LOCATION: Portland, Oregon

PARTICIPANTS: Attendance list not provided.

JUNE 11, 2003 MORNING SESSION (Agenda Item 1):

Mr. Chuck Donaldson Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) and Captain Paul Jewel US Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Portland/Group Portland (MSO Portland) call the meeting to order at 0845 hours.

Mr. Bill Whitson of US Coast Guard District 13 (USCG D13) initiates room introductions.

Ms. Beth Sheldrake of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) welcomes FEMA Regional Interagency Steering Committee (RISC) representatives for the first combined RISK/Regional Response Team (RRT) meeting.

RRT/NW AREA COMMITTEE PRESENTATION (Agenda Item 2):

Ms. Sheldrake provided a brief overview of the RRT/NW Area Committee’s role in planning, preparedness, and response in the northwest. The topics discussed included:

- Response authority under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Clean Water Act (CWA), and the Stafford Act;
  - [http://www.epa.gov/superfund/action/law/cercla.htm](http://www.epa.gov/superfund/action/law/cercla.htm)
  - [http://www.epa.gov/r5water/cwa.htm](http://www.epa.gov/r5water/cwa.htm)
- How the RRT functions under the National Contingency Plan (NCP);
- National Response System;
  - Organized Elements
  - Concept of operation
- Access to Resources;
- Federal On-scene Coordinator Responsibilities;
  - Unified Command
  - Response Assets – authorities, access contract resources, funding resources for Superfund and Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund
- Regional Response Team
  - 13 RRT’s around country
  - 13 Key Federal Agencies that are Co-Chaired by the EPA and USCG.
• National Response Team
  - The National Response Team and the Regional Response Teams are the federal component of the National Response System (NRS). The NRS is the federal government's mechanism for emergency response to discharges of oil and releases of chemicals. The National Response Team and Regional Response Teams are made up of sixteen federal departments and agencies. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) chairs the NRT and the United States Coast Guard (USCG) serves as Vice Chair. Each of the 13 RRTs are co-chaired by EPA and the USCG. The National Response Center is the communications hub of the National Response System.

• Northwest Area Committee (NWAC)
  - www.rrt10nwac.com
  - Co-chaired by Marine Safety Office (MSO) Portland, MSO Puget Sound, and the EPA.
  - Three Area committees that include two coastal and one inland.

• NW Area Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities;
• NW Area Committee/RRT Workgroups.
• Incident Command
  - NIIMS based.
  - Oil Spill Operation Field Guide.
• Geographic Response Plan (GRP)

FACILITATED DISCUSSION (Agenda Item 3 and 4):

Introduction:

Ms. Sheldrake led a facilitated discussion regarding the roles and responsibilities in a multiple agency response in the State of Oregon. Participants will include Local, State, and Federal response and support agencies. The three objectives of this scenario will be to explore the transition phases of a complicated response to include coordination issues, educate the audience on the RRT’s role/responsibility/interaction, and document the agency inputs/discussion to identify and capture lessons-learned for revision/updates to ship terrorism plans, plans to improve upon, and provide a baseline for testing in a future real-time tabletop exercises. The scenario for this facilitated discussion was as follows:

• Tank ship WORLD PRODIGY is making way at 10 knots upriver in the Colombia River Channel near Woodland, WA;
• 4 persons, traveling in a ridged hull inflatable, close in on the vessel and board the ship via an accommodation ladder;
• Just after 0900 hours the pilot dispatcher hears a code phrase from the pilot on board WORLD PRODIGY that indicates a security problem onboard that threatens the pilot and ship – need help. Neither the vessel nor the pilot answers repeated hailing attempts on marine VHS;
• 45- Minutes later – the pilot manages one additional radio contact saying, “Explosives on-board – I see two men – they ’re armed – big-time.”
• At 0945, the WORLD PRODIGY grounds to a halt off Sauvie Island and there explosions rock the tanker forward of the superstructure;
• Issues include, oil spilling into the river, shoreline wildlife sanctuary nearby, fire, explosives, terrorist activities.

