

Canada / United States North Slope (CANUSNORTH)

1998 Workshop



**CANUS North 98
Minutes
Table of Contents**

WELCOME/KICK-OFF 1

HISTORY OF JOINT EXERCISES 1

OPERATIONAL PLANS..... 2

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS..... 4

FUTURE INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT IN BEAUFORT SEA AREA..... 6

SPILL SCENARIOS 7

COMMAND AND CONTROL STRUCTURE 8

COMMUNICATIONS..... 10

IN-SITU BURNING AND OTHER NON-MECHANICAL RESPONSE TOOLS 12

EQUIPMENT & LOGISTICS 13

TABLETOP EXERCISE..... 14

SUPPORTING OBJECTIVES REVIEW 16

INDEX..... 18

CANUS NORTH 98

MEETING MINUTES - DAY 1 Wednesday, March 11, 1998

1. Welcome/Kick-Off - LCDR Mark Lickers (USCG), CAPT Denis Egan (USCG), and Mr. Barry Putt (CCG)

LCDR Lickers, the facilitator, opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 11, 1998. He made general announcements relating to the day's agenda, overviewed the exercise that would be conducted the following day, and explained the purpose of the CANUS NORTH 98 seminar/exercise. LCDR Lickers also outlined the structure of the itinerary and provided logistical information regarding the facility. He then introduced CAPT Egan, Chief of Maritime Planning for the U.S. Seventeenth Coast Guard District (CGD17).

CAPT Egan welcomed the CANUS NORTH 98 attendees to the meeting. He related an experience that emphasized the importance of taking cause and effect into consideration while planning for an oil spill in the area north of the U.S. Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). He also stressed the importance of cooperation among the various organizations from both the U.S. and Canada. He said this meeting was an opportunity to explore the two countries' different approaches to various situations and to discover the common ground between the two. CAPT Egan welcomed, in particular, CAPT Thompson, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) Federal On-Scene Coordinator (FOOSC) for Western Alaska and the North Slope, and Mr. Putt, Senior Planning Officer for the Canadian Coast Guard (CCG) Central and Arctic Region. He invited Mr. Putt to join him to make any additional opening comments.

Mr. Putt thanked the USCG, on behalf of the Canadians, for the opportunity to attend the CANUS NORTH 98 meeting, and gave an overview of his organization's operations and how they interface with their U.S. counterparts. Mr. Putt said his group was looking forward to participating in the exercise scheduled for the next day.

2. History of Joint Exercises - Mr. Paul Van den Berg (CCG)

Mr. Van den Berg said that on his way to Alaska, he was reading John Grisham's book, "The Partner", and two lines popped out at him: "It's all been planned. Then life intervened." He said those lines really set the tone for this type of response community and the activities they are involved in. Mr. Van den Berg took the group back to the early 1970s when the U.S. and Canadian governments had the foresight to develop a "Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement" to address increasing pollution problems. He said they also had the foresight to implement Annex 9, which called for a Joint Canada/U.S. marine spills contingency plan. This annex has developed into the current "Joint Marine Plan".

Mr. Van den Berg said that although the operational precepts in the existing plan had remained the same since the 1970s, there had been significant changes in both Canadian and U.S.

legislation since the Nestoka and the Exxon Valdez oil spills. He said these events have set the stage for the types of exercises that response agencies have been conducting. He noted that in the past, catastrophic event exercises have been the major focus. However, under the updated Joint Marine Plan, the emphasis would be shifting toward an incremental exercise program. These exercises would primarily consist of local level scenario, tabletop, video, and deployment exercises with expansion to a major exercise once every three years. Exercise sponsors would alternate between the U.S. and Canada each year. He said these smaller scale exercises would focus on core activities for responses. He said the focus of the CCG's National Exercise Program, for which he is responsible, would be on objective driven exercises.

LCDR Lickers introduced Mr. Deely for the next presentation.

3. Operational Plans - Mr. Mitch Deely (USCG), Mr. Barry Putt (CCG), and Mr. Larry Iwamoto (ADEC)

Using a power point presentation, Mr. Deely discussed the existing operational plans (OPLANs) which exist between the U.S. and Canada. He said the joint planning system consists of three levels of plans: the national level plan (i.e. Joint Marine Plan), the regional operational supplements (e.g. CANUS North plan), and the supporting local contingency plans on the U.S. and Canadian sides (e.g. the Alaska North Slope SubArea Contingency Plan). Using handouts, Mr. Deely highlighted the elements that exist in the Joint Marine Plan and the operational supplements. He further described how the various requirements of the operational supplements were broken down among the CANUS North plan and the supporting local plans. He noted that a training section had been added to the CANUS North plan which addresses Incident Command System (ICS) training and HAZWOPER safety training for U.S. responders. He pointed out that the Joint Preparedness Team responsibilities and contact list are also provided in the CANUS North plan. He said the communications section of the CANUS North plan was currently undergoing revision. Mr. Deely highlighted other topics contained within the CANUS North plan, including the proposed exercise program requirements previously discussed by Mr. Van den Berg. Mr. Deely then finished by stating that Mr. Putt and Mr. Iwamoto would discuss the supporting local plans.

Mr. Putt began by overviewing the Canadian plans system. He said the Canadian National Contingency Chapter is similar to the U.S. National Contingency Plan and provides the overall policy for Canada. It recently established the five CCG regions which include Newfoundland, Maritimes, Lorentschen, Central and Arctic, and Pacific. Mr. Putt said they are currently working to incorporate the old Arctic contingency plan into the new Central and Arctic plan. He said besides the U.S., he deals with three other countries: Russia, Denmark, and France. The five Canada/U.S. border response areas consist of the Atlantic, Great Lakes, Pacific, Dixon Entrance, and North Slope.

Mr. Putt said the Arctic & Central Regional Plan is currently in draft form and follows Canadian regulations which parallel the U.S. OPA '90 regulations. He said the deadline for finalization/promulgation is March 31st, 1999. Mr. Putt said the plan is divided into eighteen

areas (thirteen central areas and five arctic areas). The thirteen Central Area plans are almost completed. The five Arctic Area plans are in the beginning stages of development. He noted that the area that would affect the North Slope area includes Great Slave Lake, the MacKenzie basin, and most of the Beaufort Sea. As a side note he advised that the Northwest Territories (NWT) will be divided into two territories in 1999. Mr. Putt said the old CCG Operations Manual, Area Plans, Communications Plan, and Safety Plan were being incorporated into the regional plan. He said an "Arctic Strategic Plan" had also been developed which contains three sections; Prevention, Preparedness, and Response. He noted that this plan summarizes 34 points which encompass anticipated government, national defense, and commercial issues during a response. He said the deadline for having all eighteen area plans completed is March 31, 1999.

In addition, Mr. Putt said they are currently working in conjunction with Environment Canada on an Inland Plan which includes contractor and contact lists. Mr. Putt said they are working with Department of National Defense (DND) and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) to develop relationships that will facilitate emergency planning, preparedness, and response. He said they currently are maintaining four depots and ten arctic container packs in communities throughout the Arctic region. They are focusing on regional orientation through site audits, equipment evaluations, and training events. In the event of a spill, Mr. Putt said their strategy for response is community first, when pre-staged resources are available. In essence, the local community would be the first responders. The local responders would then be supported by the Rescue, Safety, and Environmental Response Branch of the CCG Central and Arctic region. Should the spill escalate, they would look to DND, other CCG regions, and other response organizations for support. If the spill should occur on the North Slope, international support would be automatically included through the activation of the CANUS North Plan.

