**Regions 4 & 5 Regional Response Team (RRT)**

**Fall 2018 Meeting Minutes**

**Radisson Hotel Cincinnati Riverfront**

**668 W 5th St**

**Covington, Kentucky 41011**

**Tuesday, October 16, 2018 – RRT 5 Subcommittee Meeting**

1. **Science & Technology Subcommittee** **Ms. Faith Fitzpatrick, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)**

The Coast Guard’s sub-committee chair Scott Binko reported out on the S&T subcommittee topics.

* 1. Group developing DRAFT Vendor Protocol.
		1. Reasoning is to start action at the RRT S&T and not just at the National Response Team (NRT).
			1. It benefits the vendors.
			2. It is a ground up approach.
		2. This protocol provides information to aid private industry and product vendors who wish to share product information with response agencies within the Region 5 area of responsibility.
	2. Questions –
		1. Is this a standalone piece/plan?
			1. Doesn’t have to be in a plan; however, it can be alongside plans. They can reference it or add it as an annex.
	3. Enbridge on water burn in Canada.
		1. Canada is asking RRT 5 what they would like to see, document, and test, during a controlled-on water burn on one of Canada’s controlled/test lakes.
			1. Location – in Canada near Winnipeg (Vince Palace).
			2. Canada is using smaller lakes to use for the study.
			3. There have been multiple studies (anobe burns) in Northeast Canada. This would be a wonderful opportunity to study biomass on the shores.
			4. There are a lot of studies on vegetation burns.
			5. Successful burns documented in North Dakota.
			6. A comment was made that the Delta Ducks bill in New Orleans, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) had funding for studies similar to the Enbridge on water burns in Canada.
			7. A comment on burns in Katrina and other fresh water/fresh marsh burns have been performed.
			8. Department of Canada is in the loop of this as well as First Nation.
		2. Suggestion was made for the S&T to come up with a work group that will populate an email surveying what they would like to test and see during the burns and what they would like to study.
			1. Action item of 60-day notice for the RRT 5 to get everything they need for the study.
		3. Comment was made that you might need to reverse engineer the approval process for this action. There is Federal and State approval. What do we need to know to get an approval? Will the strictest process cover everyone?
	4. Questions –
		+ 1. Is each state in Region 5 different in what they want to see during a controlled burn?
				1. Most likely yes. Sub-committee will have to poll each state on controlled burn policies. Might make sense to take the strictest controlled burns policy and implement it during the test.
			2. What type of lake is it? Is it a dead lake? Are there fish? It would be good to know this information.
				1. The Canadian lake is not dead. There are species in it. The sub-committee will reach out to find out specifics of what is in the lake to help determine what the RRT 5 would like to see in the tests.
			3. Is there a concern about instrumentation and what wildfire uses for the west coast during monitoring (dust tracks and data rams)?
				1. This question identified the need for the committee to reach out to wildfire agencies to see what instruments they are using during a wildfire event.
			4. What is the approval process for each state?
				1. Currently unknown but the work group will pursue.
			5. Would we like to test Herders?
				1. Region 1 is looking at Herders. Ohio/Cincinnati U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is looking at the effectiveness of herd burning in calm arctic waters.
			6. What products do we test during the burn?
				1. Enbridge has 70+ products that they could use/test. Maybe focus on highest volume of product.
	5. Research and Development (R&D) submerged recovery training/exercise.
		1. There was an inland submerged training/exercise that occurred. Still waiting on the report from RD&C.
	6. Transport of oil research.
		1. Research is in the planning and development fund. They look to create models that can be put together for On-Scene Coordinators (OSCs) and others for responses.
		2. Meeting with Federal agencies about tools and models.
	7. Glacial rivers – Crucial to learn about and maybe get a webinar on Development and Implementation (D&I).
		1. Data about rivers that enter the lake. Multi-directional flow happens 4-5 times a day. With the storms they are happening even more frequently. Studies are being done on how spills will be affected by multi-flow. A lot of prediction is going on with NOAA regarding spills and weather forecasting. There is a hazard associated with that on the coastal aspect. Everything is in flux due to rain and other weather factors.
	8. Fish and wildlife. Developed a color code excel sheet to fit into response plans easily on the level of impact for a set of species. The color code excel sheet will help give response operators/inform the response process. Simplify the response to one set of species.
	9. Questions –
		1. Does the RRT want to do species fact sheets? Is there an opportunity to link the table to the habitat fact sheets?
			1. Yes, it would be a good idea to add a column to the tool and link to the species fact sheets.
		2. National collection of databases. What has been done in other parts of the country?
			1. RRT should look into what other databases are using/doing.
	10. IMPACT tool. oil spill project function. Get the list of best management practices (BMPs) that relate to species.
		1. Work with other RRT regions for this project.
		2. Workgroup with Lindy as the lead.
1. **Planning Subcommittee** **Ms. Ann Whelan, U.S. EPA**

Jurisdiction Sector Sault Sainte Marie Regional Contingency Plan (RCP) Update.

