home values result, there could be legal actions. Morrison asked how much time passed from the initial release report until monitoring of private wells began. Faryan replied that three days passed before private well monitoring was initiated. However, he noted that no detections were seen when monitoring was first initiated and it took about a week for the plume to reach private wells.

### **East Peoria Oil Release**

Roger Lauder and Ramon Mendoza described a release of oil to the Illinois River in East Peoria that took place in September 2012. They said an NRC report was made on September 16, 2012 and the US Coast Guard (USCG) responded that day. Subsequently, on September 17, a joint Illinois EPA/US EPA/US Coast Guard inspection confirmed the presence of both oil and sewage. Mendoza said both the City of East Peoria wastewater treatment plant and Caterpillar, Incorporated have outfalls in the area, so one of the challenges was to determine the source of the release. As such, USGC offered its diagnostic lab capability to aid in the response, and samples were taken from ambient surface water, pooled product behind booms, and from potential sources. He said initial results appear to indicate that Caterpillar is the most likely source of the release, although there are also some issues regarding potential cross-connection between the East Peoria and Caterpillar outfalls.

In terms of the response, Lauder and Mendoza said boom was deployed by Caterpillar's contractor, as were sorbent pom-poms, which were used to catch colloidal suspensions. Both Lauder and Mendoza emphasized how training such as that sponsored by the UMR Spills Group provided critical insight into

the boom deployment and assessing its effectiveness. Lauder and Mendoza pointed to the following as lessons learned from this incident:

- Oil spill training is critical to determine the effectiveness of containment/cleanup.
- USCG support to provide source identification and monitor the site is critical to cleanup and enforcement.
- State support in an initial inspection and regarding NPDES permits is critical to a potential enforcement case.

Lauder emphasized that the USCG's ability to provide oil spill fingerprinting was very valuable in this incident. Morrison observed that this appears to be a very promising new tool for use in response. Mendoza commented that a surprisingly small volume of oil was needed for fingerprinting purposes.

### **Agency and Partner Updates**

#### *Missouri*

Rick Gann said there has not been much activity regarding spills in Missouri since the last UMR Spills Group meeting. He did note that Missouri DNR's hazardous waste program has been conducting an unused pesticides collection program for farmer and homeowners, which has gathered in 67,000 pounds of hazardous materials. Gann explained that this program has been funded via a supplemental environmental project (SEP) from a pesticide company and that about \$500,000 has been spent on the program to date, with approximately another \$500,000 remaining to be used. Moreover, the program has begun to build credibility with the public. As such, he said he expects the program to continue for the foreseeable future.

#### *Illinois*

In addition to the previously discussed East Peoria release, Lauder noted that the recent Illinois Emergency Management Agency conference focused on nuclear power plants, as well as on the effects of secondary incidents on releases. He also noted departmental changes at Illinois EPA, including the discontinuation of having a responder from Illinois EPA on call at all times, and rather relying on the Duty Officer to walk through initial response considerations. Lauder added that the overall number of Illinois EPA responders has been declining, which limits the agency's ability to be present on site, to monitor, and inspect. He noted that this declining presence actually reduces facilities' incentive to report incidents. Biellier concurred, saying that unless there is a fire response involved, a reduced agency presence can lead to less reporting by facilities. Lauder said he is interested in whether Illinois and the other states are observing a decline in the reporting of incidents which is concurrent with agency staff reductions.

Among other issues, Lauder said Illinois is working with the Great Lakes Commission on updating a Great Lakes plan, that drought has been a predominant theme, and that the Harrisburg tornado was the state's largest incident in the past year. He noted that Harrisburg did not receive a federal disaster declaration and that this might signal fewer such declarations in the future. Whelan said she had asked FEMA why a declaration was not made for Harrisburg, with the answer being that most of those affected had insurance, so a large number of claims was not anticipated.

#### *Iowa*

Rodney Tucker reported that Chuck Gipp is now the Director of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, having been promoted from Deputy Director, and that the new Deputy Director is Bruce Troutman. Tucker said Kathy Lee's move from Iowa DNR's response program to its laboratory program will result in a greater workload for him and could impact his ability to participate in the UMR Spills Group.

Tucker noted that the Iowa Hazmat Symposium is this upcoming week and will include a component which ties into TRANSCAER training. He added that next year's TRANSCAER tour will involve ethanol and include a stop in Burlington, Iowa.