The facilitated discussion was conducted from 0925 – 1135 hours and identified the following points of interest or discussion:

**Phase One:**

• Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) will establish a Joint Operations Center (JOC) in Portland;
• Discussion over the threat of information transmitted to Strategic Information and Operations Center “SIOC”;
• Joint Operations Center (JOC) established that includes - FBI, Oregon State Patrol (OSP), Local Law Enforcement (LE);
• Waterborne reconnaissance patrols;
  - Law Enforcement and fisheries.
• USCG is notified;
• Oregon Emergency Response System (OERS) notifies Governor and State Security Council.
• Notifications to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and Washington Emergency Management Department (EMD);
• Start work on press releases;
• USCG suggest that the ship be stopped before it gets to the Portland Metro Area;
  - Broadcast to Mariners - Close River.
• USCG to contact vessel owner;
  - Make sure the vessel is not contacted directly.
• Air Station Astoria asked to do over flight;
• USCG turns over incident to FBI;
• ODEQ would receive notification via Oregon Emergency Response System (OERS) – offer to send liaison to State Emergency Operations Center (EOC);
• Local Emergency Management Division (EMD) would verify report through state OEM – distribute information to local elected officials;
• Washington Ecology would be notified by WA EMD - let USCG know that Ecology could staff the Unified Command (UC) if asked;
• Portland EMD notified by State OEM - implement local notification Standard Operating Procedure (SOP);
  - Elected Officials.
  - Fire Boats.
• Federal, State, and Local Joint Information Center (JIC) would be established to craft unified messages;
• USCG could notify Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to restrict air space;
USCG uses Captain of the Port (COTP) authority to restrict movement of vessel;
- State, Local, and Federal tactical teams would be utilized.
- Columbia River Pilots Association - working with USCG on contingency plans for this sort of scenario.

**Phase Two:**

- FBI forward command would be established;
  - Tactical assets deployed.
- Evaluate other potential threats;
- State/Local Law Enforcement would try to secure perimeter;
- Re-notifications by OEM;
  - Recommend gathering of State Security Council.
  - Request FEMA send representatives.
  - Put out national alert for potential requests for resources.
- Six USCG priorities/issues;
  - Rescue crew.
  - Need to secure source of release.
  - Fire.
  - Major oil spill.
- USCG recommends that oil spill response efforts be separated from vessel investigation;
- Assets for radiation monitoring;
  - None at first responder level (local).
  - Portland Fire does have radiation monitoring capabilities and would routinely monitor.
- OERS would not notify EPA;
- Common communication has been established;
- ODEQ would send State On-scene Coordinator (SOSC) to scene;
  - Ensure command structure established.
  - Make sure response contractors notified.
  - Make sure Ecology was involved.
- Ecology would contact USCG Unified Command and offer staffing assistance;
  - Public Information Officer (PIO).
  - Environmental Unit.
  - Vessel Expertise.
  - Request opening of state oil funds.
- Portland fire would stand up EOC;
Multnomah County would take lead for Columbia County Emergency Management;
- Request State Disaster Declaration.

Sauvie Island - Wildlife Refuge;

FBI would be reluctant to allow responders near vessel;
- Concerns about secondary devices.
- Further possible plans of the terrorists.

Concerned with economic aspects related to the river closure.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS: (Agenda Item 5):

HOMELAND SECURITY PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVE-5 AND DHS REVIEW/UPDATE (Agenda Item 6):

Mr. Bill Webb (FEMA) reports on the intent of Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 (HSPD-5) and what it means to DHS and the National Response Plan. The topics covered include:

- Purpose: To enhance the ability of the United States to manage domestic incidents by establishing a single, comprehensive national incident management system.

- Objective of the United States Government is to ensure that all levels of government across the Nation have the capability to work efficiently and effectively together, using a national approach to domestic incident management. In these efforts, with regard to domestic incidents, the United States Government treats crisis management and consequence management as a single, integrated function, rather than as two separate functions.

- Mandate for Change;

- Policy: To prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies, the United States Government shall establish a single, comprehensive approach to domestic incident management.

- The Secretary of Homeland Security is the principal Federal official for domestic incident management. Pursuant to the Homeland Security Act of 2002, the Secretary is responsible for coordinating Federal operations within the United States to prepare for, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies.