* 1. Requested change to the plan so it is a lot more descriptive. This change is to be more consistent with other sectors. The hope is that it will be more helpful than the previous verbiage.
	2. Inland sensitivity maps were updated/created.
		1. Shows lands and species that need to be considered during a response. Also created fact sheets.
	3. RRT website is getting updated to be more mobile friendly.
		1. Region 5 County Fact sheets viewer – the contractor (Tetra Tech) has been working on the viewer with U.S. EPA.
			1. Shows layers
				1. Inland sensitivity atlas
				2. Water intakes
				3. Manage lands
				4. County Emergency Management Agencies (EMA)
				5. Hospitals
				6. State Contacts
				7. Etc.
		2. Mapping function to request access to Region 5 County Fact Sheets. Showed an example of the Region 5 County Fact Sheet Viewer.
			1. This mapping function of the Region 5 County Fact Sheets is not live. You can access this through the RRT 5 website. This viewer will be on the interactive map viewers.
				1. Region 5 has joint plans with other regions for area contingency plans.
				2. Second priority is to look at other inland water systems.
		3. Tools – Air monitoring evaluation, habitat factsheets, and tactics manual.
		4. Jurisdictional Linework Update – updated the line work to follow the shoreline better in the interactive viewer.
			1. Email Ann Whelan, U.S. EPA to get more pieces of the map. Anyone can access the website and plans.
		5. The website has a library for materials that people have used during disasters over time. The library is in the process of being organized to assist response efforts.
			1. Examples: asbestos, rail, national historic preservation response, etc.
		6. International plans Canada-U.S. (CANUS) – Canuscent, Canuslak, Canusplain, Lake of the Wood area, CANUS joint marine pollution contingency plan, etc.
		7. RRT Meetings page – Contains RRT meeting information from 2007 through today.
1. **Worker Health and Safety Subcommittee Ms. Larken Akins, OSHA**

Purpose of the safety subcommittee is to make everyone aware of health and safety hazards that are on site during a response.

* 1. Tribal participation is being encouraged. U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) provided safety training to the Sioux tribe and they need more training.
	2. The safety subcommittee maintains after action reports from trainings, exercises, and responses to learn and maintain best practices.
	3. Correspondence with the U.S. National Response Team (NRT) – provide studies about safety of responders and the public. Two studies that were presented. The NRT will consider the guidance of these studies and push out to the RRTs.
		1. Long-term follow up study (golf study)
		2. Deepwater Horizon Study
	4. National Disaster – Waiting on updates on Hurricane Florence.
	5. Beryllium exposure levels have been modified from a study. Three separate standards.
	6. Health and safety bulletins – rotary valves (air locks) and drum recycling.
	7. Fed-tar – Federal targets establishments that have a large amount of loss time. They will focus on these establishments and study them.
1. **Training and Exercise/Drills Subcommittee Mr. Scott Binko, USCG**

Trainings:

* 1. Funding for an oil and ice training.
		1. Milwaukee training – Tailored for operators. One-day course.
		2. February 12, 13, 14 2019 (still looking at sponsoring).
		3. Looking at an annual request sponsored by a state, USCG, federal, etc.
		4. Issue on funding for training.
	2. Exercises Incident Management System Software (IMSS) training.
		1. Looking for a week-long training for IMSS.
	3. Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Training (SCAT) Training.
		1. Issue of states traveling to other states.
		2. USCG is working with NOAA with SCAT training with Canada.
		3. Also working with joint Region 2 & 5 SCAT training.
	4. Aerial Observatory Training – is a good online 2-hour training.
	5. The Department of the Interior (DOI) and state of Minnesota is hosting an oil course in Duluth – inland focus. Target is for 24 people. Includes SCAT training broad course.
	6. Reminder if you don’t get Mike’s newsletter emails about (NOAA) email Scott Binko and he will make sure you are added to the list.

Full-Scale Exercises (FSE):

* 1. CANUSLAC coming up – August 2019.
	2. Enbridge exercise – 2nd or 3rd week of September 2019.
		1. Joliet exercise – 200 participants. Very appreciative for the exercise. Positive experience.
		2. Stockbridge, Michigan – 2020 exercise.
		3. They are doing a lot of small exercises within the community (tabletop exercises)

Other Trainings:

* 1. Clean waterways meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio.
	2. JRT – November 15th, 2018.
	3. TRIPR Meeting - Railroads in December (Columbus meeting next year).
	4. DOI is looking for opportunities to practice integrating into incident command/responses. Is that in the environmental unit? National Parks will establish their own Incident Command to manage their own things.
	5. Application purchased for subscription. Can RRT automate/self-populate on people’s calendar for training and meetings?
	6. RRT 5 will look into calendar options for the website to host training opportunities.