Tucker said Iowa does appear to be seeing a decline in the number of spills reported, noting that in 2011 approximately 700 spills were reported, which is lower than the 800 or so that have typically been reported in recent years.

#### *Wisconsin*

Tom Kendzierski reported that Wisconsin DNR has implemented an on-call spill coordinator role to supplement the Duty Officer, which is intended to provide technical support for the Duty Officer on spill-related incidents. Kendzierski said Wisconsin DNR has five spill coordinators statewide, but that the team leader position remains vacant and has been so for approximately six months.

Kendzierski said Wisconsin has developed guidance regarding highway incident response, which includes information on preventing and addressing secondary incidents. He indicated he would provide this information to Hokanson for further distribution to the whole Group.

Regarding incidents, Kendzierski said the West Shore pipeline release, as described in Faryan's presentation, was one of the major recent incidents in Wisconsin, along with an Enbridge pipeline spill in Adams County. He thanked US EPA's Theresa Holz for her assistance in this incident. Kendzierski noted that the Adams County spill had been contained to just one property, with a combination of quick response from Enbridge and the geological setting preventing the release from becoming a groundwater concern.

Kendzierski described a recent incident involving an abandoned boat near Hudson, Wisconsin. He said the general issue raised here is whether a vessel such as this can be treated as an abandoned container when the owner cannot be identified. Kendzierski said this may be an issue of general interest for the group as Wisconsin has seen a few cases where individuals purchase a boat or barge and then end up abandoning it. He said he is considering such cases to be abandoned container for the purposes of cost recovery. Faryan asked for clarification as to whether cost recovery is an issue if the owner is known or only cases where the owner is unknown. Kendzierski replied that the issue arises in cases where the owner cannot be identified. He added that, in the Hudson case, Wisconsin DNR is still seeking to identify the owner, but has not been successful to date.

#### *Minnesota*

Dave Morrison said the number of spills reported to Minnesota PCA has been fairly consistent, averaging approximately 2,500 per year. He added that the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, which is the lead agency for pesticide and fertilizer releases, also receives about 125 spill reports per year.

Morrison said the Duluth area flood of June 2012 was one of the major response events for Minnesota in the past year, with damage done to homes, roads, bridges, wastewater treatment plants, and other infrastructure. He said there was a federal disaster declaration addressing the public infrastructure component, but there had not been a disaster declaration addressing individual losses.

Regarding Minnesota-based training and exercises, Morrison noted that the Red Wing CAER group had a large exercise in the summer of 2012 that included on-river boom deployment. He said the Red Wing group now appears to be a successful, self-sustaining entity. Morrison also noted that Wakota CAER held one full, three-day course over the summer, along with two shorter refresher courses.

Morrison said an emerging issue in Minnesota and western Wisconsin is frac sand mining and its potential impact on air and water quality. Kendzierski concurred that this is a growing industry in Wisconsin and that there has been one dike breach which resulted in the release of sediment-laden water to the St. Croix River.

Nationally, Morrison said Minnesota has been in the position of offering assistance for incidents in other states but that, without a federal disaster declaration, the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) does not come into effect. As such, he said he is wondering if there are other mutual aid agreements among states that should be explored. Whelan said this issue had also come up at the Region 5 RRT meeting and Dorene Fier-Tucker of Minnesota PCA is working on a paper to explore this topic. Lauder concurred, saying the RRT discussion had led to the conclusion that a federal declaration is needed to trigger EMAC, but individual state-to-state discussions may have merit. Whelan said the RRT has set up a group to look at this issue under Minnesota's leadership.

#### *US EPA Region 5*

Faryan noted that, on the handout of recent UMR spills, those with larger volumes are likely to be drills and the actual spill events are typically smaller in volume. Tucker noted that no Iowa spills appear on the UMR list and asked Faryan to double-check on this.

Whelan commented that Region 5 has had a lot of work on pipeline spills of late, though the overall number of spill reports in the region appears to lower over the past year. Faryan commented that US EPA has been expending more resources on response of late, as states' budget reductions have limited their ability to respond.

Whelan noted there has been very positive feedback about the training held in Montrose, Iowa and particularly in regard to the wildlife response components as a unique element. She said the geographic response work done on the UMR has also been well received and there has been a similar effort initiated in the Cincinnati area and the Great Rives sub-area planning committee has also shown interest in this approach.