Mr. Iwamoto reported on the development of the Unified Plan (i.e. the joint Area Contingency Plan (ACP) for Alaska) since its inception in September 1992. He said a partnership was formed between federal and state agencies for the purpose of plan development, and gave an overview of the sections of the plan. He said for purposes of their planning process, they created the Unified Plan Volume I, which covers the entire state and provides broad policy guidance, and the Unified Plan Volume II - SubArea plans, which cover each geographic region of the state. Mr. Iwamoto highlighted the federal and state planning requirements and said the Unified Plan and the SubArea Plans satisfy these requirements. He said in order to respond successfully in the Beaufort Sea, the Unified Plan Volume I must be used in conjunction with the North Slope SubArea Plan. He said the USCG had published the initial version of the North Slope SubArea plan in August 1993 in order to meet the OPA '90 deadline, and that plan development would resume in the fall of 1998. He said one of the projects they are currently working on is reviewing staging areas and command posts on the North Slope.

He also noted that at the local level, there are Local Emergency Response Plans and industry plans which include Vessel and Facility Contingency Plans (i.e. C Plans). Mr. Iwamoto highlighted the contents and purposes of each plan and explained how all the plans would work together in the event of a major response situation.

LCDR Lickers introduced Ms. Bergmann for the next presentation.

4. **Environmental Considerations** - Ms. Pamela Bergmann (DOI), Mr. George Balmer (Environment Canada), Mr. Doug Mutter (DOI), Mr. Mike Williams (NMFS), Ms. Catherine Berg (FWS), Mr. Jack Winters (ADF&G), Mr. Rod Hoffman (ACS), and Mr. Chuck Deters (ADF&G)

Ms. Bergmann advised that Mr. Balmer was ill and would be unable to attend. She provided overview information regarding the environmental resources in the North Slope region, the contingency planning process which the resource agencies have been using, and the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process.

Ms. Bergmann said the resource agencies within Alaska, through the Alaska Regional Response Teams (ARRT) working group, have worked closely in the development of the in-situ burning guidelines that are currently in place for the State of Alaska. She said the resource agencies have taken the position that while there would be a short-term degradation to the air quality during an in-situ burn, it would be more preferable than to have shoreline impacts. Ms. Bergmann explained the mechanics of how the in-situ burning guidelines work within Alaska. With respect to wildlife protection in particular, she said "The Wildlife Protection Guidelines for Alaska", are included as part of the Unified Plan. She highlighted various topics covered within the guidelines and described the three response strategies which form the bases of the guidelines. Ms. Bergmann said they are currently working on subarea guidelines for the Pribilof Islands, and they expect to develop North Slope specific guidelines over the next five years.

Ms. Bergmann said as a result of work conducted in Alaska by the ARRT's Culture Resources Working Group, the National Response Team had developed and recently implemented a national programmatic agreement which addresses the protection of historic properties. Ms. Bergmann explained the purpose and provisions of the agreement and she gave the definition of "culture resources" and "historic properties". She said the agreement had recently been tested during the M/V Kuroshima spill in Dutch Harbor, Alaska.

Ms. Bergmann explained how the resource agencies provide input into the Unified Command through the Incident Command Structure (ICS). She also gave an overview of the NRDA presentation she had given at a CANUS workshop which was held in Whitehorse in 1995. She said it was important to note that if there was a spill which affected the transboundary area, the resource agencies would anticipate working with their sister agencies in Canada to coordinate the NRDA activities.

Ms. Bergmann introduced Mr. Doug Mutter, U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) - Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, to provide the next segment of the presentation.

Reporting for the Sensitive Areas working group, Mr. Mutter outlined the conception and background of the working group. He said the working group consisted of a core body of state and federal representatives who move from subarea to subarea for the purpose of identifying

sensitive areas within the regions. He said the working group is currently developing a section for the Unified Plan which will include a contact list and a set of initial resource priorities. He said the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) was the lead organization in collecting information about various species, providing background information on resource sensitivity, and drafting this section of the plan.

Mr. Mutter said ADF&G had also compiled a series of maps of approximately 60 areas around the state that were considered to be the most environmentally sensitive. He described the mapping project and stated that the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) was a key member of the group. He said the planning they are currently doing for the North Slope includes several regional maps and detailed maps in the development area along the pipeline. He said industry was compiling a 1-to-226,000 scale map of sensitive resources in the developed area around Prudhoe Bay. He added that they are seeking funding for the development of broad regional maps as well.

Ms. Bergmann introduced the next three speakers who gave presentations on specific biological resources that are at risk.

Mr. Williams said U.S. National Marine Fishery Service (NMFS) is responsible for all marine mammals on the North Slope except polar bears and sea otters. He said NMFS' primary concern is for the bowhead whale migration, which occurs in the fall and spring, beluga whales, and ice seals. He said because of the scattered nature of the resources, they do not currently have a response structure or a strategy developed to address their concerns. However, they are developing plans that will provide guidance in the event of a spill. He said it is their objective to protect the integrity of the bowhead and beluga whales because they are a primary subsistence resource of Alaska Natives in the area. He said NMFS essentially plays a consultative role in the event of an oil spill when whales are in the area. He said NMFS has been working in conjunction with the Canadian agencies to identify the migration routes of the marine mammal resources that travel through the Beaufort and across the border.

Ms. Berg said on a national level U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (FWS) main resource responsibilities are migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, and three marine mammals: polar bears, sea otters, and walrus. Within the North Slope/Beaufort Sea coastline, the FWS's resource responsibilities center around the U.S. Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and its associated resources (i.e. marine coastal shorelines, estuaries, barrier islands, riparian habitats, lagoons, wildlife resources, terrestrial and aquatic resources, subsistence areas, cultural resources, recreation areas, and wild/scenic rivers). She said the sensitive resource concerns were of a highly seasonal nature, with summer and fall being the seasons of most concern. Ms. Berg highlighted the FWS's response activities and the measures they use to prevent and/or mitigate the oiling of animals.

Mr. Winters said his department in Fairbanks Alaska (i.e. the Habitat and Exploration Division within ADF&G) is responsible for protecting, maintaining, and enhancing fish and wildlife, habitats, and human use of these resources in the North Slope region. He said his department is the primary trustee agency for terrestrial wildlife on the North Slope and a co-trustee for migratory birds and marine mammals. Their concern is essentially for the seabirds in the Kaktovik area in the summer season, migrating bowheads in the fall and spring, belugas,

seals, and terrestrial mammals (i.e. foxes, brown bears, and polar bears). He said their focus in the event of a spill was to keep the animals away from the spilled oil. He described some of the protection measures they have developed over the years and their work with Alaska Clean Seas (ACS) in these efforts. He said they were also concerned with protecting shoreline habitats. He finished by saying that they would be working with the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) to identify high-priority sites within the area.

Mr. Hoffman gave a presentation on ACS' wildlife response program for the North Slope. He reviewed ACS's industry resources and wildlife management for wetlands and permafrost. He discussed training and permits. He said they have personnel available who are trained in hazing techniques as well as capture and stabilization techniques. He added that there are also trained environmental units within each industry Incident Management Team (IMT). Mr. Hoffman gave an overview of equipment resources available on the North Slope.

Ms. Bergmann introduced Mr. Diters of ADF&G for a presentation on the protection of historical properties and cultural resources during a spill event.