**Tuesday, October 16, 2018 – RRT 5 General Meeting**

1. **Opening Remarks Mr. Ryan McEwan, Assistant Director,**

**Hamilton County EMA**

Welcome to Cincinnati and opening remarks

1. **Welcome and Introductions Mr. Jerry Popiel, USCG**

**Mr. Jason El-Zein, US EPA**

Co-Chairs Opening Remarks

Group Introductions

1. **State and Federal Roundtable Reports Various**

State of Indiana:

* 1. Two train derailments.
		1. One normal oil response.
		2. Princeton – 98 cars total, two boiling liquid expanding vapor explosions (BLEVEs). Partial evacuation of the city of Princeton.
	2. Seeing a large fish kill due to misuse of manure.
		1. Traced back to farm that had sugar water from a previous owner.
		2. Enforcement is being pursued.
	3. There has been a large amount of Fishkill due to:
		1. City of Greeneville ,IN shut down an intake.
	4. Large release in Decatur, IN.
		1. Ongoing.
	5. In Biz.
		1. Goal is providing a source for businesses to report tanks and other permitting and remedial programs.
	6. Electronic Spill Response forms being created.
	7. Up to nine OSCs in the state.

State of Illinois:

* 1. Enbridge exercise was a success. Coordinated response information was a great experience.
	2. Losing a few staff. They are looking to get more staff in the state.

State of Ohio:

* 1. The state has been broken up into four reporting regions with six OSCs in each region.
	2. Currently a total of 12 OSCs.
	3. Well pad fire in Ohio.

State of Wisconsin:

* 1. April 26th, 2018 Husky oil refinery. This will be a later presentation.
	2. May 15-17th, 2018 major exercise including a power outage.
	3. Training multi-agency coordination is going to happen.
	4. A lot of flooding that took out homes and dams.
	5. A weather event occurred August 17 - September 14, 2018; 23 counties were impacted between the two events.
	6. Stretched thin trying to recover funds.
	7. The state only see incidents increasing.
	8. Use of drones has been very helpful. Situational awareness, damage assessment, and tracking spills as well.
	9. A lot of perfluoroalkyl acids (PFAAs) are being worked on in the state.
	10. Personnel changes are happening, and people are filling in.

State of Minnesota:

* 1. Able to train 36 of their staff in incident command and improving their compliance with the National Incident Management System (NIMS).
	2. Had a compliance exercise with five railroads. New requirements are being enforced with the railroads. Over 100 people were in attendance. Five rails and 10 contractors. A lot of people got a lot out of it. U.S. EPA brought their command post.
	3. Incidents include:
		1. Gas station lost 5,000 gallons of gasoline. Pump didn’t turn off and pumped all night and went into sewer and lake. The local group was limited with their resources. Small towns really rely on the state’s assistance. Slow recovery;
		2. Husky Fire (Wisconsin) impacted Minnesota. They provided support with ambient air monitoring;
		3. Fire at the refinery with A triple f foam. They didn’t know where their drain systems went. The company will be changing up their drainage systems;
		4. UP Railroad had a derailment on a bridge. Lost 2,500 gallons of fuel. No local government was involved in the response. Created a lot of confusion with information sharing and operations; and
		5. Abandoned plating shop is being evaluated on what is going to be done with enforcement.

State of Michigan:

* 1. Tug boat cleanup is finally on land.
	2. Staffing changes have been made.
	3. PFAAs – they are 7% through taking samples through the state. 1,300 homes had to be put on bottled water overnight. They were able to be connected to a neighboring water system. When that happened, they had lead and copper issues with the water. Kept residents on bottled water until they could get the levels down.
	4. Pipeline safety advisory board is coming to an end. They commented on an underground pipeline under the Straits of Mackinac.
	5. Abandoned pipeline release in Stockbridge. Farmers drain tile into a creek.
	6. ATC submerged cables will be talked about later today.
	7. USCG has accepted the no anchoring in the Straits of Mackinac from the mayor. This is due to the critical infrastructure in the straits.

Tribal:

* 1. Always working to build tribal response capacity.
	2. They are doing a 2nd annual boom deployment training.
	3. ATC was part of the unified command and tribal leader in the response.
	4. Working with Enbridge to coordinate with their new equipment.
	5. Working on oil spill response plans.

Little River:

* 1. Ramping up training and response procedures.
	2. Increasing visibility during meetings for planning.
1. **Federal Partners**

DOI:

* 1. Oil response course coming up.
	2. Reorganizing their structure.
	3. Creating an excel response document to aid in species protection during responses.
	4. They are working in RRT 3 with an open discussion on how DOI gets notified during a state, local, or federal response.

USGS:

* 1. Going through some reorganization.

