

Upper Mississippi River Hazardous Spills Coordination Group

October 25-26, 2016
Moline, Illinois

Meeting Summary

Participants

Roger Lauder	Illinois EPA
Joe Sanfilippo	Iowa DNR
Dorene Fier-Tucker	Minnesota PCA
Rick Gann	Missouri DNR
Brenda Kelly	Wisconsin DNR
John Punkiewicz	USACE, Rock Island District
CDR Susana Lee-Kiddey	USCG, Sector UMR
ENS Dana Schmitt	USCG, Sector UMR
CWO Mark DeWein	USCG, Sector UMR
Mark Razny	USDOT, PHMSA
Steve Faryan	USEPA, Region 5
Ramon Mendoza	USEPA, Region 5
Ann Whelan	USEPA, Region 5
Annette Trowbridge	USFWS
Dave Anderson	NPS
Dave Donovan	Scott County EMA
Robert Hite	Environmental Restoration
Tom Fuhrhop	Environmental Restoration
Caleb Tufts*	O6 Environmental
Chris Bieller*	Seneca Companies
Joe Gaspers	Texpar Energy
Cody Lampe	Texpar Energy
Joel Sanger	Texpar Energy
Dave Hokanson	UMRBA
Mark Ellis	UMRBA
Matt Jacobson*	UMRBA
Mike Robinson*	UMRBA

*Participated by phone.

Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. by Chair Rick Gann. Introductions of all participants followed.

Approval of Previous Meeting Summary

The summary of the April 6-7, 2016 UMR Spills Group meeting was approved without modification.

Case Study Presentations

Ferryville, Wisconsin Derailment

Brenda Kelly described the September 22, 2016 derailment that occurred near Ferryville, Wisconsin and was caused by a washout of tracks resulting from a heavy precipitation event. The derailment involved two locomotives and six railcars from a BNSF train, of which four cars carried gypsum board, one car carried ethanol residue, and one car carried vegetable oil residue. Kelly noted that an estimated 1,170 gallons of diesel fuel was lost from the locomotives and traveled into the rail ballast and floodplain. She said responding agencies included Wisconsin DNR, USFWS, USEPA, and USCG, along with BNSF as the responsible party.

Kelly briefly described sensitive resources in the location where the derailment occurred, which is the area where Rush Creek enters the Mississippi River. She said the area is characterized by floodplain forest, emergent and submersed aquatic vegetation. Fish, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians are all present as well.

Kelly explained that ICS 201 Action Plan Objectives were established for the incident response as follows:

- Safety of BNSF personnel, contractors, residents, and resource agency staff
- Protecting the environment
- Containment and recovery of product
- Building access road
- Implementing an environmental sampling plan
- Re-railing locomotives, tank cars, and gypsum cars
- Preventing secondary releases
- Restoring railroad operations

She also noted that USEPA engaged and provided oversight in the following: vacuum and re-railing operations, water quality sampling, shoreline cleanup assessment techniques (SCAT), and flushing operations.

In terms of the specifics of the cleanup, Kelly said water sampling by Wisconsin DNR began the same morning as the derailment and sorbent pads were placed under the locomotives and booms deployed by mid-day. By the end of the first day, a water sampling plan had been developed and initiated. She explained that the second day's activities included SCAT, continued water quality sampling, ballast repair, and ballast flushing (until a clean sample was obtained). Then, later in the afternoon, rail traffic resumed.

Kelly offered the following lessons learned and observations from this derailment incident:

- Strive for quick communication among all agencies involved. Response implementation depends on it.
- Need to have someone respond immediately who can represent the resource. Important to know the local experts and their contact information.
- Ability to collect samples immediately. This system is dynamic.
- Need to deploy clean up equipment immediately or have trains carry an "environmental first aid kit."
- Improve ability of being proactive vs reactive: The best type of spill is one that you train for but never happens.