Mr. Diters said they have a relatively good perspective of the cultural and historical resources in the North Slope area. He said archaeological work had been performed as early as 1914, and they have identified the locations of most European-American historic sites in the area. He stated that sites located on bluffs are not at risk in a spill event, although they may be impacted by response activities. However, other sites located on the barrier islands and on the low dunes of the inside of the interior waterway would be at risk in a spill event. He described the sites and how they might be impacted by a spill and/or the associated response activities. He noted that their experience reflects that the most damage comes from the response activity as opposed to from the spill. Another point Mr. Diters elaborated on was that historic properties, unlike some wildlife resources, are non-renewable. Mr. Diters discussed the National Programmatic Agreement, which addresses compliance with section 106 of the "National Historic Preservation Act". He also gave an overview of participating agencies and available databases used during the M/V Kuroshima incident. He closed by stating that unlike wildlife population data, archaeological site information is restricted from release to the public in order to protect the sites and may require special coordination during a spill response.

The Environmental Considerations' panel members responded to questions and discussion was heard on various aspects of the presentations. Ms. Bergmann expressed her appreciation to the panel members. LCDR Lickers introduced Mr. McHale to give the next presentation.

5. Future Industry Development in Beaufort Sea Area - Mr. Jim McHale (ACS), Mr. Kent Richter (ADNR), Mr. Kyle Lonnigan (MMS), and Mr. Derrick Briggs (Northern Transportation)

Mr. McHale, President and General Manager of Alaska Clean Seas (ACS), introduced Mr. Richter to discuss future development in the Beaufort Sea on the U.S. side and Mr. Lonnigan of the Minerals Management Service (MMS) to speak on offshore tremblor areas.

Using overheads, Mr. Richter described the geographical areas of the North Slope. He gave an overview of statewide oil reserves estimates, production statistics, and discussed the North Slope's nine producing oil fields. He discussed various wells and prospects currently under development on the North Slope and stated that there are currently five plans under development that should be ready for implementation within the next five years. He then discussed current North Slope oil well and prospect activity, including plans for increasing production, abandoned wells, and recent federal and state oil and gas lease sales. He said additional information on exploration wells was available on the Alaska Division of Oil and Gas's web site and the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission's web site. Both sites can be accessed through "<http://www.state.ak.us/local/akdir.htm>".

Mr. Lonnigan said the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the "North Star" is due to come out in June 1998, with possible production startup around the year 2000. He said MMS was in the process of developing a draft EIS for the "Liberty Prospect", which will be the first completely federal offshore development project in the Alaska region. The EIS is expected to be completed in the fall of 1998. He discussed the scope of these projects and said they would involve the first buried offshore pipelines for transporting oil in the Arctic. He also stated that Murphy Oil received a three-year extension for their "Sandpiper unit" last year. Murphy Oil expects to conduct geophysical activity during the next two years and possibly drill a delineation well in the year 2000. Mr. Lonnigan said MMS was currently preparing "Lease Sale 170" to be conducted this summer for lease areas offshore of Prudhoe Bay. He said the MMS was also preparing regulations for the requirement of "certificates of financial responsibility" for offshore facilities. He said MMS currently requires site-specific oil spill contingency plans for exploration, development, and production.

Mr. Briggs said Northern Transportation Ltd of Canada was essentially a tug and barge company servicing the MacKenzie region along the Canadian/U.S. border in the Arctic. They have been involved in North Slope operations since 1963. He provided an overview of the company's scope of operation for the next year and the near future.

LCDR Lickers recessed the meeting for lunch at 11:35 a.m., and the meeting was reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

6. Spill Scenarios - Mr. Terry Cook (CCG), Mr. Jim McHale (ACS), LT Herb Oertli (USCG), and CAPT Ed Thompson (USCG)

Using a slide presentation, Mr. Cook showed representative pages from the "Beaufort Sea Environmental Sensitivity Atlas" and gave an overview of its contents. He showed various charts of areas in the Beaufort Sea around the Canadian/U.S. border. He stated that in the last ten years oil exploration activity in the Beaufort had virtually ceased to exist and any future spill events would likely be a tug or barge scenario.

Mr. McHale gave an overview of Alaska Clean Seas' (ACS) area of operations in the industrialized North Slope. He said an industry working group had developed a list of possible spill scenarios about a year ago. He noted that sub-sea pipelines beneath solid ice and

offshore blowouts in broken ice are new undertakings. He said the state mandate which requires complete spill clean-up within 72 hours would be a challenge. He explained the obstacles they would face in trying to comply with that requirement and described how the working group had developed solutions to remain in compliance. He said the draft plans have to be completed by June 15, 1998. The implementation deadline is July 1, 1998.

LT Oertli, the leader planner for the Northwest Arctic Slope Team, gave an overview of the latest draft of the North Slope SubArea Contingency Plan. He said following the distribution of the draft on June 15, 1998, the SubArea Planning Committee would task an operations subgroup to make final recommendations.

CAPT Thompson gave an overview of the USCG's role in planning and response on the North Slope. He also described the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) role in the event of a spill and the responsibilities of the EPA and USCG Federal On-Scene Coordinators (FOSCs). He said the ADEC, EPA, and MMS jointly review and approve North Slope response plans. He also stated that the USCG has no oversight or signatory authority for any North Slope response plans. As the USCG FOSC, however, he stated that he works closely with the other agencies to facilitate joint response efforts. He discussed political and Native subsistence issues that may arise as the result of a spill on the U.S. side. He stated that based on previous presentations, he thought the most likely request for the use of Canadian resources during a U.S. spill would be for barges and tugs. CAPT Thompson gave an overview of how the Jones Act would impact oil that was cleaned up and placed on Canadian barges for removal. He also stated that oiled animals (e.g. whales, birds, etc.) migrating from U.S. territory to Canadian might be another scenario which would activate the CANUS North plan.

The panel members responded to questions, and brief discussion was heard. LCDR Lickers recessed the meeting for a break at 1:32 p.m., and the meeting was reconvened at 1:47 p.m.

7. Command and Control Structure - CAPT Ed Thompson (USCG), Mr. Paul Van den Berg (CCG), and Mr. Darren Mulkey (ADEC)

CAPT Thompson said the military approach to ICS will not work in a spill event because of all the different levels of governmental agencies, private industry organizations, and volunteers who are involved in the response. He pointed out that communications security is a number one priority for USCG systems, due to military mission requirements, and that this has caused challenges in the past. He stressed that in a spill event, an open, easily accessed communications system is key to the success of the response. He said the FOSC's responsibility is to take all agencies' input into consideration and to ensure that resources are coordinated in the management of the spill response. He discussed the differences between the USCG's ICS approach and the widely used NIIMS ICS approach which has been adopted by agencies throughout the U.S.. CAPT Thompson also discussed remote response

challenges (e.g. the "Aleutian Solution"), how the Unified Plan supports the current ICS, the importance of including North Slope Borough's (NSB) input in decision making, and the importance of continued involvement in Mutual Aid Drills (MAD).

Mr. Van den Berg's presentation covered the CCG approach to ICS. He first outlined the Canadian legal framework for spill response. He said as a result of two major spills in 1970, the domestic liability compensation regime for oil pollution damage from ships had been established. He highlighted spill events since that time that had led to further legislation and the enactment of more stringent laws pertaining to oil spill pollution. Mr. Van den Berg described the provinces' and territories' involvement and responsibilities in spill prevention and response and gave an overview of Canadian laws which delineate which agencies are responsible for different aspects of a spill event. He also highlighted various agencies who are designated as lead agencies for spills that may impact the marine environment. He said the CCG had recently decided to proceed with the development of a response management system based on the ICS. He noted that the CCG ICS would be inherently different than the USCG ICS due to Canada's legislative environment. He described the past command structures and said while the essence of the ICS approach has been present in response situations for some time, it has never been formalized. He explained how current legislation makes the polluter-causer the cost-payer for pollution damage which results from a discharge of his/her ship. He discussed the procedures which are followed when the polluter takes responsibility for clean-up and the procedures which are followed when they do not. Mr. Van den Berg described the National Response Team's role in spill events and the procurement of resources. Mr. Van den Berg gave an overview of the structure and objectives of the proposed response management system.

