

Meeting Summary
Southeast Alaska Subarea Potential Places
of Refuge (PPOR) Workgroup

April 2, 2009
Ted Ferry Civic Center
Ketchikan, Alaska

Attendees:

Jason Boyer, USCG Ketchikan MSD
Marlene Campbell, City & Borough of
Sitka
Rick Erikson, Cruise Line Agency
Bob Fultz, ADEC
Cheryl Fultz, SEAPRO
Richard Gurry, SEAPA
Doug Hanson, SEAPA
Cecil McNutt, USCG

Jim Pomplan, SEAPRO
Mark Janes, Nuka Research
David Jancauskas, AKDOT

By Teleconference:

Catherine Berg, USFWS
Larry Iwamoto, ADEC
Doug Mutter, DOI
Scot Tiernan, ADEC

Proceedings:

Cheryl Fultz opened the meeting, welcomed the group to Ketchikan and led the introduction of the workgroup members.

Mark Janes gave an overview of the Subarea Contingency Plan (SCP) and the documents that comprise the Potential Places of Refuge (PPOR) section within the SCP. These documents will be developed by the workgroup describing PPOR within SE Alaska. The section will be used in the event of an emergency in a process established by the Alaska Regional Response Team's (ARRT) PPOR guidelines.

Larry Iwamoto, of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), described the ARRT PPOR Guidelines. He reviewed the 10-step decision-making process that the ARRT created for PPOR decisions that relies on the Incident Command System (ICS) to arrive at and implement decisions. He emphasized that the USCG Captain of the Port begins the process when a request for assistance from a vessel is received. He or she exercises ultimate authority during a crisis and has the option and duty to make decisions requiring immediate action.

Mark Janes gave a brief overview of the Potential Places of Refuge development process and related how the PPOR plans would be used in the context of the ARRT Guidelines.

Key points of the presentation included:

- There are no pre-designated places of refuge
- A place of refuge is selected on an incident specific basis

- PPOR plans are used in support of pre-established process
- The workgroup identifies potential sites and relevant info is collected
- The workgroup identifies information to assist decision makers during an incident
- The workgroup gathers information on use-conflicts outside of crisis situation
- Local knowledge is sought to understand capabilities, limitation, impacts

Mr. Janes listed the goals of the meeting:

- Provide public information
- Review and edit drafted PPOR documents that include:
 - The Introductory Section
 - The Risk Maps
 - The Zone Maps and
 - Supporting informational Tables
- Collect input regarding the documents & format of draft work products
- Discuss support available for aerial photography
- Establish a timeline for completion

Mr. Janes offered a review of the status of the project and explained the timeline and decisions to date. He reviewed the decisions of the initial meeting and explained that the group had selected Zones 5,6,7,8 as primary interest for this project. Mr. Iwamoto explained that the remaining areas may be addressed as funding becomes available.

The group then reviewed the Introductory Section that will appear in the SCP. The introduction will give background information and instruct the ICS participants on how to use the PPOR plans in conjunction with the ARRT Guidelines.

The group offered edits and reviewed the vessel classifications arrived at by the SE Alaska Pilots Association. The “Deep Draft” vessel classification limits the length size of to 1000 feet. Currently, there are cruise ships being built that exceed the limit. The group decided to add “1000+.” Everyone agreed that addressing PPOR for shallow draft vessels would not be feasible due to the large number of potential sites that exist in SE Alaska.

The group reviewed the risk maps and offered edits and additional information that will be included in the maps. Edits include:

- Removal of grounding sites
- Inclusion of SEAPRO and USCG response equipment depots
- Removal of near-shore fishing grounds
- Removal of abandoned canneries

The group moved to review the Site Assessment Matrix. Mark Janes explained that the SAM is a condensed reference that contains much of the information in the actual plans. Marlene Campbell offered that information regarding Sitka is incorrect and that she would like the opportunity to have it reviewed by local individuals to verify and add additional information. She was concerned that many of the PPORs were located in areas listed in the Sitka Coastal Management Plan as areas of concern and that adequate input hasn't been gathered from local communities that the plans may impact. The group then discussed the process of designating a PPOR during an incident. Having sensitive area

information available to decision-makers would educate them about the consequences of using the area, although circumstances may force them to still select the area. The group then encouraged additional outreach to gather review and input from local entities.

Mr Janes then reviewed the formatting of the SAM and the information therein. Edits were gathered and will be included in the next draft.

The group then reviewed the format and content of the individual zone maps and supporting informational tables. A discussion ensued regarding the inclusion of aerial photographs in the plans. It was brought up that some participants don't feel the benefits justify the expense. The group discussed GRS photography that was taken previously and the format used in other PPOR projects. The two are similar but different in the oblique angles and size of the area photographed. Mr. Janes will review these photos as well as others from additional sources to identify areas that will require photography. Cecil McNutt will follow up with the USCG regarding the possibility of getting support for aerial photos.

The group began a discussion on the specific location of each PPOR. Capt. Richard Gurry suggested that such specificity was not necessary and counterproductive in limiting the vessel masters to pin-point locations. The group agreed that the location should be denoted with a latitude and longitude, but also have the qualifying statement of "in the general area of."

Additional edits were offered and additional sites selected. These will be included in the next draft of the PPORs and will be available for the workgroup to review.

Mr. Janes then reviewed the project timeline for the completion of the project. Ms. Campbell requested additional time for local review of the documents and encouraged additional local input. She agreed to have the documents and input submitted by May. Mr. Janes will present a draft list of the sites edited during the meeting to assist her review. The group agreed that after the review and edits are received that Nuka Research will produce and post the PPOR documents to the web site. The workgroup will then review these and submit edits and revisions. If after this time there are no major issues that require the group's attention, the PPOR will be considered approved by the workgroup.

Action Items:

- Nuka Research will take and incorporate the edits and changes to the individual PPORs, Site Assessment Matrix, the Introductory Section and Risk Maps.
- Nuka Research will revise the list of sites and submit them to Ms. Campbell.
- Nuka Research will review available photography and submit to the USCG a list of sites needing additional support.
- Nuka Research will engage in additional outreach to Coastal Management Plan project managers and continue to contact other local governmental entities.
- USCG will investigate use of a helicopter for aerial photography.