- The Secretary shall coordinate the Federal Government's resources utilized in response to or recovery from terrorist attacks, major disasters, or other emergencies if and when any one of the following four conditions applies: (1) a Federal department or agency acting under its own authority has requested the assistance of the Secretary; (2) the resources of State and local authorities are overwhelmed and Federal assistance has been
requested by the appropriate State and local authorities; (3) more than one Federal department or agency has become substantially involved in responding to the incident; or (4) the Secretary has been directed to assume responsibility for managing the domestic incident by the President.

• The Secretary shall develop, submit for review to the Homeland Security Council, and administer a National Incident Management System (NIMS). This system will provide a consistent nationwide approach for Federal, State, and local governments to work effectively and efficiently together to prepare for, respond to, and recover from domestic incidents, regardless of cause, size, or complexity. To provide for interoperability and compatibility among Federal, State, and local capabilities, the NIMS will include a core set of concepts, principles, terminology, and technologies covering the incident command system; multi-agency coordination systems; unified command; training; identification and management of resources (including systems for classifying types of resources); qualifications and certification; and the collection, tracking, and reporting of incident information and incident resources;

• Creation of DHS;

• Roles and Responsibilities of DHS;

• DHS and Other agency Operations;
  - DHS Secretary Role.
  - Federal Regional Interagency Structures Role.
  - Pre-Declaration of activities may be performed using federal agency funding.
  - New Response Plan would assign primary Federal Agency responsibilities by contingency and functional areas.

• What will the Secretary coordinate?
  - Federal Operations.
  - Thresholds before Secretary coordinates.
  - Specific situations will require special coordination between DHS and the Attorney General, FBI, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State.

• Umbrella Authority.

• Bill.Web@dhs.gov - contact for further information or copies of presentation.

NATIONAL RESPONSE PLAN UPDATE (Agenda Item 7):

Mr. Bob Pond (USCG Headquarters) provides a brief update on the status of the National Response Plan (NCP). The topics of discussion include:

• HSPD-5:
  - Directs the creation of the NCP.
  - National Interagency Management System (NIMS).

• Life cycle concept through the NRP;
  - Designed to prevent, prepare, and recover from an incident.

• New base plan;
Use much of the National Interagency Incident Management System (NIIMS) and Incident Command System (ICS)/UC concepts;
- Used to address all hazards and all phases of an incident from awareness to recovery.

NIIMS vs. NIMS;
Review of authorities and regulations;
- Revisions necessary to NRP for implementation by September 1, 2003.
Consultation Agencies and Forums;
Interim Process;
Timetable;
Multiple agency coordination;
How this will affect the Responsible Party;
Issues with Security vs. Public Awareness;

NRT/RRT CO-CHAIR 2003 MEETING REPORT (Agenda Item 8):

Mr. Matt Bernard (USCG D13) reports on the National Response Team Regional Response Team Meeting that occurred on March 4, 2003, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The following was reported:

- Meeting’s general theme focused on the new Homeland Security shift and Weapons of Mass Destruction response issues;
- FBI and Emergency Management’s lack of integration – related issues;
- RRT Roundtable general issues:
  - Included the difficulty of procuring security clearance for civilians.
  - Restriction of travel.
  - Classified information issues.
- Effective program to deal with derelict vessels;
- Arial and Mapping Technologies;
- Devices and sources to transfer resources across state lines;
- Job exchange in Region 5;
- Dispersant usage;
- Region 4 – Bottom up style response issues;
- Region 2 – Development of a radiation protocol manual;
• RRT Roundtable
  - EPA reorganization.
  - DHHS funding potential.
  - OSHA’s use of ICS.
  - Nuclear Regulatory Commission moving towards ICS.
  - DOA- training OSC’s to be able to respond in an ICS environment.
  - NRT – HSPD-5, NIMS ISC Model, and NRT/RRT being used as a model.
  - DOI to be included in PREP Drills.
  - FEMA – resource for travel funding.
  - DOD – Scenario Discussion – Lessons Learned.
  - EPA- Case study on radiation clean-up site.

TOPOFF-2 REPORT(Agenda Item 9):

Ms. Sheldrake provided a brief report on the results of the recent TOPOFF-2 exercise. The following topics were discussed:

• TOPOFF-2;

  - TOPOFF is a national-level, multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional, real-time", limited-notice WMD response exercise, designed to better prepare senior government officials to effectively respond to an actual terrorist attack involving WMD. In addition, TOPOFF involves law enforcement, emergency management first responders, and other non-governmental officials. Short of an actual attack, such exercises are the best possible way to train responders, gauge preparedness, and identify areas for improvement.