Mr. Mulkey's presentation covered how the State of Alaska would organize in a response situation. He described the state and federal geographical boundaries, who has jurisdiction over which areas, the hierarchy of the unified command structure, and how it would operate in a spill event. He gave a brief overview of the state's Field Operations Guide (FOG) and the Unified Command Structure. Using charts, he highlighted resources that would be needed and time lines for certain stages of a spill response. He briefly addressed logistical problems inherent in a spill response on the North Slope, as well as the command structure and communications issues for a North Slope spill response. Mr. Mulkey recapped the state's agency and resource contact lists which include private contractors used by the state. He also gave an overview of the state's general objectives in a spill response. Mr. Mulkey said that as a result of the M/V Kuroshima spill, the state had developed a web site containing USCG and ADEC information which provided up-to-date information to the press and public. Mr. Mulkey reported that the North Slope Borough (NSB) and State of Alaska had entered into a Local Response Agreement this year. The agreement essentially allows the state to use the NSB resources and formalizes the reimbursement process for their costs. He gave specific examples of how the local knowledge base and resources could be utilized in a spill event.

LCDR Lickers recessed the meeting at 2:48 p.m. for a break, and the meeting was reconvened at 3:00 p.m.

8. Communications - CWO Bill Benning (USCG), Mr. Jean Guevremont (CCG), Mr. Jim McHale (ACS), and Mr. Ed Collazzi (ADEC)

Mr. Benning elaborated on CAPT Thompson's earlier comments regarding the secure nature of USCG communications. Mr. Benning said his incident responsibilities within the USCG included being a broker of communications support for the Captains of the Port (COTP) within each of the three zones in Alaska (i.e. MSO Anchorage, MSO Valdez, and MSO Juneau). He described the USCG's initial response procedures, which include the establishment of a communications system that would be in operation for the first 48 to 72 hours. His long-term priority would be to establish a communications system which would support response operations for the duration of the event. He described the primary communications equipment and its capabilities, including the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of using INMARSAT and cellular phones in a spill event. He said the USCG coordinates with other agencies, local communities, industry, and the responsible party (RP) to provide a communications vehicle for the USCG in an event. He briefly described the USCG communications station in Kodiak, which provides a significant MF and HF strategic communications capability. He also discussed how the use of current technology (i.e. the Internet) could be a tremendous communications tool in a spill event.

Mr. Guevremont addressed the Canadian Coast Guard's communications capabilities in the western Arctic. He said the Marine Communications and Traffic Services Division (MCTS) of the CCG oversees the operations of CCG radio stations and vessel traffic services. He stated that the CCG operates two stations in the Arctic; the Halkett Station on Bathen Island (eastern Arctic) and Inuvik Station in the MacKenzie Basin (western Arctic). He stated that Inuvik Station operates only during the navigational season. He said the MCTS mission is to provide communications and traffic services for the marine community and the public at large in order to ensure the safety of life at sea and the protection of the environment. He described the services provided at Inuvik Station, including peripheral sites and their associated communications facilities. He also overviewed MCTS's area of responsibility, the Shiva Project, and the impact the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) will have on MCTS's operations in the north. He said it was his understanding the USCG would be implementing HFDSC in the Kodiak area in the near future, which, with the GMDSS, would provide double coverage in that area. He stated that vessels must be in compliance with GMDSS standards by February 1, 1999.

Mr. McHale discussed ACS's area of coverage and gave an overview of the equipment that is currently in place throughout the North Slope. He said the equipment is state-of-the-art; including multi-subscriber and UHF/VHF hand-held radios, an earth station, base stations, radio/telephone links, and a mobile response center (MRC). He noted that all of this information was contained in the North Slope SubArea Plan.

Mr. Collazzi presented the state's communications capabilities, available equipment, and human resources. He said as the manager of the Preparedness Section within ADEC, he was responsible for ensuring that the Response Teams in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau have the tools to do the job they are sent out to do. He described the functions and purpose of the Statewide Logistics Group within his program and said one of their primary concerns is their

communications capability. He said his office had adopted an approach to communications which incorporates the use of small, portable fly-away base stations. This enables the Response Teams to establish rudimentary communications in the field in the beginning stages of a spill event. He described other communications equipment utilized by the Response Teams, their capability in at risk areas, and their coordination efforts with other agencies. He said they are currently working to expand their fixed VHF repeater systems in high-activity areas that are at risk for oil spills. He briefly addressed the Emergency Communications Response Team (ECRT), a strike team that is available for immediate deployment to any location within Alaska to establish an initial emergency communications link.

9. Review Outstanding Issues - LCDR Mark Lickers (USCG)

There were no outstanding issues to be reviewed at this time.

10. Recess for the Day

There being no further business on the day's agenda, and no objection, the meeting was recessed at 3:50 p.m., to be reconvened Thursday, March 12, 1998, at 9:00 a.m..

CANUS NORTH 98

MEETING MINUTES - DAY 2

Thursday, March 12, 1998

1. **Opening Remarks:** LCDR Lickers made a few opening comments and then introduced the panel members for the In-Situ Burning presentation.

2. **In-Situ Burning and Other Non-Mechanical Response Tools** - Mr. Tom DeRuyter (ADEC), Mr. Jim McHale (ACS), Mr. Bruce McKenzie (ACS/BP), and Mr. Barry Putt (CCG)

Mr. DeRuyter said they would be looking at in-situ burns from both the operational and regulatory standpoints. He introduced Mr. McKenzie to present the operational aspect.

Mr. McKenzie described the optimum conditions for conducting an in-situ burn, including weather conditions, wave height and speed, and oil thickness and properties. He said Alaska North Slope (ANS) crude oil emulsification tendency starts at 1 and stability is 1, so emulsion would occur immediately upon the crude hitting the water. He said for purposes of the tabletop exercise scheduled for later in the day, this means they would have a limited window of time to conduct an in-situ burn. Mr. McKenzie said for the burn removal rate, a typical good rate to use for calculations is .07 gallons per minute per square foot of oil that is on fire. He described how to ignite an in-situ burn by using heli-torches, diesel gel, and different types of igniters. He discussed the difficulties with igniting weathered oil and the issues of starting more than one fire. He also addressed the issue of safety during in-situ burns, including the importance of being aware of the potential for flashbacks after a burn has died down or gone out. He outlined the elements of a safety plan and what resources are currently available on the North Slope for conducting an in-situ burn.

Mr. DeRuyter said the State of Alaska had adopted, through regulation, the Unified Plan, which contains a section entitled "In-Situ Burning Guidelines for Alaska." He said the guidelines offer a logical basis for making consistent decisions while still allowing the best professional judgment of the Federal and State On-Scene Coordinators (FOSCs/SOSCs). He recapped the guidelines, including who makes the decision to conduct an in-situ burn; the OSC approval process; the implementation, authority, operations of the unified command; trial burns; and when in-situ burns cannot be used as a spill clean-up method.