NOAA:

* 1. Site down in the Gulf of Mexico. They are working on well collapses and testing. Beneath the water and all the way to satellite. Focusing on remote sensoring.
	2. Working with GRI to update the environmental sensitivity maps. It is long overdue to update the Great Lakes maps.

Department of Transportation (DOT):

* 1. No report.

PHMSA:

* 1. Hired new staff. Almost fully staffed.

OSHA:

* 1. New area director.
	2. Upcoming Directives that are active.
	3. Safety and Health bulletins are being worked on (air locks and drum recycling).

U.S. EPA:

* 1. New internal guidance for oil spill response. New section on endangered species, Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs), etc.
	2. PFAAs will be talked about later.
	3. Senate filed hearing about the Straits of Mackinac.
	4. Sector Sault Sainte Marie exercise went well. Boom deployment. U.S. EPA is now officially allowed to hire Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS’s) for oil responses. UAS team out of Detroit.
	5. Environmental Sensitivity (ESI) Maps are being worked on.
	6. For the Straits of Mackinac, there is a proposal for a final rule: From October 31st there will be no large anchoring in the Straits of Mackinac.
	7. Air coordination group. DOI has a robust UAS.
	8. Going through some reorganizations. No change in Superfund. Superfund will lose brownfield and go to a different division.
	9. Two new OSCs are starting soon.
	10. Fully staffed OSCs.
	11. Fourth acting director; new Director will be hired soon.
	12. Last year there were 44 cleanups and 40 emergency responses (20 oil and 20 cleanup). Normally average 60 a year.
	13. Continue to work on vapor intrusion (a lot in Ohio). Air purifying units are deployed inside a home to help.
	14. Sites that are National Priorities List (NPL) candidates (100 homes that require clean up). They are changing standards to national. New standard is no longer 400 it’s 1,200 units for NPL standards. Small number of homes will be 400 and above.
	15. PFAAs – assist Michigan in these cleanups. They have the ability to sample. Cleanup is different than response. It will take a few years to figure out a solution between PFAAs cleanup and emergency response. You can get assistance with sampling and response, but it is limited. There is currently no funding to deal with PFAAs.
	16. They are updating the Region 5 Vapor Intrusion guidance in DRAFT. States all have helped in forming this guidance.
	17. Original guidance was written on 2011. It will be out in a couple of months.
1. **Hudepohl Removal Action Case Study Mr. Steve Renninger, U.S. EPA**
	1. Case study on the Hudepohl Removal Action.
	2. Requested U.S. EPA assistance with asbestos removal. Large asbestos was being blown out of the building and in large piles within the buildings.
	3. Misting operations. They would load piles of debris for removal.
	4. Asbestos material collapsed into the beer cellars.
	5. Air monitoring for asbestos and dust activities was done during clean up.
	6. Total of 15,000 tons of asbestos material was removed from the site.
	7. Hamilton County Port Authority – 2008 they started doing clean up development. They work with Ohio EPA and others to help owners buy this land.
	8. When the port authority took ownership, they fenced off the area and secured the site.
	9. $200,000 of remaining polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) and asbestos work left to be completed building.
	10. Looking to be a $3-4 million site to make it a gravel lot.
	11. No Questions
2. **Lunkenheimer Removal Action Case Study Mr. Steve Renninger, U.S. EPA**
	1. Case study on the Lunkenheimer Removal Action.
	2. Site made steam valves for river boats.
	3. Site had heavy metal contamination. Lead waste everywhere.
	4. Cincinnati requested U.S. EPA assistance.
	5. Approximately 800 drums of foundry sand remained.
	6. Sand piles in the factory.
	7. Transformers containing PCBs.
	8. Hazcat for each drum.
	9. Air monitoring in place.
	10. To date – 5 weeks of waste shipment including 10,000 gallons of oil, 100 cubic yards of debris, 200 cubic yards of lead waste, and 100 cubic yards or recycled material.
	11. No Questions
3. **USCG Mackinac Straits-Dielectric Oil Spill Mr. Brian Streichert, USCG**
	1. Case study on the Oil Spill in the Mackinac Straits. Boat anchored in the straits and dug up and ruptured an oil pipeline.
	2. No Questions
4. **Ohio EPA Case Study**
	1. Case study on a transformer at a school that was damaged by a lawn care company.
	2. No Questions
5. **Subcommittee Report Out**

Science and Technology.

* 1. Vendor protocol – Vendors go through Science and Technology (S&T) subcommittee before presenting to the RRT5.
	2. In Situ Burning – Enbridge has a potential to do a control burn in Canada on an experimental lake.
		1. 60-day turn around on what the RRT5 wants to see.
		2. What types of oil will be experimented with?
		3. Form a working group that includes some items on air monitoring, and flora and fauna effects.
		4. Questions on burning approval process works within the states.
		5. Gather existing data mobile burn plan and fire service.
	3. Fate and Transport.
		1. Need for webinar on tools and models as well as application to previously glaciated rivers and Great Lake River mouths.
		2. River velocity data collected by other agencies that isn’t publicly available.
	4. Endangered Species Act response operations matrix.
		1. Matrix tool developed to be rolled out this fall. Links endangered species with response action and level of impact it might have on that species.

