

Mt Hope Bay Geographic Response Plan (GRP) Project

June 26, 2012, 9:00 a.m. Fall River Emergency Operations Center Fall River, Massachusetts

Attendees

Kira Adams - USCG Sean Baker - USCG

Colleen Brown – Swansea Con Com Rachel Calabro – Save the Bay

Priscilla Chapman - Mass Audubon Society

Dan Crafton - MADEP

James Cullen - Massachusetts

Environmental Police

John Duponte – Moran Environmental

Arnold Geller – USCG Auxiliary

Julie Hutcheson - MADEP

Dave Janik – Massachusetts Coastal Zone

Management

Scott Jepson – Somerset Fire Department

Merilee Kelly – Acushnet Conservation

Commission

Stefani Koorey – Green Futures Tom Kutcher – Save the Bay

Mike LePage - Fall River Fire Department

Chris McDonnell – Nuka Research Sheila Medeiros – Dominion Energy

David Messier - Somerset Fire

Department

Marta Nover - Taunton River Watershed

Association

Gary Oliveira - Macallister Towing

Rich Packard - MADEP

Mike Popovich - Nuka Research

Greg Sawyer - Massachusetts Division of

Marine Fisheries

Sanne Schneider - Nuka Research

Welcome & Introduction

Rich Packard of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) welcomed the group and introduced Mike Popovich, Project Manager with Nuka Research and Planning Group. Popovich thanked everyone for coming and asked that the group introduce themselves.

Review

Packard spoke about the history of the project as a whole, which had its beginning after previous oil spills, like the Bouchard in Buzzards Bay in 2003. The program was directed by legislation, to examine marine oil spills in coastal areas. During a response, Packard explained, Unified Command is comprised of the USCG at the federal level, the MassDEP at the state level, the Responsible Party (RP), and often an Oil Spill Removal Organization (OSRO). First responders, however, are often local fire departments, harbormasters, environmental organizations and stakeholders. The MADEP has provided coastal towns with the tools to respond in the event of an oil spill; Oil Spill Response Trailers, Geographic Response Plans (GRPs), and the training to use them.

The MassDEP and Nuka Research have developed GRPs for all the coastal regions in Masachusetts: Cape Cod and the Islands, Buzzards Bay, the North Shore, Boston Harbor, and the South Shore. The Mount Hope Bay region is the final piece of the pie for which GRPs need to be developed.



Review of Preliminary Site Selection

Popovich explained that there are 20 candidate sites in the Mount Hope Bay region. These were identified by using the Environmental Sensitivity Index maps (ESI) created by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The purpose of this site selection meeting is to obtain local input to identify sensitive resources to be protected at each site and to further delineate specific sites, if necessary. Packard noted that the boundaries for the region were chosen based on the two power plants bracketing the Mount Hope Bay region of Massachusetts, Brayton Point to the south and Montaup (now inactive) to the north. The inland or northern boundary for the purposes of this project will be the Berkley/Dighton Bridge and the project scope will include Assonet Bay and the Lees and Cole Rivers.

Project Overview

Due to the presence of several participants who were not able to attend the kick-off meeting on June 6th, Popovich, Packard, and Chief Sean Baker (USCG) provided a brief overview of the overall project scope covering much of the material contained within the "Project Overview" PowerPoint which can be found at the project website.

Packard noted that Fall River's trailer was on-site in the parking lot and there might be time to review the contents prior to the conclusion of the meeting.

Marta Nover of the Taunton River of the Taunton River Watershed Association (TRWA) asked to whom the trailers were accessible. Packard replied that typically the fire departments or harbormasters in each community have access to the trailers. Should a community need more resources, there is a process of mutual aid that can be utilized. Most coastal communities in Massachusetts were provided with trailers.

Popovich brought the group back to the GRP discussion, emphasizing that testing is the process that finalizes a GRP. Tom Kutcher from Save the Bay asked whether the GRPs used dispersants as a tactic, and Popovich replied that this project only encompasses mechanical response options and not alternative response technology like use of dispersant or in-situ burning. Packard and Baker noted that the ACP has a wealth of information regarding alternative response technologies like dispersants. Baker said that the dispersant policy, put into place in the 1990s, is currently being re-evaluated. Packard closed the discussion stating that the use of dispersants is beyond the scope of this project.