Mr. Putt addressed the Canadian regulations which govern the use of in-situ burning in spill events and their procedures for authorization and implementation. He said although in-situ burning is still considered under Research and Development (R&D), it is a feasible clean-up method that is being technologically improved and used more frequently. He described the Novik, Newfoundland offshore burn exercise in 1993. The exercise entailed two burns that lasted about an hour and cleared 70,000 liters of oil. He described the participants, operations, and equipment used in the exercise. Mr. Putt gave an overview of the CCG equipment which is available at Tuk and Newfoundland.

3. Equipment & Logistics - Mr. Rick Janelle (USCG), Mr. Barry Putt (CCG), Mr. Jim McHale (ACS), Mr. Bruce McKenzie (ACS/BP), Mr. Ed Collazzi (ADEC), Mr. Lee Majors (NAVSUPSALV), and CDR ET Allen (ALCOM)

Mr. Janelle introduced each presenter and said they would identify their available equipment, where it is located, and how to access it. Following the presentations they would open the floor for a discussion of logistical concerns regarding equipment use.

Mr. Putt said the Canadian equipment resources which are applicable to a North Slope spill included ten arctic container packs, four depots, CCG vessels, contractors, and a support infrastructure. Mr. Putt elaborated on the types and locations of the equipment resources. He said Tuktoyaktuk, with an airfield, would be the primary resource location for a spill in the Beaufort. Hay River, with its staffed base and airfield, is a secondary resource location. He recapped the equipment inventory and resources available at each location. He overviewed equipment transportation, weather conditions, windows of opportunity, personnel accommodations, communications, logistical support, and customs issues. He gave an overview of the Inventory Maintenance Management System (IMMS), the Canadian inventory-tracking system, and The Maintenance Authority (TMA). He noted that the Canadians use laptop computers to input, transfer, and access their data.

Mr. McKenzie said ACS and the North Slope operators currently have over a quarter of a million feet of boom available, 28,000 feet of which is ocean boom; over 65 skimming systems; and 17 vessels. The vessels range from 20 to 65 feet and can operate in shallow water in the vicinity of the producing fields. He noted that ACS anticipates taking delivery of some new vessels in June 1998 as well. In terms of storage, they have floating bag storage units, six 249-barrel aluminum barges, as well as contractor storage resources that are available on the North Slope. Mr. McKenzie described ACS's comprehensive communications system, which is extendible outside the bounds of the North Slope operating area.

Mr. McKenzie described under what conditions equipment can be released for a spill near the Canadian border or into Canada. He added that Alyeska Pipeline, on behalf of the shippers from Prince William Sound, maintains a large stockpile of dispersant equipment and two contract Hercules aircraft. Mr. McKenzie said the logistical challenge would be in identifying the facilities that can be used as an operations base on the North Slope. He said Tuktoyaktuk, which has a 5,000-foot airstrip, would be the most likely Canadian staging point and Kaktovik, also with a 5,000-foot runway, would be the closest U.S. staging point. Stokes Point, which is very close to the U.S./Canadian border on the Canadian side, may be another possibility. He suggested that a marine base, utilizing barges and man camps, could be used in the summertime.

Mr. Collazzi said that as the head of the Preparedness Program, he provides support to the area teams in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau. He said in the case of the North Slope, they would provide support to the Northern Alaska Response Team. He described the process by which his group would be notified and authorized to provide support in an event. He said their responsibilities would consist of oversight and monitoring. Their equipment, the majority of which is located in Anchorage, consists mainly of communications, computer equipment,

and personal protective gear. He noted that deployable Connexes are located in Fairbanks and various places throughout the state. He said their outside resources include term contractors, community spill response agreements, and their call-out directory. Mr. Collazzi said communication, coordination, and integration among all the response agencies is a key factor in any spill event.

Mr. Majors gave a brief history of the U.S. Navy Supervisor of Salvage (NAVSUPSALV) organization. Originally the organization's mission was to provide salvage capability for the U.S. Navy (USN) worldwide. In the '70s, the USN added pollution response capabilities to their mission. Their responsibilities have expanded over the years to include other Department of Defense (DoD) facilities around the world. He gave an overview of the facility and equipment which he manages in Anchorage (i.e. U.S. Army's Fort Richardson Base). He maintains skimmers, booms, command bands, cleaning bands, rigging and shop bands, and personnel resources. He said there is approximately \$15M worth of oil spill response equipment on the base. He noted that the USN is designated in the U.S. National Contingency Plan as a resource for Federal On-Scene Coordinators (FOSCs).

CDR Allen, plans officer (J5) for the Alaskan Command (ALCOM), said Contingency Plan 5210 was their plan which supports civil authorities within the State of Alaska during all disasters. He said the plan had been signed during the summer of 1997. He recapped how requests from the FOSCs for oil spill response support are processed and highlighted what support is available. He described DoD resources consisting of fixed-wing aircraft (i.e. C-130s, CH-47s and 47Ds, and UH-60s), rotary-wing assets (i.e. Hueys), and land equipment; including heavy equipment and vehicles. He said Civil Engineering Squadrons and Public Works have trained HAZWOPER personnel. The U.S. Air Force has a "prime beef" package for setting up an airfield in a bare-base environment, access to communications squadrons with robust communications capabilities, and remote radar sites located throughout the state. He said the resources are requested by FOSC through his boss, CAPT Terry Walstrom (USN), the Defense Coordinating Office (DCO).

Mr. Janelle addressed specific logistical issues on the North Slope, including the availability of accommodations, storage facilities, trained personnel, and support transportation. Mr. Hennessy discussed health and welfare issues. Mr. Janelle stressed that there be one logistical section that handles coordination of all personnel in order to avoid duplication of effort and maximize the use of all assets.

LCDR Lickers recessed the meeting for lunch at 11:31 a.m., and the meeting was reconvened at 12:40 p.m.

4. Tabletop Exercise - LCDR Larry Musarra (USCG), Mr. Les Dawes (CCG), Ms. Charlene Hutton (ACS), and Dr. Rod Hoffman (ACS)

LCDR Lickers introduced the tabletop and highlighted the objectives. He said his role as the facilitator was to maintain the flow of the exercise. He stated that Mr. Dawes and LCDR Musarra would be the facilitators for their respective governments.

Mr. Dawes got things started. He said they wanted to focus on evaluating the notification procedures identified in various plans. As far as incident management, they wanted to determine how well the two countries can form a joint response team. From the U.S. side, they want to see how well the U.S. can merge with other agencies to establish their command teams and perform logistical support. He noted that on the Canadian side there are currently two CCG regions who would work together to cover a spill in the Beaufort Sea area.

Mr. McHale started off the exercise by saying he was the polluter in this scenario, CAPT Monique Lewinsky of Rinky-Dink, Incorporated. He described the incident as occurring on his drill ship Thorgisl, and he gave the location as just east of the demarcation line in U.S. waters. The C-Plan they would be using was built in '87/'88. Mr. McHale said he had evacuated the drill ship because of a fire and explosion with a resulting oil spill. He demonstrated the U.S. National Response Center (NRC) call he would be required to make under this situation. The NRC player forwarded the information to the Federal On-Scene Coordinator at the CG MSO Anchorage. The MSO actions were demonstrated, including telephone notification of the U. S. Coast Guard Seventeenth District Command Center {CGD17 (cc)}, ACS, BP, ARCO, and ADEC.

CGD17 (cc) then simulated making a series of Search and Rescue (SAR) related calls to the North Slope Borough (NSB), the Alaska State Troopers (AST), and other SAR agencies within the state. Once the SAR function had been set in motion, the CGD17 (cc) would alert their chain of command. They would be in direct communication with the MSO and would determine how they could be of assistance in the incident. They would initiate the contact list for the ARRT and would review the requirements of the CANUS North Plan.