#### *US EPA Region 7*

Jeff Weatherford said there have not been sizeable spills in Region 7 of late. He also said he is now the lead Region 7 staff person for the St. Louis sub-area, replacing Jim Silver, who recently retired from US EPA.

#### *US Coast Guard*

Bryan Klostermeyer said most of USCG's update will be covered in presentations the following morning regarding spill response equipment and the Atlantic Strike Team. Tim Ross said there are a few new facility response plan (FRP)-qualifying entities along the UMR working to get approvals in place.

#### *USDA-APHIS*

Tim White said Jason Suckow had been working on text for the wildlife annex of several contingency plans. He offered to share this text with any interested individuals.

#### *Transcanada*

Bob Baumgartner reported that Transcanada held a training and exercise in South Dakota the same week as the UMR training in Montrose, Iowa. He said the South Dakota training was associated with the Keystone pipeline and included both classroom and field components. Baumgartner noted that Transcanada will also be hosting training sessions along the Missouri River.

*IL MABAS 39/Seneca Companies*

Chris Biellier mentioned an upcoming multijurisdictional effort to take place in the Siouxland sub-area incorporating a terrorism scenario involving a train derailment.

**Cultural and Historic Resources in UMR Planning and Response**

Morrison commented that, in reflecting on the previous meeting's discussion of this topic, his sense is that there are couple entities in each state it is important for responders to be familiar with and that State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) are not likely to hand off decision-making regarding these resources. As such, his observation is that responders need to have contact information for these entities and a simple list of SHPOs along the UMR is a reasonable first step. He said this could be both a stand-alone item and part of the UMR Spill Plan.

Whelan said that responders run into questions such as how to clean off historic structures and would benefit from SHPO input on such questions, and hopefully find consistency among states' approaches. Morrison observed that there is not a shoreline cleanup assessment technique (SCAT) analog for cultural resources which responders can look to for guidance. Whelan commented that mapping of historic and cultural resources may be helpful for responders, but that there are challenges in mapping these resources due to their potential density and the number of features that have not yet been identified.

Hokanson said he would circulate the draft list of state cultural and historic contacts to the Group for their input and then seek to finalize this and incorporate it into the UMR Spill Plan.

**UMR Spill Plan Update**

Hokanson reviewed the status and timeline of UMR Spill Response Plan and Resource Manual update, noting that the update is scheduled for completion by September 30, 2013. He summarized proposed changes to the plan's content and sought the Group's input on these changes, including:

- Whether to use a phone list or the Emergency Action Field Guide at the front of the document.
- Whether the document should be written with potentially responsible parties in mind as an audience.
- What the frequency of update should be.
- Whether the plan's memorandum of agreement should be updated, modified, and/or re-signed.
- How the geographic scope of the plan should be defined.
- How the relationship of the UMR Plan to other plans should be presented.
- How the role of UMR plan should be described.
- How the function of notification protocols should be described.
- What the function of the "role of private and public organizations" section is.
- Whether the fax component of the notification protocol should be dropped.

Whelan said it is important to highlight that the UMR Plan is incorporated by reference in the Region 5 and Region 7 area plans. She also said the UMR Plan needs to specifically address the role of locks and dams in response on the UMR.

*The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:15 p.m. and resumed at 8:00 a.m. on October 17, 2012.*

## **UMR Spill Plan Update (*Continued*)**

Whelan said it is important for the updated plan to create a connection to the UMR Pool-specific geographic response plans that have been developed over the last few years. In addition, returning to her comment from the previous day, she stressed that because the UMR plan is incorporated by reference to Region 5 and Region 7 plans, it is part of the policy of these regions. As such, facilities required to do FRPs need to be consistent with the policies laid out in the UMR Plan. Hokanson said these connections can be highlighted in the sections that deal with the purpose of the UMR plan and its relationship to other contingency plans.

Morrison said the UMR Plan performs an important function in that it is a mechanism that compels Minnesota to be in communication with other UMR states. Gann concurred, saying that his observation is that it has been of value particularly in comparison to situations where such a plan does not exist for a shared waterbody.

Hokanson asked specifically whether the fax element of the notification protocol should be dropped and whether an electronic/email notification element should be added. Gann said Missouri DNR has an electronic system of notification and that this could be connected to an electronic notification element in the UMR Plan. Tucker said an electronic component should definitely be added to the protocol and Gann suggested that, as a starting point, the emails for each of the states' UMR Spills Group representatives could be added to the notification roster. All concurred with this suggestion and Hokanson said he would add an electronic component to the notification protocol and emails to the notification roster.