  - TOPOFF-2 involves three venues: Chicago – Biological attack in several locations; Seattle – Radiological Dispersion Device (RDD) detonation; Washington D.C. – Reactions by top officials to attacks and threats of additional attacks.

  - The exercise begins on May 12, 2003 and includes 36 hours of continuous, live, full-scale exercise play, in the field and at the City's emergency operations centers. Visible, full-scale play ends on May 14th. A greatly scaled down, table-top exercise will continue through the end of the week.

• Effects of HSPD-5 and Office of Homeland Defense;
• National Response Plan Utilization;
• Distinction between crisis and consequence management;
  - Principal Federal Official (PFO).
• EPA General Observations;
  - Realistic field play.
  - Learning opportunity.
  - EPA to test new area command organization designed to support
    field emergency responders and ensure information flow from the
    field to EPA upper management and decision makers were
    occurring in a timely manner.
  - Allow EPA to further engage with response partners and continue
    strong relations.
  - Generated lessons learned.
  - Reinforced planning and preparedness.

• Lessons learned:
  - Data collection management. There was a lack of clear leadership
    in developing a monitoring and sampling plan and establishing
    data quality objectives.
  - Response agencies appeared to be competing for work rather then
    collaboratively working on common objectives.
  - Issues with the use of ICS.
  - Unified Command principals were not utilized during the exercise.
  - Information was not shared and disseminated consistently.
  - Request for support came from multiple resources and demands for
    information and decisions were inconsistent and often
    contradictory.

• Recognition of existing authorities;

• Health and Safety;
  - Lack of clear Health and Safety Plan led to potential risk to
    responders.

• Next Steps;

• Other comments;
  - Mr. Ron Tsunehara (OSHA) comments that information was
difficult to obtain. OSHA is working to be more involved with
emergency responders.
  - Mr. Whitson saw issues related to the command center.
  - Mr. Dale Jensen (Ecology) reports that there were a number of
command centers and identified that the exercise stretched
resources and provide quality lessons learned.
  - Mr. Whitson comments on the direct effects of DHS in TOPOFF-
2.
  - Mr. Chris Field (EPA) reports on the role of the RRT and urges the
RRT to take a lead role and further our experience in Area
Command and to further bridge the gap between agencies and
locals.
NOAA COASTAL STORMS INITIATIVE (Agenda Item 10):

Mr. Mike Devany (NOAA) provides a brief update of the NOAA Coastal Storms Initiative. The following topics were discussed:

- Coastal Storms Initiative;
  - The Coastal Storms Initiative is a nationwide effort led by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to lessen the impacts to coastal communities from storms. To accomplish this goal, local, state, and federal organizations are working together on site-specific projects.
  - Pilot program in Jacksonville Florida is synonymous with our region for El Nino related issues.

- Hazardous Materials Planning Training;
  - Hazard Identification – result in scenario.
  - Cameo Training.
  - Both used to develop HAZMAT annex – how to integrate that into the NWACP.

- Environmental Sensitivity Index Atlas;
- CAMEO Training Module for the University of Washington;
- Watershed Modeling and Ecological Forecasting for the Willamette River;
- CAMEO, MARPLOT, ALOHA;
- Environmental Sensitivity Index Maps;
- Intended Client Audiences;
- Transferability of information – used in other geographic areas;
- Key changes in thinking and behavior – State and Local consequence management;
- Goals under Coastal Storms Initiative;

NATIONAL ASSOCIATE MEMBER AGENCY PRESENTATION - NASTTPO (Agenda Item 11):

Mr. Mark Ligman (Washington Emergency Management Department) comments briefly on the National Associate Member Agency Presentation (NASTTPO) which is made up of members and staff of State Emergency Response Commissions (SERCs), Tribal Emergency Response Commissions (TERCs), Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs), various federal agencies and private industry. Members include state, tribal or local government employees with Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know (EPCRA) program responsibilities, such as health, occupational safety, first response, environmental, and emergency management agencies. Associate members are welcome and include anyone with an interest in effective EPCRA implementation. The membership is dedicated to working together to prepare for possible emergencies and disasters involving hazardous materials, whether they are accidental releases or a result of terrorist acts.
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• NASTTPO annual and midyear meetings provide optimum settings for interaction and the sharing of ideas, problems, and solutions with other people responsible for implementing EPCRA;