The call from the CG MSO Anchorage to ACS was simulated. ACS advised that vessel was not part of ACS's co-op. Authorization for ACS's response would then need to be directed from the FOSC (i.e. federalizing the response) or the ACS Board of Directors. CG MSO Anchorage advised ACS to seek their board's approval. Simultaneously the MSO would access the "U.S. Pollution Fund" for deployment of personnel and resources to the incident. ACS advised the FOSC to contact the NSB so that they could contact Kaktovik.

The facilitator advised that the crew had come ashore, and the drill ship owner had chartered an aircraft and left the country. Discussion was heard regarding who would decide where the command center would be located and what additional information would be obtained from the MSO. Various lead agency representatives described the actions they would take and the calls they would make to implement response action, obtain funding authorization, and mobilize personnel and equipment.

CAPT Egan described how CGD17 would invoke the Joint Marine Plan and the CANUS North plan. He included the notification of the USCG Commandant in Washington, D.C., the U.S. National Response Team (NRT), and the USCG Pacific Strike Team (PST). On the CCG side, Sarnia, Hay River, and Prince Rupert would be notified. Discussion was heard regarding who the various agencies would contact and how the CANUS North Plan invocation would occur.

Mr. Cook advised that once the Northwest Territories had been notified, he would activate a 24-hour spill line. Mr. Dawes summarized the complete list of notifications that would be made

on both the Canadian and the U.S. sides. Notification of the ARRT, various state agencies, and the primary players were among those discussed.

Ms. Bergmann said DOI would be contacted by CGD17 or CG MSO Anchorage, and she described the type of information they would request. She said DOI would then notify DOI in Washington, D.C., the U.S. FWS, the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. MMS, ADF&G, the U.S. Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the State History Preservation Office, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. National Marine Fishery Service (NMFS), the Alaska Intertribal Council, and others. She would also offer to assist in the identification of an historic property specialist for the incident.

Other agency representatives described the actions they would take, who they would notify, and what their levels of contribution would be throughout different stages of the incident. Discussion was heard regarding the role of the MSO and the FOSCs, the deployment of assessment teams, activation of military support and command posts, what types of logistical support would be required and who would provide it, and the use of the "Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund" to finance the operations.

Mr. Dawes asked the FOSC for the North Slope, CAPT Thompson, and the Canadian Deputy On-Scene Commander, Mr. Putt, to demonstrate the conversation they would have after having been notified that the CANUS North Plan had been invoked. CAPT Thompson said he would first compare notes to make sure they both had the same basic notification information. He would advise Mr. Putt what actions had been done on the U.S. side and he would confirm the conditions and direction of the spill. Mr. Putt said the information would be filtered down to Sarnia, either through the Duty Officer or the Operations Center. He described what would take place after those notifications and the types of information he would elicit from the FOSC during that telephone contact. CAPT Thompson said he thought the main logistics support sites would be in Anchorage and Deadhorse, with the main command post being located in Kaktovik. After discussing logistics, determining the type of assistance needed, and determining priorities, the Canadian side could begin to implement assistance decisions and deploy personnel and equipment to the site.

Mr. Dawes ended the exercise. He recapped the notification process, invocation of the CANUS North plan, the contact between the U.S. FOSC and the Canadian Deputy, and the Canadians steps for gearing up for mobilization.

5. Supporting Objectives Review - Mr. Les Dawes (CCG)

Custom's protocols for taking equipment back and forth over the border and Ministry of Labor requirements for foreign civilian workers in Canada were briefly discussed. The importance of documenting all equipment and resources which would be transferred across the border was stressed. Mr. Dawes noted that the communications issues were primarily covered in the presentations, but continued coordination was needed. There were no observations voiced on the in-situ burning presentation. With respect to the ICS, there was general agreement that this issue needs more work. Specifically, further development and training is need for the ICS structure below the section chief level. Discussion was heard on logistics issues, including a

suggestion to include local government inputs to the ICS logistics section. The strategy development objective was not covered during the seminar/exercise. There was a general CCG consensus that the alerting procedures identified in their plans needs more work (i.e. with regard to communication between the Pacific Region and Arctic and Central Region). It was suggested that the NSB be added to the FOSC's notification lists.

Mr. Dawes reminded everyone to e-mail or fax additional observations to LCDR Musarra within the next three weeks. (Note: None were received.)

6. Closure - CAPT Dennis Egan (USCG) and Mr. Barry Putt (CCG)

CAPT Egan complimented the Canadian cadre on the their number of attendees and thanked them for their enthusiastic participation. His closing remarks focused on what had been accomplished and the importance of integrating the two response systems together. CAPT Egan also expressed his appreciation to the resource trustees for their participation and input during the course of the meeting. He said it had been a productive meeting and an appropriate level of exercise given the degree of plan development which currently exists. He said he was encouraged by the progress that had been made in getting a signed agreement in place between the two countries. He thanked everyone for their participation and wished them all God's speed during their return home.

Mr. Putt thanked CAPT Egan for his closing comments, and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the seminar/exercise. Mr. Putt thanked the CCG Pacific Region for its continuing assistance to the Central and Arctic Region during the transition of responsibilities for the Beaufort Sea region. He briefly discussed the importance of the planning process and said this seminar/exercise had been beneficial in addressing several issues of mutual concern.

There being no further business and no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

CANUS North 98 Minutes

INDEX

A

Alaska Clean Seas (ACS) 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15
Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) 2,
6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15
Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game (ADF&G) 4, 5, 6, 16
Alaska Dept. of Natural Resources (ADNR) 7
Alaska Regional Response Team (ARRT) 4, 15, 16
Anchorage, Alaska..... 11, 13, 14, 15, 16
Arctic Container Packs (CCG) 3, 13

B

Barges and Tugs (Canadian)..... 8, 13

C

Canadian Dept. of National Defense (DND) 3
CANUS North Plan 2, 3, 8, 15, 16
Cultural Resources (U.S.) 5, 6
Customs 17

D

Deadhorse, AK 16
Depots (CCG) 3, 13
Disperants (U.S.) 13

E

Exercise Requirements 2, 17

H

Hay River, NWT..... 13, 16
Historical Resources (U.S.) 6

I

Incident Command System (ICS) 2, 4, 9, 17
Inuvik, NWT..... 10

J

Joint Marine Plan..... 1, 2, 16

K

Kaktovik, AK..... 6, 13, 15, 16

Kodiak, AK 10, 11

M

M/V Kuroshima Spill (Aleutians)..... 4, 6, 10
Marine Mammals..... 5, 6

N

Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA)..... 4
North Slope Borough, AK (NSB)..... 9, 10, 15, 17
Northern Transportation Ltd of Canada..... 7

P

Pipelines (U.S. new) 7, 8

S

Search & Rescue (SAR) 15
Sensitive Areas 5
Stokes Point, AK 13
SubArea Plans (U.S.)..... 2, 3, 8, 11
Subsistence Resources (U.S.) 5, 8

T

Tukttoyaktuk, NWT..... 13

U

U.S. Alaska Command (ALCOM) 13, 14
U.S. Dept. of Defense (DoD) 14
U.S. Dept. of Interior (DOI) 4, 16
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)..... 8
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) 4, 5, 16
U.S. Mineral Management Service (MMS)..... 7, 8, 16
U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) ... 4, 5, 16
U.S. Navy Supervisor of Salvage (NAVSUPSALV).....
13, 14
Unified Plan (Alaskan ACP) 3, 4, 5, 9, 12