Health and Safety.

* 1. HAZWOPER to Sioux tribe.
	2. After Action Report (AAR’s) was requested for responses and exercises
	3. OSHA – targeting of worksites that have high number of loss time and injury cases, recordable cases or high total of recordable cases.

Planning Sub-committee.

* 1. Fact sheets.

Training and Exercises.

* 1. There are a lot of training opportunities.
	2. They are trying to get them on the RRT5 website.
		1. Oil and Ice February 22-24th, 2019.
		2. DOI oil spill training Duluth, Minnesota.
		3. Emergency managers conference in Columbus, Ohio.
		4. Water in Cincinnati, Ohio.
		5. USCG systems training four sectors.
		6. Marine Spill Response Corporation (MSRC) training.
			1. 10-12 training sessions on the lakes.
		7. NRT posted trainings on the website. The NRT will look into getting an Email out on Training and exercise schedules.

**Wednesday, October 17, 2018 – RRT 4 & 5 Joint Meeting**

1. **Opening Remarks Gary Andrew**

Introductions were made around the room.

1. **Sector Ohio Valley Overview Captain Zamperini**

Captain Zamperini gave an overview of units and assets.

* 1. Waterway management, marine safety, search and escue, aid to navigation, ports, coastal security, and marine environmental response.
	2. Ten states, 54 congressional districts.
	3. 8,300 miles of navigable waterways, 3,000 used commercially.
	4. 30 major lakes, 211 dams, and 57 locks.
	5. Five nationally ranked ports for total annual tonnage.
	6. Close to 400 active and reserve personnel.
	7. Six buoy river tenders.
	8. Eight 29-ft small boats.
	9. Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission (ORSANCO) is used for notification of water intake response.
	10. It can be difficult when it comes to oil spill response.
	11. No Questions
1. **DOI National Unmanned Aircraft Systems Project John Vogel, DOI**
	1. Mr. Vogel gave a presentation on DOI – UAS Capabilities.
	2. John Vogel trains a large group of people in DOI in UAS.
	3. It’s all about pixel size. UAS offers increased resolution.
	4. DOI – Flies Uninhabited Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) vetted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). They will go out and find a vendor that will do what they need to do.
		1. Example Volcano fly overs.
	5. DJI M600 & DJI Mavic Pro – experimental flight logs go back to China and that’s not allowed.
	6. Aircraft that are used heavily are the Birdseye view, FireFly 6 Pro, and the 3DR Solo.
	7. Ground Control Station (GCS). Two pilots. Laptop base or iPad.
	8. 385 Pilots in DOI and going up fast.
	9. UAS can provide:
		1. Mapping;
		2. Monitoring; and
		3. Data collection.
	10. Mapping:
		1. Overlapping images;
		2. Point cloud;
		3. Surface Model; and
		4. Ortho-Mosaic.
	11. Multi-Spectral Sensors:
		1. Agriculture assistance; and
		2. Pipes leaking.
	12. Thermal Sensors
	13. Real time video
		1. Challenges:
			1. Physical data transfer instead of cards;
			2. Satellite-based communications work anywhere; and Water sampling sensors – Not here yet but they are being tested.
	14. UAS USGS - Contacts:
		1. Jeff Sloan
		2. Mark Baur
		3. Joe Adams
	15. Questions –
		1. How much heat can these UAVs take?
			1. They have not been tested. They put it up at 1,000 feet and that was the benchmark they used. As eruption’s in Hawaii went down they were able to get closer.
			2. There was an aircraft that went into the sulfur dioxide (SO2) plume and it got corroded but survived.
		2. USCG established a pilot program. How did you establish who enters the program?
			1. They control who is selected to go to the schools. National aviation manager puts name in until class is full. Requirement is to pass the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) 107. Then there are additional DOI requirements. HAZMAT training and Health and Safety. There are five specific courses. DOI and FAA work together and have exceptions.
		3. What are the decontamination procedures for the UAV?
			1. Calibrate every time it’s used and then wipe it down. They were concerned about the electrical circuits, but they were protected. They don’t have an good weather changing UAV. They lost a few aircraft to rain because they are not designed to be wet.
		4. Can you talk to the response times and capabilities of the DOI?
			1. A bunch of agreements were in place with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) already with the Kilauea eruption response. FEMA paid USGS. Depends on the situation.
		5. What do you do with sensitive mapping and data collection?
			1. 3DR solo would be used so the DJI that sends data back to China is not an issue.
			2. Required to fill out an online form after every flight that includes latitude/longitude, what you collected, and for what reason. It then becomes public information.
		6. What is going to China that we are not giving up as public record already? Nothing. However, it is not allowed to have information transmitted to a manufacturer.
		7. What are we using to process information?
			1. Photoscan by Edjsoft. No requirements. Pix4D is a good one.
		8. How do you deal with the privacy issue?
			1. Privacy is a big deal, so they use every effort to notify people that they are flying over their land. Example Cape Cod they tried to fly over beaches when it was not as populated.
2. **Cincinnati Sub-Area Plan Steve Renninger, US.EPA**