• NASTTPO works with other organizations and federal, state, tribal, and local agencies with an interest in EPCRA and, through frequent mailings, keeps its members informed about issues, legislation and regulatory developments affecting EPCRA;

• NASTTPO studies EPCRA issues and comments on federal proposals such as DOT, EPA, FEMA and OSHA draft rules; issues papers produced by such federal agencies; and budget actions which affect implementation of EPCRA;

• www.nasttpo.org
• www.lepcinfoexchange.com
• Region 10 is invited to attend future meetings;
• The next NASTTPO meeting is scheduled for November 17-21, 2003, Las Vegas;

USCG PROPOSED RULE; 2003 REMOVAL EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS
(Agenda Item 12)

Mr. Whitson explained the USCG proposed rule and removal equipment requirements. The following topics were discussed:

• Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is out for comment until April 9, 2003;
• The Rule proposes four things. Each was discussed;
More information can be found at www.dms.dot.gov. Go to the “Search” tab and search for document 8661. Then view comments.

AGENCY UPDATES (Agenda Item 13):

FEMA
Mr. Mike Hammond (FEMA) discussed recent events that included a June 3, 2003 exercise in Pendleton. Mr. Hammond commented on the importance of participation, real time flexibility during a drill, and shelter-in-place related issues. Contact Mr. Hammond for a copy of the final report or for hazardous materials related questions.

DHHS
Reports on the effects related to the transition in the Department of Homeland Security.

NOAA
Mr. Devany comments on the Endangered Species Act Consultation, sponsored by the EPA and Coast Guard in conjunction with National Marine Fisheries. Draft is due
soon. Following will be an extension of the second phase to include Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. Devany introduced Ruth Yender (Scientific Support Coordinator) who is replacing Ms. Sharon Christopherson.

**WA ECOLOGY**

Mr. Dale Jensen reports on the following:
- Long term funding prevention tool in Neah Bay.
- Ecology continues to work with DOJ and Coast Guard on oil water separator related issues. There is a joint seminar scheduled for May 14, 2003.
- Ecology is working on response organizations and planning standards for preparing for spills;
- Implementation of Drill Track as a training tool;
- 16,000-gallon Cruise Line Sewage Spill Response;
- Methamphetamine Lab Update – Ecology has responded/cleaned up approximately 7,500 labs since 1990.
- Working with the Coast Guard on Protocols for roles and responsibility of spills.

**OR DEQ**

Mr. Chuck Donaldson reports on issues related to the State of Oregon’s financial status.
- Regional management.
- Re-Tasking efforts- one OSC assigned to WMD related issues.

Further, Mr. Donaldson reports on the State’s “White Powder” response methodology.

**EPA**

Mr. Field reports on issues related to Emergency Response enforcement, Superfund cleanup, and Oil Spill Response.
- Colombia Plating Facility Clean-up
- Klamath Falls Response

**USCG**

Mr. Whitson comments on the following:
- The ability of an Incident Commander to respond to multiple large-scale incidents and Area Command.
- District 13 is working with both MSO Puget Sound and MSO Portland to identify the next incident type and exercise.
- Oil Spill Control Course in September (Seattle). If you are interested contact Mr. Whitson.
- Logistics Exercise and Logistics Workgroup in September.
- Salvage Conference.
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**MSO PORTLAND**  
Captain Paul Jewell (MSO Portland) comments on the Oil Water Separator Bypass Program.

- Farewell to Dave Pierce (MSO Puget Sound)

**MSO PUGET SOUND**  
Commander Mike Dix (filling in for Captain Danny Ellis – MSO Puget Sound) reports on the following:

- Manchester Drill.
- Farewell to Jason Lehto (MSO Puget Sound).
- Security and Financial Issues.
- Recent Oil Spill responses.
- Cruise Liner industry.