W

Web Sites..... 7, 10

CANUSNORTH 98 Participants

Name	Organization-Location	Job/Specialty Description	Exercise Role - Presentations	Phone & FAX	E-mail
1 Allen, E.T. CDR	U.S.Fed - Alaska Command (Joint Army, Navy, & Air Force Command)- Anchorage, AK	J5 - Contingency Plans	Participant - Equip/Logistics	P: (907) 552-8133 F: (907) 552-8136	allen.edward@hqexch1.elmendorf.af.mil
2 Amell, Ray	CCG- ONT.-Prescott	Program Manager	Observer	P: (613) 925-2865	amellr@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
3 Anderson, John	U.S. Local Government - Northslope Borough, AK		Participant	P: (907) 852-0390 F: (907) 852-0327	Janderson@companyco.NorthSlope.ak.us
4 Balmer, George*	CAN Fed- Environment Canada - Whitehorse, Yukon	Environmental Issues	Participant - Environmental Issues & In-situ Burn	P: (867) 667-3406	BalmerGeorgeEC@df0-mpo.gc.ca
5 Benning, Bill CWO	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mor) - Communications	Participant - Communications	P: (907) 463-2343	wbenning@cgalaska.uscg.mil
6 Bergmann, Pamela*	U.S.Fed - Department of Interior (DOI)-Anchorage, AK	Environmental Issues	Participant - Environmental Issues	P: (907) 271-5011 F: (907) 271-4102	Pamela_Bergmann@ios.doi.gov
7 Brachma, Calvin	CAN Local- Government of NWT		Participant - Future Development in Beaufort Sea		
8 Briggs, Derick	CAN Industry- Northern Transportation Company Ltd. (NTCL) - Hay River, NWT	Environment Officer	Observer	P: (867) 874-5132	debriggs@ntcl.com
9 Butler, Jean CDR	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mpc) - Plans & Exercises	z-Not attending	P: (907) 463-2210 F: (907) 463-2216	jbutler@cgalaska.uscg.mil
10 Cocklin-Vendi, Mary	U.S. Industry - BP	Environmental Health and Safety	Participant - Future Development in Beaufort Sea	P: (907) 564-4766	
11 Collazzi, Ed	State of Alaska - Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) - Juneau, AK	Preparedness Section Manager	Participant - Communications & Equip/Logistics	P: (907) 465-5229 F: (907) 465-5244	Ecollazz@envircon.state.ak.us
12 Cook, Terry*	CCG- Hay River, NWT	Program Manager	Participant - Scenarios	P: (867) 874-5559	cookt@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
13 Dawes, Les	CCG- B.C.-Victoria	Regional Exercise Officer	Controller - Exercise Design (Lead)	P: (250) 920-6963 F: (250) 743-4890	dawesl@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
14 Deely, Mitch	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mpc) - Plans & Exercises	Participant - Plans: CANUS	P: (907) 463-2208 F: (907) 463-2216	ideely@cgalaska.uscg.mil
15 DeRuyter, Tom	State of Alaska - Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) - Anchorage, AK	Northern Area Response Team	Participant - In-Situ Burning	P: (907) 451-2145 F: (907) 451-2362	Tderuyte@envircon.state.ak.us
16 Diters, Chuck	U.S.Fed - Fish & Wildlife Servicer		Observer	P: (907) 786-3386	chuck_diters@mail.pws.gov
17 Dutrizac, Bill	CCG- B.C.-Richmond	Acting Supervisor of Response	Participant	P: (604) 313-6319 F: (604) 270-7349	dutrizacb@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
18 Egan, Dennis CAPT	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mp) - Plans & Exercises	Participant - Introduction	P: (907) 463-2199	degan@cgalaska.uscg.mil
19 Ehrhart, John	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mpc) - Plans & Exercises	z-Not attending	P: (907) 463-2217 F: (907) 463-2216	jehrhart@cgalaska.uscg.mil
20 Goodman, John	CCG- ONT.-Samia	Supervisor of Response	z-Not attending	P: (519) 383-1954	goodmanj@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
21 Guevremont, Jean	CCG- ONT.-Samia	Communications Branch	Participant - Communications	P: (513) 383-1941	guevremontj@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
22 Hennessy, Brian*	CCG- B.C.-Prince Rupert	Senior Response Officer (SERPO)	Participant	P: (250) 627-0316	hennessyb@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
23 Hoffman, Rod DR.	U.S. Industry - ACS		Controller - Exercise Design	P: (907) 659-8145 F: (907) 659-8228	Rhoffman@alaska.net
24 Hutton, Charlene	U.S. Industry - ACS	Special Projects & Development Coordinator	Controller - Exercise Design	P: (907) 659-3207 F: (907) 659-2616	akclean@alaska.net
25 Iwamoto, Larry*	State of Alaska - Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) - Anchorage, AK	Prevention Section Manager	Participant - Plans: Northslope ACP Vol II	P: (907) 269-7683 F: (907) 269-7648	Iwamoto@envircon.state.ak.us
26 Jacobsen, Rosanne	U.S. Industry - ARCO/Eide & Miller		Observer	P: (907) 265-1338	rjacobs@mail.arco.com
27 Janelle, Rick*	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mor) - Oil spill equipment specialist	Participant - Equip/Logistics	P: (907) 463-2247	rjanelle@cgalaska.uscg.mil
28 Kadow, Kenneth	U.S. Industry - ACS		Observer	P: (907) 659-3226	
29 Lickers, Mark LCDR	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (dqpc) - Facilitator	Controller - Facilitator	P: (907) 463-2047	mlickers@cgalaska.uscg.mil
30 Majors, Lee	U.S.Fed - Navy Supervisor of Salvage (NAVSUPSALV) - Anchorage, AK	Base Manager - Equipment Specialist	Participant - Equip/Logistics	P: (907) 384-2968 F: (907) 384-2969	supsalv@alaska.net