**Bill Lohner, OH EPA**

* 1. Report out on the Cincinnati Sub-Area Plan.
	2. No Questions
1. **Great Rivers – Metropolis/Paducah Plan Kevin Turner, US EPA**

**Blaine Kinsley, IL EPA**

* 1. Report out on the Great Rivers – Metropolis/Paducah Plan
	2. No Questions
1. **Louisville Sub-Area Plan Rick Jardine, US EPA**
	1. Report out on the Louisville Sub-Area plan that is in the process of being created
	2. Questions - no questions.
2. **Data Management Tabletop Exercise Report Matt Huyser, US EPA**
	1. Matt provide an update on the Data Management Tabletop Exercise Report.
	2. S&T Data Tabletop Exercise:
		1. Wanted to collect, evaluate, and disseminate essential information and data on a local and state level; and
		2. Wanted to evaluate team concepts.
	3. Scenario – Multimedia and multijurisdictional resources.
	4. Identify data and information sources.
	5. Top data management programs for the tabletop exercise:
		1. WebEOC;
		2. Sharepoint;
		3. HISN Connect;
		4. Defense Connect system;
		5. ResponseLink;
		6. GeoPlatform;
		7. ERMA;
		8. Secure Google Drive;
		9. Scribe & Viper; and
		10. Email.
	6. Findings:
		1. Preparation is needed to save time and money. You should seek out available programs to use for other events.
		2. Deliberate practice. Practice it every day. Improve your data management ability.
	7. No Questions
3. **Comments from Rear Admiral Brown**
	1. District 7 Miami, Florida Coast Guard Admiral.
	2. Talked about being a consumer of the U.S. EPA and other state/local expertise.
	3. USCG is more up and down the chain of communication. Disasters are more multi-directional communication.
	4. Remember the people who wrote the plan are not the ones necessarily responding to the incident.
	5. A lot of USCG things you can have a 100% success rate. In disasters you cannot have that. You need to manage as best as you can but there will always be impacts.
	6. Thank you for all your hard work.
4. **Pipeline and Emergency Responder Initiative (PERI) Program Arthur O. Buff,**

**PHMSA**

* 1. PERI Program.
		1. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) – protect people and the environment by advancing the safe transportations of energy and hazardous materials.
		2. Gas distributions of 2.2 million miles. Majority of gas is natural gas.
		3. Responsible for liquid natural gas (LNG).
		4. Underground natural gas storage facilities are new, but they are being reported on.
		5. Team looking at regulations to update.
		6. Regulations were passed so that PHMSA can take regulatory action against excavation. It’s simple to comply, call 811 before you dig. If you hit the line call 911 and the hot line.
			1. 39 adequate states.
			2. 13 states are not adequate.
				1. States that have been approved to get those funds back.
				2. States that are not approved, the funds go to U.S. Treasury.
	2. What is a PERI?
		1. Voluntary partnership between operators and federal government.

What they want to accomplish:

* + - 1. Enhanced responder understanding of pipeline risks;
			2. Strengthen relationships; and
			3. Improve management of pipeline emergencies nationwide.
		1. There are pipeline regulations (safety plan, provide a liaison, etc.).
		2. Provided goals and objectives.
		3. They consider the training alternative responder training.
	1. Questions –
		1. In Minnesota – have there been thoughts about combining with Trans Care?
			1. They are finding out that each state is different. So, they will work however they need to with locals to take advantage of what is going on.
		2. What about putting PERI worst case scenarios into continuity plans?
			1. That is possible but it’s new.
		3. What other issues are there for pipeline eruptions besides strikes?
			1. Corrosion
			2. Welding
1. **ORSANCO Sam Dinkins, ORSANCO**

Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission.

* 1. Formed in 1948.
	2. Mission is to protect the uses of the Ohio River.
	3. Is it safe for recreation and is it safe to drink?
	4. Primary areas:
		1. Communication;
		2. Time of travel modeling;
		3. Water quality monitoring; and
		4. Analytical support.

Urea Ammonia Nitrate Barge.