**DOI**  
Mr. Preston Sleeger (DOI) comments on the following:

- Bureau implementing Contingency Plan;
- Participation in PREP drills;
- National Monuments off the Coast of California to the BLM.

**OSHA**  
Mr. Tsunehara comments on the following:

- Agency getting involved in emergency response workers health and safety;
- Effects of WTC;
- Agency meet for the first time in the RRT/NRT Co-Chairs Meeting.
- TOPOFF-2 Exercise participation;
- Incident Command System adoption;

**GSA**  
Mr. George Clarke (GSA) comments on the following:

- GSA and FEMA interagency working group established in Region 10;
- Next meeting is scheduled for July 15, 2003 at the FEMA Headquarters;
- If you would like to attend please provide your email address to Mr. Clarke.
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. David Summner (Department of Agriculture) comments on the following:

- Colombia Space Shuttle Recovery efforts;
- Biscuit Fire resource comparison;
- Zip code Fires – Leadership Issues;
- Education Potential related to National Fire Incident Teams;

DOJ

Ms. Jeanne Franken (DOJ) comments on the following:

- Litigation and Criminal Investigation Insight;
- New Carisa Update;
- Urges emergency response community to identify with the possibility that litigation may follow a response.

NAVY

Ms. Tammy Brown (NAVY) comments on the following:

- Regional Worst Case Drill;
- Regional Contingency Plan Concept;
- Regional Spill Management Team.

AUDIENCE

No comments received from the audience.

1610 HOURS MEETING ADJOURNS FOR THE DAY
Mr. Bob Pond (USCG Headquarters) discussed the USCG 2003 Proposed Rule and Removal Equipment Requirements. The following was discussed:

The Caps levels originally established by 33 CFR 155 and 33 CFR 154 were designed to ensure that vessel and facility plan holders maintained a baseline capability to respond to oil spills in various generic environments around the country. The purpose of this Caps review has been to determine the practicability of increasing these Caps levels to require vessel and facility plan holders to maintain an augmented response capability, using all available technologies to respond to the full range of spill scenarios. These technologies include mechanical recovery but also dispersants, in situ burning, and oil spill tracking. The Coast Guard contracted a team of information specialists to conduct a technology-based review and evaluate the following questions:

- *Is a 25% increase in the mechanical recovery Caps practicable at this time as proposed in the regulations? Is another increase in mechanical recovery Caps practicable in 5 years?*

- *Is a dispersant requirement practicable?*

- *Is an in-situ burn requirement practicable?*

- *Is a requirement for oil spill tracking technologies practicable?*

The Cap Review has been completed and is available for downloading on this website or is available for viewing on the Docket Management System's website (http://dms.dot.gov). This document should be viewed as an input that the Coast Guard will use to evaluate the scheduled increases for mechanical recovery requirements, and as input for pending regulatory projects that may address other removal technologies.

**For more information visit:**

**AREA COMMAND PRESENTATION (Agenda Item 15):**

Mr. Whitson provided a brief presentation on Area Command. The follow topics were discussed:

- **Area Command Overview;**
  - Area command is established when an incident is so large that it must be divided and managed as two or more separate incidents; or when multiple, separate incidents with Incident Management Teams (IMT) must be managed. The role of area command is to provide oversight direction to multiple incidents rather than providing direct action on any one incident as a Type 1 or Type 2
IMT would. Area command manages the efforts of various Incident Commanders to ensure that the overall objectives are being met, to set priorities among incidents and to allocate scarce resources between incidents.

- ICS- What is it?
- Unified Command – What is it?
- Incident Action Plan (IAP) common objectives and strategies;
- Why would you use Area Command?
- Area Commander responsibilities;
- Chain of Command and reporting relationships;
- When Area Command should be established;
- Area Command Organization;
- Technical Specialist within an Area Command;
- Major responsibilities of the Area Commander;
- Area Command considerations;
- Priority establishment;
- Demobilization Issues;
- Area Command Authority;
- Differing understanding of Area Command;
- Challenges associated with Area Command.
  - What we can do as a region to exercise Area Command.
  - Spill of National Significance/Incidents of National Significants.