CANUSNORTH 98 Participants

	Name	Organization-Location	Job/Specialty Description	Exercise Role - Presentations	Phone & FAX	E-mail
31	Mattson, Bob	State of Alaska - Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) - Juneau, AK	Southern Area Response Team (SART)	Observer	P: (907) 465-5349 F: (907) 465-2237	bmattson@envircon.state.ak.us
32	McHale, Jim	U.S. Industry - Alaska Clean Seas (ACS) - Anchorage/Northslope, AK	Oil Spill Response Organization (OSRO)	Participant - All sections	P: (907) 762-3330 F: (907) 659-2616	JEMcHale@alaska.net
33	McKenzie, Bruce	U.S. Industry - ACS/BP		Participant - In-Situ Burning & Equip/Logistics	P: (907) 564-5511	mckenzbd@bp.com
34	Mellow, Chris	U.S. Local Government - Northslope Borough, AK	Mayor's Office	Participant		
35	Monkelien, Klye	U.S.Fed - Minerals Management Service - Anchorage, AK		Observer	P: (907) 271-6431	Kyle_Monkelien@mms.gov
36	Mulkey, Darren	State of Alaska - Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) - Anchorage, AK	Northern Area Response Team	Participant - Command and Control	P: (907) 451-2126 F: (907) 451-2362	Dmulkey@envircon.state.ak.us
37	Musarra, Larry LCDR	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mpc) - Plans & Exercises	Controller - Exercise Design (Lead)	P: (907) 463-2211 F: (907) 463-2216	lmusarra@cgalaska.uscg.mil
38	Mutter, Doug	U.S.Fed - Department of Interior (DOI)-Anchorage, AK		Observer	P: (907) 271-5011 F: (907) 271-4102	douglas_mutter@ios.doi.gov
39	Oertli, Herb LT	USCG-Anchorage, AK	MSO - Operational Planner	Participant	P: (907) 271-6700 F: (907) 271-6751	msoanc@alaska.net
40	Ogilvie, Rick	CCG- B.C.-Prince Rupert	Program Support Officer	Observer	P: (604) 624-5390 F: (604) 627-1513	ogilvier@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
41	Pawlowski, Rick LCDR	U.S.Fed - Alaska Command (Joint Army, Navy, & Air Force Command)-Anchorage, AK	J6 - Communications	Participant - Communications	P: (907) 552-1988 -1913	Pawlowski.Fredrick@HQEXCH1.Elmendorf.af.mil
42	Putt, Barry	CCG- ONT.-Sarnia	Contingency Planning Officer	Participant - Introduction and Equip/Logistics	P: (519) 383-1956	puttb@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
43	Rodden, Don*	CCG- B.C.-Vancouver	Acting Superintendent Rescue & Environmental Response	z-Not attending	P: (604) 775-8839	roddend@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
44	Schuyler, Alan	U.S. Industry - ARCO	Environmental Health and Safety	Participant - Future Development in Beaufort Sea	P: (907) 263-4307	aschuy@mail.arco.com
45	Stucke, Heinz	CCG- ONT.-Prescott	IMMS Officer - Equipment Database	Participant	P: (613) 925-2865	stuckeh@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
46	Thompson, Ed CAPT*	USCG-Anchorage, AK	MSO - Commanding Officer	Participant - Scenarios and Command & Control	P: (907) 271-6700 F: (907) 271-6751	msoanc@alaska.net or Ethompson@cgalaska.uscg.mil
47	Thornburgh, Don	U.S. Local Government - Northslope Borough, AK		Participant		
48	Tuxhorn, Ross CDR	USCG-Juneau, AK	District (mor) - Operations/Command Center	Participant	P: (907) 463-2244	rtuxhorn@cgalaska.uscg.mil
49	Van den Berg, Paul	CCG- ONT.-Ottawa	Senior Officer Planning & Preparedness	Participant - History of Joint Exercises, Plans: Arctic Region, and Command & Control	P: (613) 993-9755 F: (613) 996-8902	vandenberp@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
50	VanDerploegs, Kirk	CAN Industry- Northern Transportation Company Ltd. (NTCL) - Anchorage, AK	Operations Manager	Participant - Future Development in Beaufort Sea	P: (907) 264-6682	poc@alaska.net
51	Walker, Jeff	U.S.Fed - Minerals Management Service - Anchorage, AK		Participant		
52	Wheeler, Alex	CCG- ONT.-Sarnia	Program Manager - Rescue, Safety, & Enviro. Response	Participant	P: (519) 383-1978	wheelera@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
53	Whitney, John Dr.	U.S.Fed - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)-Anchorage, AK	Scientific Support Coordinator	z-Not attending	P: (907) 271-3593 F: (907) 271-3139	whitney@hazmat.noaa.gov
54	Williams, Michael	U.S.Fed - National Marine Fisheries		Observer	P: (907) 271-5006	mike.williams@noaa.gov
55	Winters, Jack	State of Alaska - Dept. of Fish & Game - Anchorage, AK		Observer	P: (907) 459-7285	Jwinters@fishgame.state.ak.us

* = Participated in CANUS NORTH 1995 exercise (Whitehouse, Yukon).

Exercise Planner Notes for CANUS North 98

1. Exercise Format.

-The seminar format, which was developed for the exercise, was very successful for the following reasons:

- (1) The operational plans which define joint response operations are in draft form.
- (2) The participants, while subject matter experts, do not normally work together to respond to oil spills (e.g. USCG and CCG).
- (3) The last joint exercise which addressed "Command Issues" had occurred two years earlier.
- (4) Many of the U.S. players had changed since the last joint exercise.
- (5) The after action report from the last exercise was not very detailed.
- (6) Issues, which were important to participants and were not known to the planners, were easily brought to the attention of the entire group for discussion/resolution.
- (7) The presentations provided participants the opportunity to learn from each other in a non-decision making environment.
- (8) The presentations set the stage for the table top exercise at the end of the seminar.
- (9) The format allowed for relatively accurate recording of important issues.

-It should be noted that the above issues are, more likely than not, the standard situation which planners face when coordinating exercises involving joint operations. Keeping this in mind, we highly recommend the seminar format to exercise joint response groups. If a field deployment exercise is scheduled, we further recommend a multi-exercise program which begins with a seminar formatted exercise.

-The seminar/exercise should have started with a presentation covering the geographic area of the Beaufort Sea region (e.g. significant geographic landmarks, distances from local communities, community descriptions, prevailing weather and current conditions, transportation facilities, etc.). Due to the varying experiences of the participants and the large expanse of territory involved, this presentation would have created an valuable baseline for following presentations/discussions.

-Breaks were scheduled in the itinerary for 5-10 minutes each hour. This provided the facilitator the flexibility to take the breaks or press on with the itinerary when presentations went overtime.

-Planners should be careful not to cover too many topics/objectives during an exercise. Generally, the more topics covered - the less time for detailed presentations and discussions.

2. Presentation Coordination.

-Detailed guidance needs to be provided to panel leaders and presenters at least *three weeks before* the event. The guidance should provide the reason for each presentation, the topics to cover, information for coordinating with other agency experts, and the time constraints (i.e. the itinerary).

-The A/V capabilities of the facility should be provided to the presenters as soon as they are available. Planners should resolve this issue at least *four weeks before* the event so that it can be included in the panel leader/presenter guidance.

-An additional overhead machine with a map of the geographic area would have been helpful during the presentations. This would have allowed the presenters to utilize both their A/V equipment and a map of the area. In addition, the map would have been useful to presenters who were not able to give A/V presentations.

-We scheduled a one hour “Panel Coordination Meeting” during the first hour of the event which worked extremely well. This allowed presenters from industry, state/territories, and federal agencies the opportunity to informally get to know each other and discuss the flow of their panel’s presentations. In addition, presenters with A/V equipment had the opportunity to make sure it was set up and working correctly.

3. Stenographer Services.

-The use of a professional stenographer greatly assisted in the documentation of the presentations and discussions. The timeliness and level of detail captured by the stenographer greatly surpassed the capabilities of the CG planning staff. This also allowed the event planners to meet the “last minute” needs of the participants (e.g. making copies of handouts) without affecting the documentation process.

-Specific guidance needs to be provided for the stenographer so that their report will contain the level of detail desired for the after action report. The itinerary and objectives should be used to define when the stenographer can summarize discussions and when detailed recording is needed.

-The stenographer should provide their report electronically in a format compatible with the applicable CG standard workstation (e.g. Word not Word Perfect).

-In order to accurately document “who said what”, the stenographer needs a detailed participant list and should be positioned at a dedicated table in the front of the room.

-Wires for the stenographer’s recording system (e.g. stationary microphones) need to be secured with tape to prevent tripping hazards.

4. Professional Facilitator.

-A professional facilitator was very effective in managing player participation and in keeping the presentations in time with the itinerary.

-The facilitator was extremely effective in conducting an “unbiased” hotwash. A detailed objectives list was provided to the facilitator which allowed him to run the session even though he was not a subject matter expert for the topics.

-The facilitator has seated near the stenographer and assisted in identifying speakers.

5. Sound System. During the table top exercise a cordless microphone would have facilitated player participation and the ability of other players and the stenographer to hear what was said.