* 1. Cracked in half;
	2. Notified Louisville water;
	3. Created time of travel modeling;
	4. Assisted initial water quality monitoring plan; and
	5. Conducted/coordinated response.
1. **Chemical City Planner Resource (ChemCPR) Planning Tool Dante Stellar**

The ChemCPR planning tool will provide federal, state, local, tribal and territorial emergency preparedness, prevention, and exercise planners with the technical products needed to support regional planning for a catastrophic, accidental airborne chemical release. The goal of the chemCPR is to supplement, not replace, existing chemical release planning tools such as CAMEO/ALOHA with higher fidelity impact assessment products that *incorporate the effects of buildings, terrain, time and spatially varying weather, and gas density*to better describe how a catastrophic chemical event might unfold.  This discussion will demonstrate the tool’s capability and discuss the outreach that has been accomplished to acquire stakeholder feedback.

* 1. These are planning tools. Not to be used during a response.
		1. City Planner Resource (CPR).
			1. Key planning factors (KPF).
			2. More sustainable approach to reach broader planning community.
			3. Web based planning tools:
				1. iCPR – improvised nuclear device

Web-based interface through CM portal

Example given

1 of 600 scenarios

* + - 1. ChemCPR – Chemical
				1. Chem is accidental release modeling. They were unable to use an on-purpose release because this is provided to the public.
			2. bioCPR - Biological
			3. radCPR – Radiological
	1. CPR helps
		1. Planners understand how things unfold.
		2. Identifies critical infrastructures.
		3. Identifies resources needed.
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1. **Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) Issues/PFAS Mr. Jerry Popiel, USCG**
	1. Case study:  Response to 2018 AFFF spill at Coast Guard Air Station Detroit.  Review of response operations conducted to mitigate the impact of perfluorooctanoic acid and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFAS/PFOS).
	2. AFFF is known to have PFAS in it even if it is marked that it does not contain PFAS.
	3. June 16th, 2018 $347,000 spent on the response. No funds available to clean these sites up. No U.S. EPA CERCLA or other clean up funds to pull from.
	4. The canal was entirely filled with foam.
	5. Product was 800 gallons of AFFF that was used in ships, shipyards, etc.
		1. PFOS and PFAS - Any combination of Per and Polyfluoroalkyl substances. It is unregulated.
	6. They were deconstructing the AFFF station and a contractor broke a valve and glass and cleaned it up.
	7. Response:
		1. Secure storm sewer/drain;
		2. Secured AFFF pump room;
		3. T7T marine flushed and removed contaminants from 1.5 miles of underground storm drain system;
		4. Investigated path of discharge after they found out they did not stop the source;
		5. Requested civil engineering unit (CEU) in Cleveland, Ohio to join unified command;
		6. Completed source sampling;
		7. AFFF degraded in two tanks;
		8. AFFF went down the deck drain. Seam in the foundation went to a different drain and that’s how it leaked out;
		9. Used a granular activated carbon (GAC) filtration system for treatment;
		10. Dual stage GAC were used; and
		11. Came to an agreement that long-term treatment was dilution.
	8. Challenges:
		1. Pre-existing PFAS on site;
		2. Understanding of degraded AFFF solution;
		3. Large equipment and various contractors arriving at a secure base/facility;
		4. Worksite nearly caused base to flood due to secured storm discharge; and
		5. Sampling issues:
			1. 10-20 feet, deep drains;
			2. Method of sampling; and
			3. Speed of sampling results.
		6. Blueprints:
			1. Groundwater communication to drains;
			2. Base sewer systems blueprints – 1962;
			3. CEU Cleveland blueprints – 1982; and
			4. 1.5 miles of underground drains crossing street and air fields requiring a special escort.
	9. Best practices:
		1. Closed-loop filtration process worked;
		2. Great partnerships;
		3. Special sampling;
		4. Contractors need to be pre-approved and vetted to prevent delays;
		5. Manning for contractor oversight (split into 3 divisions); and
		6. Utilizing base resources and personnel.
	10. Questions –
		1. If the contractor kept the record of the PFAS - how much was treated and how much carbon was used to treat and what were the costs?
			1. 10,000 pounds of carbon, but it was not all used.
			2. At the end of 9 days, tests results for PFAS was at 0.
			3. Over 7 days we did about 9 million gallons of purifying water.
			4. Collected samples throughout the base and from the source and the discharge.
			5. Most PFAS treatment is normally significantly lower levels. Took 6 months to replace the carbon filters.
		2. Is there good information on the degradation of foam?
			1. AFFF is supposed to be exposed to water to quickly expand. The sooner you get to it the better.
		3. Did you do lake sampling?
			1. They did one at the outfall, but they did not do lake sampling.
		4. What did you do with the firetanks and vacuum trucks?
			1. They put it through the filtering system.
		5. Did the safety data sheets (STS) say they contained PFAS or PFOS?
			1. PFAS – PFAS is any combination of PFOS, etc.
			2. There are 8 different carbon chains that are within PFAS.
			3. What was listed on the tanks and what was purchased was in the tank. They will eventually break down and make it to PFAS.
		6. Do you have any idea for best practices and storing since it can breakdown and contain PFAS?
			1. Storing yes. They are working on storing and upgrading these better on the base.
			2. No idea on the company if they have made any changes.
			3. This product right now is not listed as a National substance. We cannot use funds for cleanup. If there is a spill and the levels are so high the Federal government needs to respond and deal with the issue.
			4. In Region 5 they have met with API and there is a lot still in use. Everyone is asking can we use it? Should we use it? We are trying to move away from that chemical.
			5. The difference is an emergency response compared to a cleanup.
			6. Firefighting water is exempt from regulation; however, they were not thinking about PFAS when the exemption was written. The potentially responsible party (PRP) will have to decide on how to deal with it.
			7. They don’t/can’t write a violation because there are no regulations at this time.
2. **Environmental Response Team Mr. Greg Powell, U.S. EPA**