Mark Razny asked why several hours passed before action to address the locomotive's leak (i.e., placement of sorbent pads) was taken. Kelly responded that, at least from a local responder's perspective, there were much bigger issues to address, as widespread flooding was ongoing at the time. Dorene Fier-Tucker concurred, saying that on the Minnesota side of the river flooding was also ongoing and stretched response resources throughout the area. Nonetheless, Fier-Tucker said she was a bit surprised at how long it took for BNSF to take action. Kelly noted that conditions of widespread flooding may also have slowed BNSF's response. Joe Sanfilippo noted that Alliant Energy has equipment in the area and this could be used in a similar situation if others' resources are not immediately available.

Regarding contamination of the rail ballast, Fier-Tucker asked Kelly how options of flushing and excavation were evaluated, noting that in Minnesota excavation is typically seen as the preferred first option for cleanup. Kelly said she had not been part of this decision-making process and as such she did not have information on how this decision was made.

Lee-Kiddey asked how Wisconsin DNR was first notified of the spill. Kelly said this was first picked up via police scanner. Lee-Kiddey said USCG Sector UMR did not receive an NRC report, though eventually they were notified via phone call. In reviewing a list of NRC reports for the UMR, Hokanson did confirm that that an NRC report was made at some point for this incident.

Campbell's Island Barge Grounding

CDR Susana Lee-Kiddey began the case study presentation by thanking the UMR Spills Group for the opportunity to present and said she looked forward to the discussion with the Group. ENS Dana Schmitt then gave an overview of the barge grounding incident which took place at Campbell's Island on the UMR near the Quad Cities on September 3, 2016. Schmitt explained that this incident really had two separate components: the grounding of the vessel and the recovery of the barge. He explained that a federal pollution response project from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF) was opened for the vessel itself (UTV Zeus) and a CERCLA project was opened for the anhydrous ammonia barge.

Schmitt explained that, in an attempt to recover the grounded barges, the port bow tank of the UTV Zeus had suffered a small rupture (1 inch puncture). While no pollution was observed, boom was deployed around the vessel and it was transited to a nearby dock for temporary repairs, with permanent repair to follow later at a dry dock.

Regarding the anhydrous ammonia barges, Schmitt reported that one of the barges was refloated the same day as the initial grounding and it was repositioned at a temporary mooring location. Efforts to re-float the second barge, including use of the lock and dam system to increase water levels, were not successful. Eventually, the first (freed) barge traveled downstream to unload its contents and then returned to be used in lightering the second barge (i.e., transferring the anhydrous ammonia from the grounded barge to the free barge), due to the limited number of barges designed to transport this product. Lightering operations were successfully carried out on September 13, 2016. USGC's Strike Team was on site for this recovery effort and conducted air monitoring during the lightering operations.

Lee-Kiddey asked whether USEPA has air monitoring equipment available which could be used in an incident such as this one. Steve Faryan replied that this type of equipment is available from USEPA, and is stationed at Marion, Illinois, as well as in Chicago and Kansas City. Lee-Kiddey, Faryan, and Ann Whelan all agreed that keeping the availability of this equipment in mind for any future incident would be very important.

Schmitt described how communication unfolded during the incident. He said an NRC report was eventually made by USCG, but had not been made initially by Kirby Inland Marine. Schmitt said USCG had also been in contact with USEPA, but not necessarily individual state response agencies. He said it is USCG's intent to notify potentially affected states and other government entities in any future such incidents. Schmitt also clarified that NRC notifications can and should be made in potential spill situations such as this. He also emphasized value of Unified Command in carrying out this response.

Lee-Kiddey noted that there had been miscommunication in regard to NRC reporting, in that Kirby Marine (the barge owner) thought that the NRC report had been made by others, while USCG expected that Kirby had made the notification as the responsible party. She said USCG did eventually make the report. Mark DeWine reiterated that potential releases such as in this incident can be reported to NRC. Hokanson suggested that the language in the UMR Spill Plan's notification protocol may need to be modified to address this scenario of potential release which could have significant impact.

Schmitt asked who the states would like to have called in an incident such as this. All states responded that their duty officer is the appropriate 24-hour contact. Hokanson noted that this 24-hour contact information, as well as contact information for UMR Spills Group members can be found in the UMR Spill Response Plan and Resource Manual. Schmitt also asked if there is a threshold volume of release or potential release at which the states wish to be notified. The Group responded that there is not a fixed threshold *per se*, but rather an assessment of the potential impact on a case-specific base. Further, the Group said it is better to err on the side of reporting even small incidents so that agencies at minimum have awareness in case they receive questions.