## **USCG Updates**

### *Response Equipment Inventory*

Following up on information presented by Todd Peterson in April 2012, Bryan Klostermeyer said USCG is waiting on further instruction regarding the release of information related to their response equipment inventory efforts.

### *Vessel of Opportunity Skimming System (VOSS)*

Klostermeyer said the Granite City, Illinois-based VOSS will remain in its current location for the upcoming year, as USCG determined it would be more affordable in the near term to maintain its current location. However, it remains USCG's intent to relocate the VOSS.

### *First Aid Response Trailers*

Regarding the disposition of the First Aid Response Trailers, Klostermeyer said USCG is currently reviewing its property policy to determine what mechanism(s) might be appropriate to allow for the transfer of the trailers from USCG to another entity. He emphasized that USCG's preference is to make the trailers available to agency partners if possible. Klostermeyer noted that four trailers from Sector UMR have been distributed to spill response cooperatives at Red Wing, Lake City, and Winona, Minnesota, as well as to Marquette, Iowa. He said Matt Stokes (USCG Coast Guard Auxiliary/STARS Training) has worked on the distribution of these trailers, adding that while there is no formal agreement in place, the cooperatives have taken responsibility for trailer repair and maintenance.

Tim Ross said the Quad Cities Marine Safety Detachment (MSD) has two trailers which are in good shape. Klostermeyer noted that Sector Ohio River may also have a small number of trailers available for relocation. Joe Davis said the Bettendorf Spill Cooperative currently has one trailer it obtained from USCG in Paducah, Kentucky and is interested in obtaining another if possible. Davis also suggested that any agreement between USCG and a host entity include language stating: 1) the host entity can access and use the equipment at any time and agree to maintain and exercise the equipment, replenishing materials as needed/as they are consumed, and 2) USCG can also access and use the

equipment at any time (for training, exercises, and actual responses), returning the trailer to the host post-use and replenishing/replacing any equipment consumed during use. Gann suggested that the City of Hannibal would also likely be interested in hosting a trailer. Faryan said the La Crosse area maybe another promising location for a trailer.

Hokanson said he would draft an email to Dan Denham, USCG, with the Group's recommendations, as a way of formally communicating the groups suggested locations.

#### *Atlantic Strike Team*

Klostermeyer gave an overview of the Atlantic Strike Team (AST), which is part of USCG's National Strike Force (NSF). He described the mission of the NSF as to provide assistance to the Coast Guard and EPA Federal on Scene Coordinators while they execute their responsibilities under the national contingency plan and, if extended into a Stafford Act response, under Emergency Support Function (ESF) #10. Klostermeyer said the NSF is made up of three teams, as follows: 1) the Pacific Strike Team located in Novato, California, 2) the Gulf Strike Team located in Mobile, Alabama, and 3) the Atlantic Strike Team located in Fort Dix, New Jersey. The National Strike Force Coordination Center located in Elizabeth City, North Carolina coordinates operations for all three teams and all the teams have the same training and equipment so that they are interoperable. Klostermeyer described several incidents and events in which the Strike Teams had recently participated. He also gave AST contact information, including an office phone number of 609-724-0008 and web address of [www.uscg.mil/hq/nsfweb/](http://www.uscg.mil/hq/nsfweb/).

Morrison asked Klostermeyer how the Strike Teams relate to other such teams, such as the National Guard Civil Support teams. Klostermeyer said the Strike Teams and Civil Support Teams do have some similar equipment and engage in joint training sessions.

Morrison asked when the AST is notified and brought into response. He said he understands that the National Response Center (NRC) sends spill reports to the AST, but he not sure under what circumstances the AST is actually brought into a response. Klostermeyer replied that, unless the incident is extremely large/significant, the AST will not automatically be brought in. However, he added, the AST will potentially become involved in other incidents if requested and can provide phone consultation to responders. As such, Klostermeyer said responders should not hesitate to contact the AST if they are in need of assistance in a response. Faryan concurred, saying that while the AST is not a first responder, it is a resource that responders can utilize. Whelan said the AST can also assist in long term removal situations.

Morrison asked whether the AST has all hazard training and equipment. Klostermeyer replied that the AST indeed has all-hazard capacity, including unique equipment that can be brought into use as needed to match the conditions of an incident.