Special team within the National Contingency Plan

* 1. Has response capabilities:
		1. Standard or unique – multi-matrix sampling and monitoring;
		2. Dive unit;
		3. Radiation;
		4. Air dispersions modeling;
		5. Oil spills;
		6. Health and safety;
		7. Information management technology; and
		8. Cited in 2005 USCG hazardous materials guidance.
	2. Resources:
		1. Trace Atmospheric Gas Analyzers (TAGA) bus;
		2. Dive unit;
		3. Radiation resources; and
		4. CT sampling and monitoring.
	3. Seerely Road Reactive Metal Drums:
		1. 5 drums cost half a million to clean up;
		2. Finding the contactor to deal with it was very hard; and
		3. The cleanup area was across from a school, so they had to wait until the school was out.
	4. Questions -
		1. What do you use NAC for?
			1. It’s a reactant coolant. Not sure but they think pharmaceutical.
1. **Social Media Use During an Emergency Response Mr. James Davis, USCG**
	1. Determine appropriate release authority for two-way communication.
	2. Monitor social media sites.
	3. Conduct regular analysis and outreach.
	4. Drive traffic to related news sites.
2. **Superior Refinery Fire Mr. Dave Morrison, US EPA**
	1. On April 26, 2018, an explosion ripped through the Husky Refinery in Superior, Wisconsin. Debris from the blast flew 200 feet and punctured a steel tank filled with asphalt spilling more than 15,000 barrels and caused a major asphalt fire. The asphalt fire migrated to within 200 feet of a hydrogen fluoride tank.
		1. Fire started, and initial fire was extinguished.
		2. Evacuation was ordered for Superior, Wisconsin.
		3. Chemical Safety Board was brought together.
		4. Asphalt burned so hot that water wasn’t working.
		5. You needed to let the fire burn a little for water to work.
	2. Response:
		1. IMACC model was run.
		2. 2nd IMACC model was run with Hydrochloric acid.
		3. Water was impacted.
		4. Air monitoring plan was put together:
			1. Loaded in a viewer;
			2. Monitored the air monitoring contractor of responsible party; and
			3. Community air monitoring was given to the locals daily.
		5. Soot, Debris, and Asbestos:
			1. Soot was not local; and
			2. Insulation of tanks were sent through the community exactly like the plume model.
		6. Will be a long time until they start back up. At least 2020.
		7. There was command post confusion. At one time there was 2 command posts. Turned into a unified command.
	3. Questions –
		1. What was the final costs of all this?
			1. Not sure but in the millions.
			2. Cannon is still in its containment.
		2. How did the secondary containment perform? It sounds like it didn’t hold up well
			1. 21,000 gallons of water was added and it’s not supposed to hold that much.
		3. How long was unified command up?
			1. 2 weeks.
		4. PFAS – Monitoring Mill Creek.
			1. The creek is staying at 50 parts per million (ppm) in the creek and there’s not a clear reason why that is.
3. **Action Items:**

Reminder about participation forms.

Thanks to Regions 4 and 5.

RRT co-chairs:

* 1. Region 4 – Thank you everyone for coming to this meeting. There were a few challenges I’m glad we were able to work through. It was appreciated.
	2. Thank you, the members of the industry. Thank you to the states in Regions 4 and 5. Walked away with a lot of information and things to think about. Need to revisit the data management with the shareholders. Area contingency plans was great to see. The ground work has been laid**.** We need to think about social media and maybe adopt best practices from USCG. Should we do a joint meeting once every 2 years? Please share your comments.
	3. Region 5 – thanks to Region 4 for making the arrangements. Thank you everyone for being here. We enjoyed the presentations and discussions that happened in the room.
	4. Thank you, to all the states, for being here. Thank you, co-coordinators.

We are planning for the 2nd week in May 2019 for the next RRT 5 meeting in Indiana. Keep an eye out for the meeting invite.