Dave Donovan commented that, from the perspective of a local emergency management agency, he felt that USCG did an excellent job of communication during the event.

John Punkiewicz noted that, by coincidence, a report had just come across of minor release from a Marquette barge between Lock and Dam 11 and Lock and Dam 12 on the UMR. He said he would talk with USCG personnel regarding this over the upcoming meeting break.

Big Slough Debris Accumulation

Joe Sanfilippo displayed photos of a significant accumulation of debris, including some hazardous materials (primarily household hazardous waste such as propane tanks), which has built up at Big Slough, an off-channel area of the UMR in Iowa, as a result of large precipitation events and increased flows. Sanfilippo explained that the cleanup of the area has not yet been initiated in part due to the likely costs associated with this action, and that he is sharing the situation with the Group to gather any recommendations they may have regarding how to pursue such a cleanup.

Ann Whelan asked if the goal of the cleanup would be removal of all debris or just certain types of materials. Sanfilippo replied that, at minimum, Iowa DNR would like to see that the household hazardous waste is removed. Whelan suggested that it may be possible to appeal directly for federal assistance, potentially from FEMA or possibly USACE or USFWS.

Roger Lauder commented that, in a similar situation on the Sangamon River in Illinois, an accumulation of debris, primarily a logjam, was not removed in timely fashion and resulted in alteration of river flow, with further increases in removal costs resulting. As such, he recommended that this situation be addressed as soon as is feasible.

PHMSA Update

Mark Razny noted that there are three recent/ongoing PHMSA rulemakings involving rail transportation which may be of interest to the Group. These are:

- *HM-251A: Review and Update of Rail Carrier Regulations in Part 174*, which is pre-Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).
- *HM-251B: Oil Spill Planning and Information Sharing for High-Hazard Flammable Trains*, where a NPRM has been issued.
- *HM-251C: FAST Act Requirements for Flammable Liquids and Rail Tank Cars*, which is a final rule.

Razny said he would focus the remainder of his presentation on *HM-251B: Oil Spill Planning and Information Sharing for High-Hazard Flammable Trains*. He explained that this is currently an open rulemaking, where public comments had been received through September 2016 and where a final rule is expected in July 2017. Razny summarized this proposed rule as follows:

- It is responsive to the many comments received in response to the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in 2014.
- It revises the applicability of comprehensive oil spill response plans based on thresholds of petroleum oil that apply to an entire train. Specifically, it proposes to expand applicability of comprehensive oil spill response plans to high-hazard flammable trains (HHFTs) with 20 or more cars in a continuous block or 35 or more cars throughout the train loaded with liquid petroleum oil.
- It requires railroads to share information about high-hazard flammable train operations with state and tribal governments. Specifically, railroads must notify State Emergency Response Centers (SERCs), Tribal Emergency Response Centers (TERCs), or other state designated entities who share information with other state and local public agencies upon request, as appropriate.

Razny explained that the rule seeks to address concerns regarding the increase of petroleum transportation by rail, responds to the current situation where only basic response plans are required for trains, and follows recommendations from the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) to expand the applicability of comprehensive plans to address the risks from unit trains.

Razny described some of the components of the proposed comprehensive oil spill response plans (OSRPs) for HHFTs, including the identification of response zones along the rail route, plans to address a worst case discharge, a notification checklist, locations of oil spill response organizations (OSROs), identification of environmentally sensitive areas, consistency with the NCP and applicable ACP, use of NIMS/ICS, and procedures for training, drills, equipment testing, and recordkeeping. He explained that plans would be submitted to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) for approval and that the railroad would be required to review the plans every five years or after an incident.

Regarding the notification component of the proposed rule, Razny explained that that this would include an estimate of the number HHFTs that are expected to travel through each county within the state per week, the routes over which the HHFTs will travel, a description of the materials shipped and applicable emergency response information, and the identification of a contact point at the railroad. The proposed rule would require monthly notification by the railroad (or a certification of no change in anticipated HHFTs). The SERCs or TERCs may then provide information to authorized local governments upon request, though railroads may mark information confidential for security or business reasons.