For more information please visit:

http://www.nwcg.gov/pms/forms/ics_courses/ics_courses.htm
(See: Module 15)

INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM/AREA COMMAND Case Study – Shuttle Columbia Response, TOPOFF (Agenda Item 16):

Mr. Mike Szurlog presented a case study on the Shuttle Columbia Response. Sections that were presented including a slide show, EPA role and use of Area Command, Issues related to data management, Area Command in not traditional formats, and a short Emergency Response Team (ERT) Video that encompasses the response.

The following highlights were presented:

- EPA’s Role;
- Total Projected Budget;
- EPA’s Contractor responsibilities;
- Data management related issues;
  - Data calls.
  - Identification of Debris.
  - Volume of calls.
  - Prioritization of resources.
- Regional Response Team Considerations;
• Typical Hazardous Materials;
• 8 minute ERT Video presentation.

**Area Command during TOPOFF-2**

Ms. Sheldrake described the use of Area Command during the 2003 TOPOFF-2 exercise. The following topics were discussed:

- Area Command;
- EPA Area Command;
- Communications control;
- Positions staffed for TOPOFF-2;
- Organization chart;
- Area Commander’s Primary Responsibilities;
- EPA’s general impressions;
  - Effective information gathering through chain-of-command and supporting response operations.
  - Station EPA liaisons in all critical operations center locations.
  - Regularly scheduled communications with liaisons and field operations were essential.
  - Use of protected website to enhance communications.

**INTERNATIONAL OIL SPILLS CONFERENCE (IOSC) REPORT**
(Agenda Item 17):

Mr. Bernard provided a brief update on the International Oil Spills Conference (IOSC). For more information please visit: [http://www.iosc.org/about.htm](http://www.iosc.org/about.htm)

Mr. Bernard discussed the following:

- International Maritime Organization. - [http://www.imo.org/index.htm](http://www.imo.org/index.htm)
- Vessel Prestige- [http://www.ems.org/oil_spills/prestige.html](http://www.ems.org/oil_spills/prestige.html)
- Classes and presentations available, including ICS;
- Ports of Refuge related issues;
- Mr. Mike Devany commented on: [http://www.pewoceans.org](http://www.pewoceans.org)

**WORKGROUP REPORTS (Agenda Item 18):**

**Communications:**

- The communications workgroup has re-organized the Communications Section;
- The plan was reduced in size by 2/3;
- Ready to be delivered to RRT by next meeting.
GRP:
- Mr. Wylie representing Mr. Dale Davis discussed the on-going efforts of the GRP Workgroup. The following was discussed:
  - Completion of the Mid-Columbia GRP;
  - Six Action Items for this year:
    1. Transfer of responsibility of the Mid-Columbia Geographic Response plan to the EPA.
    2. Update the NWACP.
    4. Washington Pipeline Geographic Response Plan (GRP)
      a. [http://www.ecy.wa.gov](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/)
    5. Shoreline Database Update
  - Next meeting is scheduled for August 19, 2003.
  - List of GRP’s for the future.

Hazardous Substances:
Ms. Sheldrake commented on the following:
- 2003 Update of NWACP;
- Update of Section 7000 – changes reflecting Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- Have updates by 2004.

Marine Fire Fighting:
No Changes.

Response Technologies:
Ms. Pilky Jarvis filling in for Ms. Sarah Scherer discussed the following:
- Take on all response technologies;
- Existing objectives will be revised;
- ARTS process;
- Separate Response Technologies into multiple groups. Each group will have a lead;
- Group is looking at descriptions and best work practices that came out in the BA and BO for the ESA consultation. Those are compared to the shoreline countermeasure manual to see what needs to be updated.
- Putting together training for the Smart Protocols in March 2003;
- Decanting policy review status;
- The committee decided to request the Response Technologies Workgroup to assess what resources are required to go forward in re-addressing dispersant policy.
Public Affairs:
Mr. Matt Bernard discussed the following:
- Staff Changes.
- Public Affairs Workgroup Completed Fact Sheets;
- If you have ideas for new Fact Sheets please notify the Public Affairs Workgroup;
- Risk Communications Training.

Steering Committee:
Mr. Matt Bernard explained the following:
- Committee Reviews;
- Outreach Program – PAM;
- Next meeting September 3-4, 2003 – Seattle, WA;
- Minor Changes – NWACP