



Cape & Islands GRP Group Meeting

September 20, 2007, 1:00 p.m.
MassDEP – Hyannis Office
973 Iyannough Road
Hyannis, MA 02601

Attendees

Neil Churchill- MA Division of Marine Fisheries
Peter Closson- ESCO Terminal, Inc.
Dan Crafton- MassDEP
John Davidson- Provincetown Harbor
Nicole DeBenedictis- Nuka Research
Elise Decola- Nuka Research
John Joe Dec- USCG Dist. 1, Boston
Bill Gasperetti- USCG MSD Cape Cod
Greg Gifford- Steamship Authority
Robert Gottsche- Marant Canal

Steve Lehmann-NOAA SCC Boston
Dean Melanson-Hyannis Fire Dept.
Allison Miller- USCG MSD Cape Cod
Sue Nickerson-Nantucket Soundkeeper
Sean O'Brien-Barnstable County Dept. of Health & Environment
Rich Packard- MassDEP
Mike Whiteside- MassDEP
Eric Shufelt- Barnstable Harbormaster
Mike Popovich-USCG District 1, Boston
Mike Whiteside- MassDEP

Welcome & Introduction

Rich Packard gave opening comments, noting that this was an important meeting that would result in the selection of approximately 30 GRP sites. There will be additional opportunities for review of the final product.

Recent Activities

Elise DeCola summarized the activities since the last meeting. Information collection and outreach has been going on all summer, with several small meetings held to solicit local input in this phase. She noted that the group will be narrowing the list of nominated sites that has resulted from these meetings down to 35-40 sites, and that GRP will be developed for approximately 30 of those sites. In addition to the site selection, a sub-group has met once to review and develop general tactics that will be used as the basis for the GRPs. She then referred the group to the site selection matrix, which had been revised to reflect input received over the last few days. She explained that it has been categorized by subzone with 4 main regions. Protection priorities set 1997 were used as starting point. At this point, there are more candidate sites nominated than can be selected, so the focus of this meeting is pare the list down, although it is still possible to nominate any sites that may have been overlooked. She emphasized that the matrix should not be abandoned after the site selection process, that it still has value in cataloging sensitivities and priorities should non-GRP spills be threatened by a spill, or should another round of GRPs be developed in the future.

Rich Packard added that the input to date has prioritized sites primarily because of natural resources and environmental sensitivity – therefore, this group today might



also focus on relative risk and protectability in selecting from among the nominated sites, since they are all sensitive areas.

Site Selection

DeCola referred to a handout that listed the high priority nominated sites by sub-region, and suggested that the group work through these based on their map location. She referred to a series of ESI maps that had been marked with different color dots to indicate general site location.

There was some discussion about the need to use local site names, and DeCola acknowledged that they would continue to revise the site names to align with local terminology. In general, the goal is to identify between 7 and 10 sites in each sub-zone.

The group began with the list of nominated sites for the Mid/Upper Cape subzone. They agreed to combine several sites, and to prioritize those sites that were most likely to be oiled and that had sensitive shoreline, particularly marsh areas. The group then discussed the sites in the Lower/Outer Cape, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket. The Lower/Outer Cape and Martha's Vineyard site lists were also pared down to meet the scope of work for the project. The Nantucket list included only 7 sites, therefore all of those were agreed to.

Many of the sites selected are large embayments with multiple marsh/stream areas. Some are pond systems with several ponds connected. The group agreed that for these large systems, the GRP would include several sub-strategies focused on the areas of highest concern.

In discussing the Lower/Outer Cape, Packard and DeCola noted that they had not had direct contact with the Town of Harwich during outreach efforts, and that someone would try to follow up with them to identify their top priority. One of the L/O Cape sites was reserved for a Harwich pick.

In discussing Monomoy, the group agreed that while it was highly sensitive, it was largely unprotectable. Similar determinations were made for areas on the outer coast of the Cape. In discussing the Muskeget and Tuckernuck sites in Nantucket, the group noted that difficulties accessing these sites might preclude the development of GRPs. Shallow water makes access difficult at low tides. Also, seal breeding is the primary priority and Lehmann noted that it is very difficult to design an oil spill strategy to protect seal haulouts and breeding areas.

There was also some discussion about protecting areas that can be closed off by blocking a culvert or washover area. The group agreed to try to identify as many of these areas as possible as part of this project, and include them somehow in the final document, possibly as a map that shows culvert locations for blocking, and another map for washover areas. Lehmann suggested that a protocol be developed for closing these two types of areas off.



The final list of selected sites is below. They are in no particular order. The #s in parentheses refer to the site numbers in the site selection matrix.

Mid/Upper Cape

1. West/ Contuit System
2. Barnstable Harbor
3. Waquoit Bay System
4. Popponeset Bay
5. Lewis Bay, Hyannis Harbor, Great Island
6. Woods Hole Harbor
7. Old Harbor/Sandwich
8. Scorton Creek

Lower/Outer Cape

1. Chatham Stage Harbor
2. Herring River (Harwich)
3. Pleasant Bay/ Chatham Harbor
4. Nauset System
5. Hatches Harbor
6. P-Town Harbor
7. Wellfleet Harbor
8. Rock Harbor/Namskasuit Marsh
9. Pamet River (Truro)

Martha's Vineyard

1. Menemsha complex
2. Tisbury Pond systems/Edgartown pond systems
3. Lake Tashmoo & Marshes
4. Vineyard Haven Harbor/ Lagoon Pond
5. Sengekontacket Pond
6. Katama Bay and Pond/Edgartown Harbor
7. Cape Pogue Bay

Nantucket

1. Nantucket Harbor entrance
2. Nantucket Harbor marsh (may be combined w/1)
3. Polpis Harbor
4. Madaket Harbor
5. Muskeget (if feasible)
6. Tuckernuck (if feasible)

GRP Layout

DeCola referred the group to the last 4 pages of the handout, which contains a draft layout for how the GRPs will look, based on Nuka Research's previous work in Alaska and the Buzzards Bay GRP layout. She noted that topo maps or charts would be used as a base layer in place of aerial photos, because they reproduce



better in black & white. She then walked the group through the strategy table and how the GRP would be used. There was a general consensus that this layout would work well for the project.

Tactics Guide

Because the meeting had run a bit over schedule, the group abbreviated their discussion of the Tactics Guide. DeCola noted that a meeting had been held in August and that a second draft of the tactics guide was on the web for review. The project will continue to focus on site surveys and GRP development over the next month or so, but she asked the group to also take this time to look at the draft guide.

Next Meeting

DeCola stated that the next meeting would be held in November/December, and that at that meeting the group would be discussing the actual GRPs for the sites selected today.

Action Items

- DeCola will generate a list of sites for review once more by the group. She will distribute via e-mail as soon as possible.
- The group will review the Tactics Guide and provide comments to DeCola.
- Site surveys will begin the second week of October. DeCola will circulate a sign-up e-mail for volunteers to come along on the site surveys. Local knowledge is particularly important. Boat access would also help.