Ellis asked if the rulemaking is expected to affect the release of rail shipment information to state and local emergency responders. Razny replied that to date, this process has been largely dependent on individual state policy. Fier-Tucker said MPCA has been working through this issue, as there are varying degrees of comfort among rail companies in regard to the release of information to the state. She noted that some data is labeled as security sensitive information (SSI) but it has not always been clear why this designation is made. Razny responded that SSI is typically a Homeland Security designation which requires that the information be secured. However, he added that his understanding is that this is a policy decision rather than a legal requirement *per se*.

Separately, Razny noted that Harold Winnie is no longer the Community Assistance and Technical Services (CATS) program staff person for the Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) Central Region. Rather, the new contact point is Angela Pickett (who can be reached at angela.pickett@dot.gov, 816-329-3823).

Other Agency and Partner Updates

Minnesota

Fier-Tucker noted that, along the UMR, MPCA had been engaged in a radiological release drill, as well as an exercise involving Flint Hills Resources. She also commented that Minnesota had faced extensive flooding issues, which had occurred at the same time as the Ferryville derailment discussed earlier in the meeting. Lastly, she noted that Minnesota is in the process of re-branding its agency logos so that individual agency logos will no longer be used and a single logo will be used to represent all state agencies.

Wisconsin

Brenda Kelly said there was no further report for Wisconsin beyond the Ferryville case study as presented previously.

Iowa

Joe Sanfilippo said there was no further report for Iowa beyond the issue of cleanup at Big Slough, as had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

Illinois

Roger Lauder said Illinois EPA staff had been engaged in a number of recent trainings and exercises, but there had not been any major incidents of late. Lauder noted that Alec Messina had been named Illinois EPA Director in July 2016.

Missouri

Rick Gann said there had not been any recent significant spill incidents in Missouri, though there had been some fish kills associated with recent flooding, including impacts to many Asian carp. He also noted that Harry Bozian had recently been appointed Director of the Missouri DNR.

USFWS

Annette Trowbridge said USFWS did not have any additional report.

USEPA Region 5

Steve Faryan said USEPA Region 5 had recently responded to a derailment of a Union Pacific train near Superior, Wisconsin. This incident involved the release of a product used in polyethylene production from tanker cars. The spilled product had been contained in the Pokegama River and prevented from entering Lake Superior. Faryan said state and local responders were also currently on scene, along with personnel from US Coast Guard Station Duluth.

USACE

John Punkiewicz said high water conditions have been a predominant consideration for USACE in recent months. He also noted that USACE Rock Island District staff had been engaged during the anhydrous ammonia barge grounding described in the earlier case study presentation.

US Coast Guard

CDR Lee-Kiddey also commented on high water conditions being a significant issue for USCG. She noted USCG's role in the barge grounding incident as previously described in the case study presentation.

Department of the Interior/National Park Service

Dave Anderson said the Department of the Interior (DOI) has been pursuing an Inland Oil Spill Preparedness project, funded at \$1 million for the current year and next year. He explained that this project is focused on the threat of spills posed by rail and pipelines. Anderson also noted that a DOI-developed inland oil spills course may be offered at Horicon Marsh in the near future, which will be supported by USFWS. He said the date for this training is yet to be determined. Further, he noted that DOI is seeking to hold this training across the country and in general is very open to partnering on preparedness projects.

Texpar Energy

Joe Gaspers said Texpar has increased its capacity at Davenport and is open to participation in preparedness activities when opportunities arise.

Environmental Restoration

Tom Fuhrhop said Environmental Restoration (ER) has been engaged in multiple responses of late and has been working with multiple US EPA regions. Bob Hite noted that ER has also been collaborating with Inland Rivers, Ports, and Terminals (IRPT) to engage port operators in the development of preparedness plans.

Scott County (Iowa)

Dave Donovan said Scott County is looking to build and enhance partnerships. He added that work is ongoing to form a CAER group in the Quad Cities area.

Seneca Companies

Chris Bieller reported that Seneca has continued to conduct response training for ethanol plants in the region.