### **Spills-Ecological Collaboration Efforts**

#### *Status of UMR Pool Geographic Response Plans*

Mark Ellis reminded the Group that geographic response plans, including response strategies, maps, and an initial incident action plan (IAP) have been completed for UMR Pools 7 and 13. He said work on the Pool 10 geographic response plan is nearing completion, as field work has been conducted and the next step is to create digital versions of the identified response strategies. Ellis said that one more pool is expected to be completed in the upcoming year.

Whelan asked whether the Group had any preferences for a next pool to pursue in developing geographic response plans. Ellis said one possibility would be to pursue a pool in USFWS' Winona District, as there has not yet been a geographic response plan completed for a pool in this area. Whelan said she thought that USFWS might be interested in doing a pool on the lower portion of the River.

Morrison asked how pools have typically been selected in the past. Ellis said USFWS has typically given a recommendation of possible pools and then US EPA, the states, and other agencies have responded to USFWS' suggestions.

Whelan asked the Group whether the geographic response plan should include materials that span beyond the first operational period of response. She noted that the 234 Form is really a planning document, and that one approach might be to add in a second 234 Form. Ellis concurred that this might be an option to pursue and could be discussed with pool planning groups.

Faryan said it is also worth considering ways to expedite the geographic response plan creation process, such as using aerial photos to develop response strategies in lieu of a field day. Ellis said another possibility would be to allow one agency with nearby staff to conduct the field component (e.g. Iowa DNR offered to have its field staff do onsite verification if needed).

#### *Habitat Fact Sheets*

Whelan reminded the Group that the fact sheets were an outgrowth of lessons learned in recent responses and use the previous net environmental benefits analysis (NEBA) fact sheets as a starting point. She said the fact sheets now available on the UMRBA website are final drafts – meaning they are available for use as needed, but that further modifications and improvements are expected. Whelan encouraged the Group to use and circulate the fact sheets and continue to provide feedback on them. She said one of the future goals for the fact sheets is to provide them in a more dynamic way online so that photos of indicator species can scroll, etc.

White asked Whelan how she envisions that the fact sheets will be used in response. Whelan replied that she sees the fact sheets as connected to incident action plans and the inland response tactics manual. She said she also sees a role for the fact sheet in shoreline cleanup assessment techniques (SCAT) and in expanding the ability to adapt responses to specific vegetated habitats. Morrison said he sees the fact sheets both as a tool that brings more natural resource information to responders and as a conversation-starter between responders and natural resource managers during an incident. Whelan concurred, saying she see the fact sheet as something that raises good questions during a response and makes explicit the tradeoffs that may need to be made in pursuing a particular response technique in a specific habitat.

Whelan said she envisions that the fact sheets will be in circulation for a year or so and then may be subject to further updating and integration with various plans. She added that the fact sheets also function to help guide response in areas where geographic response plans have not yet been developed.

#### *Other Efforts and Next Steps*

Morrison said previous discussions had raised the possibility of incident command system (ICS) training for natural resource managers and he is interested in hearing the Group's suggestions for training related to spills-ecological collaboration. Baumgartner said one component to potentially address is volunteer management, both how to pre-plan for volunteers and how to manage volunteers on site. Faryan concurred that volunteer management would be a good topic for future training sessions.

White suggested that chain of custody related to wildlife recovery may also be a good cross-cutting training topic. Baumgartner proposed the development of matrix to accompany the habitat fact sheets that would communicate priority habitats to protect, if such a priority exists or can be determined.

#### **UMR Early Warning Monitoring Network**

Greg Swanson shared a history of the early warning monitoring network effort on the UMR, including both the initial pilot effort at Lock and Dam 15 and the more recent work which has resulted in five stations along the UMR utilizing both chemical/physical and biological (mussel gape behavior) data

collection. He discussed the connection between source water protection and the early warning monitoring network, and listed the benefits of a network as follows:

- Compliments drinking water plant source monitoring efforts
- Advanced warning of natural water quality changes
- Advanced warning of contamination/spill events
- Correlation to other UMR concerns (e.g. nutrient impacts)
- Enhanced data collection and sharing
- Enhanced understanding of UMR dynamics
- Enhanced communications among UMR stakeholders

Swanson said the monitoring network effort grew significantly in preceding years when funding and leadership was provided by US EPA. However, he noted that with the end of this support, the initiative is facing a number of challenges, including:

- Perpetuation of the network
- Funding
- Data warehousing, sharing and integrity
- Bio-monitor algorithm refinement
- Sustaining and strengthening UMR partnerships

Bob Bohannon next provided details on the monitoring installation located at the Mid-American Energy's Riverside Generating Station and maintained by the City of Moline, as well as Moline's efforts to store and share data produced by this station. He described both the YSI multiparameter sonde and S-can spectrometer employed to collect a variety of chemical and physical data. Bohannon said the S-can unit is very easy to use and requires minimal maintenance, and that calibration is done on the YSI sonde every two weeks.