Review of Site Selection Delineation, Priorities, and Resources at RiskPopovich reviewed with the group the three primary site selection priorities: 1) the environmental sensitivity at each site: 2) the risk of oil spill impact: and 3) the ability to protect each site. Baker noted that within a candidate site there might be multiple tactics/strategies to protect sensitive resources.

Packard, in response to a question, stated that sites and/or resources are not ranked by priority as part of this project. In the event of an actual spill, prioritization will take place within a Unified Command (UC) setting with input from



the USCG, State, Responsible Party, and other entities at the federal, state, and local levels. Kutcher asked about cooperation between states, since Mount Hope Bay is encompassed by Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Packard replied that cooperation usually occurs during a spill and that in those cases when spill impact both states, the RI Department of Environmental Management (DEM) would be a part of the UC. Gary Oliveira of McCallister Towing voiced concern that a marine oil spill in shared waters might fall through the cracks between the states. Baker reiterated that RI/MA would both be a part of UC.

Oliveira noted that Massachusetts seemed more progressive in the field of oil spill response than Rhode Island and questioned the reason behind that. Popovich stated that Nuka Research developed GRPs for Providence four years ago, but that the project was limited in scope, only encompassing upper Narragansett Bay. Packard replied that it could be a difference in priorities or a deficit in funding, but assured the group that in the event of a spill the two states would work together and develop priorities as needed. Sheila Medeiros of the Brayton Point Power Plant (MA) stated that if there was a spill from the facility that would impact Spar Island, they would clean it up, though it's in Rhode Island. Packard reiterated that for this planning project the work group would focus on Massachusetts.

Site Survey Plan, Schedule, Logistical Support Needs

Popovich asked the group to break into two sub-groups and split up the candidate sites, to review and prioritize resources within those maps, and to focus on high priority areas. In response to a question from Stefani Koorey of Green Futures, Baker stated that the names of the candidate sites do not denote what should be protected (i.e. a map entitled Somerset Marina does not mean the Marina is a priority). It just delineates an area. Popovich agreed and reiterated that the Work Group can not only modify the site list, but also site names. He directed the groups to use the ESI maps and the site selection matrices, which use information from the ESI maps in a table format.

MassDEP Trailer Overview

Following the site selection break-out session, the group went outside the EOC to view the Fall River pre-positioned trailer which had been prepared for viewing by Fall River Fire Department personnel. Mr. John DuPonte from Moran Environmental Recovery provided an overview of the equipment in the trailer and explained how it is used in implementing the GRPs. The group then returned inside to briefly discuss and solicit participation in the next phase of the project; site surveys, and wrap-up the meeting.

Site Survey Teams

Popovich discussed the make-up of future site survey teams indicating they are typically comprised of local representatives along with personnel from the USCG, MADEP, Nuka Research, as well as other resource agencies, stakeholders, and OSROs. After a brief group discussion it appears that a minimum of two vessel days and a shore day will be required. Surveys will be done by land and/or water, and Popovich asked for volunteers from the group. He will contact the group via email to schedule surveys around a high tide during the last two weeks of July.



After the site surveys are complete, a tactics sub-group will meet to discuss boom configuration, anchor configuration, shore side recovery points, and local response resources.

Comments and Suggestions

Project Timetable

Initial meeting – June 6, 2012 Site selection meeting – June 26, 2012 Site surveys – late July GRP tactics – July/August 2012 Review/Finalization of GRPs – Sept/Oct 2012 Bring to AC meeting for incorporation into ACP – Nov/Dec 2012

Action Items

- Revise Base Maps of selected sites based on group input
- Finalize site survey schedule and participants
- Conduct site surveys
- Schedule final work group meeting in September

Popovich and Packard thanked the attendees for coming and participating in the site selection process. Popovich closed by saying that he would be in contact with the Work Group to schedule the site surveys and assemble site survey teams. The site selection meeting adjourned at 1200 hrs.