UMR Spill Plan Update

Hokanson said the memorandum of agreement (MOA) governing the UMR Spill Response Plan and Resource Manual had been signed by the USCG District 8 Commander earlier in the month and was forwarded on to USEPA Region 5. He explained that the only signatures remaining to be completed were those of USEPA Region 5 and Region 7 Administrators.

The Group discussed the need to also update the UMR "Emergency Action Field Guide" and produce laminated copies as had been done in the past. Hokanson agreed to pursue the update and work with USEPA as they had previously provided for reproduction and lamination.

Mapping and Planning Updates

Region 5 Inland Sensitivity Atlas

Ellis said UMRBA staff continue working to complete the Illinois statewide update of the Inland Sensitivity Atlas (ISA), with anticipated completion in spring 2017. Fier-Tucker noted that MPCA is observing that industry has been integrating the ISA, as well as UMR pool plans, into their planning documents.

Sub-Area Updates

Ramon Mendoza said USEPA is coordinating with the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC) in the Quad Cities regarding an exercise being planned for the spring/summer of 2017. Additionally, he noted that the Quad Cities Sub-area Contingency Plan had recently been updated.

Heath Smith noted that the Great Rivers Sub-area Plan is being developed as a coordination plan which will bring together more specific tactical plans from smaller geographic units (e.g., Paducah area, Ohio-Mississippi River confluence area).

Smith also reported that the Greater St. Louis Sub-area Planning Committee had met in September 2016 and that the St. Louis Sub-area Plan is available via the EPA Region 7 site on the [epaosc.net](http://epaossc.net) website. He added that an initial Incident Action Plan (IAP) is in development for the section of the Missouri River within the St. Louis Sub-area. Smith said EPA Region 7 is collaborating with EPA Region 5 to schedule a Transportation Rail Incident Preparedness and Response (TRIPR) training for St. Louis in spring 2017.

(Note: Smith's report was actually given on meeting's second day, but is recorded here for continuity with other sub-area reports.)

New UMR Tools

UMR Spill Response Equipment Map

Matt Jacobson demonstrated the UMR Spill Response Equipment map, which is a web-based map allowing users to identify equipment which is stored on the UMR river corridor. Jacobson explained that the viewer can now be reached via the UMRBA website from the spills page (<http://www.umrba.org/hazspills.htm>) but that a password is still needed to view the map. He noted that the password is available from UMRBA staff upon request.

The group discussed the need for a yearly review of the contents of the map viewer. Jacobson agreed a periodic full review would be helpful, though he also emphasized that the idea of the viewer is that equipment holders can review on an ongoing basis and provide updates as needed (by either directly adding to the map or notifying UMRBA staff if an update is needed).

NRC Spill Reports Map

Mike Robinson displayed the current version of the UMR NRC Spill Reports map, which is available at <http://umrba.org/spmp/mp/sp-mp.html>. He noted that this version is produced using the Leaflet application, which provides some useful functionality (e.g., clustering) but is also labor-intensive to maintain. As an alternative, the map could be produced in ArcGIS online, which allows more flexibility in use and is easier to maintain, though it may not be as visually appealing. Robinson displayed the ArcGIS Online version of the map.

Hokanson and Robinson asked the Group to consider how they might to proceed forward. Whelan said she understood the rationale to move to ArcGIS Online, but would really like to see the clustering

function available in the map. Robinson said he could look into providing that functionality in an ArcGIS Online map. Hite suggested BatchGeo as another online mapping tool to potentially investigate.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5 p.m. and reconvened at 8:00 a.m. on October 26, 2016.

Review and Wrap-Up of Day 1 Topics

Spill Notification Process

Gann suggested that a notification drill should be held before the next UMR Spills Group meeting in order to test out notification processes. There was general consensus that the Group should seek to execute a notification drill in the near future.

Whelan suggested that a helpful tool for notification processes might be a dynamic contact list, which would be updated based on where the incident occurs, and that perhaps this could be integrated into an IAP template. Ellis said similar functionality could also be achieved by creating a jurisdictional map viewer for the UMR which could display regionally-relevant contact information. Mark Razny suggested that perhaps contacts should be tiered into primary and secondary contact groupings.