Bohannon explained that US EPA is no longer able to host data generated by the monitoring stations. As such, Moline has investigated alternatives for data sharing and is currently pursuing use of WQdata.com, which is the platform recommended by USEPA's contractor. Bohannon showed examples of other applications utilizing this data sharing platform.

Tucker asked where the Mid-American station is located. Mike Anderson replied that it is a couple miles downstream of Lock and Dam 14. Swanson noted that this location is upstream of all four public water supply intakes located in the Quad Cities.

Whelan said US EPA still has interest in seeing the network succeed, but at this point there is not a funding mechanism to support it any longer. She said the agency is willing to help in whatever other ways it can, aside from funding per se. Bohannon said one way all the agencies can aid the network is simply to keep the conversation going regarding the effort. Whelan said US EPA may be able to also provide some coordination assistance. Weatherford said he could inquire as to the ability of US EPA Region 7 to assist.

Swanson said Moline is committed to paying for an initial year of data sharing and that Bohannon has been in conversation with the other network locations regarding their interest in participating in data sharing. Swanson said he view the data sharing component as one way of motivating interest in the

network. Morrison said connecting the network to nutrient-related concerns, and algal toxins in particular, may be one way to add value and generate support.

### **Missouri River Response Strategy Development**

Jeff Weatherford presented information regarding the recent effort led by US EPA Region 7 to develop response strategies for the Missouri River in the Greater St. Louis area. He described the purposes of the effort as the following:

- Identify sensitive environments that warrant protection in the event of a spill
- Identify appropriate response strategies (collection, exclusion and/or diversion)
- Identify equipment (containment boom) needs
- Identify river access and staging locations
- Identify other unique considerations (river or seasonal conditions)
- Provide information in format compatible with St. Louis Subarea Mississippi River Response Strategies prepared by UMRBA

Weatherford said participants in the effort included US EPA Region 5 and Region 7, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, the USFWS, St. Charles County LEPC, TetraTech (US EPA's contractor), Missouri American Water, and Environmental Restoration, LLC. He said the effort was very successful, with findings including the following:

- USFWS provided valuable information relative to pallid sturgeon habitat areas
- Environmental Restoration provided valuable input on booming strategies and river behavior based on actual response experience
- Participation by other agencies provided a good opportunity for relationship building
- All sensitive environments identified by USFWS were related to pallid sturgeon
- Not all sensitive environments identified in the field were obvious on aerial photographs
- Not all boat ramps/access points were identified in available databases
- A total of 27 response strategies were developed
- Containment boom requirements of all strategies is approximately 50,000 yards

Weatherford said work will now continue to finalize and digitize the outcomes of the effort and that further information is available on the [epaosc.net](http://epaosc.net) website.

### **Confirming Priorities and Action Items**

Hokanson listed the following priorities and action items emerging from the meeting:

- Funding mechanisms, including PRFAs, will be further discussed at the next meeting.
- UMRBA staff will work with Group members to confirm contacts and revise the cultural/historic contacts list.
- UMRBA staff will work on updates to the UMR Spill Plan and send a revised version to the Group in advance of its next meeting.
- UMRBA staff will communicate to US Coast Guard the Group's preferences for disposition of the first aid response trailers.

- The next spills-ecological coordination conference call will provide a venue to discuss selection of a next UMR pool for geographic response planning.
- US EPA will consider its ability to provide coordination assistance for the UMR early warning monitoring network.
- US EPA and UMRBA will continue to receive comments on the habitat fact sheets.
- The following have been identified as potential topics/considerations for a next UMR-based training:
  - Incident command system
  - Habitat fact sheets
  - UMR pool geographic response plans
  - Volunteer management
  - Cultural and historic resources
  - Boom deployment
  - Possible location at an industry facility

#### **Next Meeting**

The Group agreed that its next meeting should take place in late March or early April 2013 in the Quad Cities. Hokanson said he would follow up with a scheduling email.

*With no further business, the meeting adjourned at noon on October 17, 2012.*