Razny noted that notification is often thought of as a downstream process, but asked whether there is any value in upstream notification as well. Whelan said there could be some value in terms of upstream response resources potentially being available to assist. She added that an airborne release could also have upstream impacts. There was general concurrence that some level of upstream notification may be appropriate. On the UMR, this might be one or two pools (locks and dams) above the release point.

Spill Notification Threshold

Gann also reflected on the preceding day's discussions wherein USCG had asked if there is a certain threshold amount of release above which the states would wish to be notified. He observed that since initial reports, as made to the NRC, often do not accurately reflect the eventual, actual volume of a spill, it is challenging to establish a volume threshold for notification. Reiterating the outcome of the preceding day's conversation, he recommended that notification be made according to the threat presented, as well as the potential threat (even if a release had not yet occurred) and that it is better to err on the side of "over-notifying" rather than to forgo notification. Schmitt thanked the Group for their input on this question and said he would share the feedback within Sector UMR.

UMRBA Strategic Planning

Hokanson said UMRBA's current strategic plan covers the period of 2013-2017 and includes spill response planning and mapping as one of the Association's seven core focus areas. He said UMRBA's Board had recently begun the process of preparing the next five year strategic plan and that spill planning and mapping will again be one of the focus areas. As such, he said it is likely that UMR Spills Group members may be surveyed at some point in the upcoming months in order to get their input into this area of UMRBA's strategic plan.

Geographically-Specific Response Planning

UMR Pools

Ellis said planning materials are currently being completed for the UMR Pool 11-12 area and will be finalized by the end of the year. He explained that the next UMR pool to be addressed in the planning process will likely be Pool 9, as its completion would mean there is a contiguous set of pool plans

spanning from Pool 5 to Pool 13. Brenda Kelly said Wisconsin's River Team would agree that completion of Pool 9 should be a next priority.

Ann Whelan observed that choices made to date in evaluating where to develop pool-specific plans have been driven by a convergence of sensitive resources (e.g., the UMR Refuge) with spill threats (pipeline and rail). Therefore, she noted, some of the pools on the lower UMR, and the open river, may be candidates for future planning given the presence of pipeline crossings. Whelan also commented that Pool 4 would be a potentially promising candidate for future work as its completion would help bridge the spatial gap between response strategies completed in the Twin Cities area and the plans in place from Pool 5 downstream.

St. Croix National Scenic Riverway

Ellis explained that UMRBA has entered into a cooperative agreement with the National Park Service (NPS) to develop a spill response plan for the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway (SACN). He noted that, although this work is not focused on the mainstem UMR, the St. Croix River is a tributary to the UMR and the tools developed/enhanced during the project may prove to be very useful for spill planning elsewhere in the region. As such, the St. Croix plan may be of interest and value to the UMR Spills Group. Ellis explained that work on this project had been initiated in 2016 and will run through the end of calendar year 2017.

Ellis said the St. Croix project addresses the entirety of the SACN from headwaters/tributaries to the confluence of the St. Croix and Mississippi Rivers. To aid in planning, the project will break the riverway up into four reaches and it is anticipated that an IAP will be developed for each reach and that a single planning product will then pull all four reaches together. Ellis and Robinson also displayed a preliminary St. Croix online mapping tool which has been developed to accompany both the planning process and any plans that are ultimately developed.

Dave Anderson said NPS is definitely interested in sharing information about the spill response plans it is developing, including not only the St. Croix plan but also spill response plan annexes developed for a number of other NPS properties.

Whelan said NPS' work to develop the St. Croix plan and others is much appreciated. She emphasized the importance of bringing together these plans, as well as industry-developed plans, in compiling response information for the region.

National Park Service Spill Response Planning

Anderson provided an overview of spill response planning within the NPS. He explained that he is essentially a one-person program working to support contingency planning at NPS properties nationwide. He said NPS had developed its response plan "annex" format as a mechanism by which to enter in to formal spill response planning activities and to initiate communication with those potentially involved in a spill response.

Anderson said a number of NPS spill response annexes have been developed in the Great Lakes Area in coordination with USEPA's Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) and that he would be sure to also share these with Region 5's Oil Program. He noted that one of his goals is to align NPS plans with existing regional contingency plans.

Anderson reported that an annex is currently being developed for the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area (MNRRA), which encompasses the UMR in the Twin Cities metro area. He noted that this work has helped identify 16 priority areas for protection within the MNRRA above and beyond the areas already identified in the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sub-area Plan's existing response strategies.

Anderson emphasized that in this, and other NPS planning efforts, his goal is to build partnerships and minimize duplication of effort.

Whelan concurred in the value of collaboration. She further suggested that it would be valuable to exercise response in the Twin Cities area as a way testing out protection strategies identified via NPS and in the sub-area generally. Anderson responded that NPS would be very interested in ground-truthing protection strategies and bringing in local partners.

Hokanson asked how the NPS annexes can be obtained or accessed. Anderson responded that he had originally envisioned a website to provide access, but that a number of obstacles have come up in this regard. For now, he suggested that individuals simply contact him if they are interested in receiving an annex. Whelan suggested that it may be possible for USEPA Region 5 to help in the hosting of NPS response plan materials.

Anderson reminded the group that the Department of Interior (DOI) also has an inland oil spills course it is seeking to make more broadly available. In this effort, DOI is looking to engage and collaborate with others agencies and organizations. Hokanson asked whether a training schedule is currently available. Anderson said he would provide Hokanson with the training schedule, which could then be forwarded on to the group.

Training and Exercises

Hokanson initiated the training discussion by noting that supporting training has long been a function of the UMR Spills Group, both by hosting training sessions directly and by collaborating in/promoting training sessions held by other groups. He displayed a table of recent UMR training events and asked the Group if they had any thoughts or preferences in regard to training for the upcoming year.

Whelan observed that, in terms of training location, the Montrose, Iowa venue had seemed to be very successful. Gann concurred that this was a very good location for training purposes. He added that the St. Louis area would also be a beneficial, if very different, location to hold training, noting that training in St. Louis might allow the opportunity to work with the commercial navigation industry. Schmitt and Whelan both suggested that a joint training program in St. Louis, in coordination with USCG, could be very advantageous. Lauder observed that, in order to facilitate participation, significant lead time would be needed in scheduling any training event. He added that Illinois EPA staff is definitely interested in shoreline assessment cleanup techniques (SCAT) training.

Mark Razny said PHMSA is looking to hold a training session in northeast Iowa in the near future focusing on oil and ethanol derailment incidents. He explained that this would likely be a one day, adapted, Transportation Rail Incident Preparedness and Response (TRIPR) training session. Razny added that PHMSA would also like to host a TRIPR training in St. Louis in the upcoming year.

Brenda Kelly suggested that, from Wisconsin's perspective, it would be beneficial to include a discussion of water sampling as part of training – e.g., what parameters are typically collected, why these are collected, where samples are taken and for how long. Annette Trowbridge said USFWS staff are interested in SCAT training, as well as a discussion of Wildlife Branch roles and duties. Dorene Fier-Tucker agreed, saying integrating the wildlife component is a unique angle that can be brought to UMR training. Fier-Tucker also expressed interest in a science of oil spills class. Whelan observed that the DOI inland oil spills training described previously by Anderson could potentially be a venue which addresses the science of oil spills. Anderson said the specific date of the DOI training to be held at Horicon Marsh is TBD, and it could take place either in the spring or fall of 2017.

Whelan said there would be value in fleshing out the desired components of a training module, perhaps looking back at the Montrose training agenda, and then delivering that training at a variety of locations on the river. Ideally, she said, this could be a one-day training module which could be easily adapted and implemented. It could also be paired up with another type of existing training or event, such as TRIPR training or a USCG industry day.

Joe Sanfilippo and John Punkiewicz suggested that a training could also address lock and dam operations as they relate to spill response. Lauder concurred, saying this would be useful component.

Gann suggested it would be good to coordinate on training plans with Joe Davis at USEPA Region 7, as he has historically been quite engaged in UMR training activities.

Next Meeting

Hokanson said he would be in contact with the Group regarding the scheduling of a next meeting, which most likely will occur in March or April 2017.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at noon on October 26, 2016.