



ALASKA
Department of
Environmental
Conservation

Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC)

**Cruise Ship Waste Water Science Advisory Panel
Teleconference Summary**

**November 1, 2011
8:00 AM – 10:00 AM (AK Time)**

Present

X
X
X

X
X

X
X

Panel members

Mark Buggins*
Dr. Reinaldo Gonzalez
Kenneth Fisher
Juha Kiukas
Lamberto Sazon
Lincoln Loehr**
Thomas Weigend
Steve Reifentuhl***
Michelle Ridgway****
Dr. Silke Schiewer
Dr. Simon Veronneau

Municipality of Sitka
Burns and McDonnell
EPA
Ecomarine
United States Coast Guard
Stoel Rives LLP
Meyer Werft
Southeast Herring Cons. Alliance
Oceanus Alaska Env. Services
U of A Environmental Engineering
Quinnipiac U School of Business

- * Mark Buggins fills the legislatively mandated coastal community Panel seat.
** Lincoln Loehr fills the legislatively mandated cruise ship industry Panel seat.
*** Steve Reifentuhl fills the legislatively mandated commercial fishing industry Panel seat.
**** Michelle Ridgway fills the legislatively mandated NGO Panel seat.

Others Present on the call

Hermann-Josef Mammes	Meyer Werft
Mike Tibbles	ACA
Michelle Bonnet	ADEC
Rob Edwardson	ADEC
Melissa Goldstein	ADEC
Krista Webb	OASIS Facilitator

Meeting Objectives

- Review DEC progress since the September SAP meeting.
- Outline the format of the April 2012 Technology Conference.
- Summarize progress made by Work Groups on the report.

Summary

8:00 a.m. - 8:05 a.m. Krista Webb - Facilitator

- Welcome and introductions
- Review, finalize, and approve draft agenda

8:05 a.m. - 9:05 a.m. DEC

- Michelle Bonnet described what DEC has been doing since last SAP meeting
 - Rob detailed review of Legislative Intent – the legislators were focused on treatment – cost and effectiveness, not the bigger picture of economic feasibility for the state, industry or individual operators. Reviewing the focus of the legislature during committee meetings has helped DEC decide to go with a BAT-style analysis (Best Available Technology).
 - Notes from Rob’s review of the legislative testimony will be sent to the Panel
- Michelle described the thought process of DEC to identify a transparent framework for logical systematic evaluation of each method. DEC developed flow charts, but they were too binary to use for evaluation (Yes/No). DEC settled on BAT-style evaluation process used in NPDES permitting, CERCLA, and spill contingency planning. DEC and OASIS developed draft matrices for treatment, control, and prevention with draft evaluation parameters. These matrices, once developed, will be critical for the Technology Workshop and 2013 permit development. The Panel was asked for immediate high-level feedback with regard to using this framework.
 - Reinaldo pointed out that High, Moderate, or Low were not quantitative enough to ultimately rate the individual treatments or methods. He suggested using a 1-5 scale so that the alternatives could be scored.
 - Max suggested identifying “threshold criteria” such as a minimum score for effectiveness to retain an alternative
 - Lincoln noted that certain criteria such as Feasibility of Installation were unknown. Where are ratings coming from? Krista confirmed that we need Panel input and expertise to apply the ratings
 - Thomas noted that new builds and retrofits may have different scores. He is not sure if we would be able to fill out all columns for all ships. Overall, he thought spreadsheets were a good idea; Panel needs to go through and fine tune.
 - Silke agreed that it would be good to quantify with 1-5 ratings and that thresholds would be needed.
 - Simon felt that the big discussion will be how to come up the ranking scale.
 - Later in the teleconference, Lincoln asked about the environmental benefit column. Reinaldo confirmed that it would have the same value for

all the technologies. Lincoln thought that even though this was the case, the column should be left in the spreadsheet.

- Reinaldo asked if land based treatments were no longer on the table. Rob confirmed that nothing is out of consideration. The tables and lists of methods and treatments can continue to be populated by the Panel.

OASIS/DEC will send the matrices to the Panel requesting more detailed feedback on the criteria used for evaluation as well as the technologies and processes being evaluated. The Panel is asked to provide this feedback within two weeks of receiving the matrices. DEC and OASIS will then populate the cells in the matrices and send the populated matrices to the Panel for review and comment.

9:05 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. Krista

- Krista outlined DEC's vision for the April 2012 Technology Workshop:
 - Review/acknowledge previous Technology Conference. Summarize it and make the feasibility study available.
 - Purpose of the Technology Workshop is to tell general public
 - Why the Panel is working on the issue: set stage for focusing on the 4 parameters of interest. Summarize the history, ballot initiative, statute and permits to this point,
 - Inform people about what technologies are onboard now and what levels of effluent quality they are achieving.
 - Review process for evaluating pollution prevention, control, and treatment technologies (BAT): complete list of technologies, flowchart, matrices for cost comparisons.
 - Present experimental technologies (R&D.)
 - Provide professional, interesting, interactive and engaging visual aids – BAT matrices/flowchart on posterboard, multi media such as video and power point, pictures/posters of ship illustrating how systems fit onto ships
 - The advantage of present BAT process of evaluating alternatives is that an observer can see how each rating was arrived at by looking at each cell.
 - The goal of the TW is to give the public the opportunity to understand the work of the Panel and create confidence in the Panel process and upcoming report
 - Krista asked Panel members for feedback about the plan for workshop.
 - Lincoln wondered why experimental technologies would be showcased at this point and suggested that the workshop provide context: what are the current processes? Compare with other permitted discharges in the state. Answer the “so what?” question. Clarified that he was not suggesting inviting vendors, but that he was just wondering whether that was part of the vision.
 - Thomas asked who would be running the show and presenting information, as the individual panelists can't speak to the technologies specifically. He agreed that we would not want the

vendors marketing. He suggested having third parties explain the technologies.

- Simon agreed that we did not want marketing vendors but stressed that it was important to have expertise on the technologies present. He also suggested a formal panelist Q&A session to put the information in context.
- Lincoln pointed out that the legislature wanted the technology conference to determine if systems were available to meet WQS. Vendors at the workshop would help inform the Panel. Not salesmen, but technical experts.
- Simon said it would be good for the public to see lack of transparency from vendors, and understand their reasons for protecting their processes. He also suggested we extend an invitation to the cruise lines to share their current technologies and levels of success as well as videos of engine rooms.
- Michelle pointed out that the interim report should be well in hand prior to the April Workshop and release of the draft 2013 permit, and information gained by the Panel at the April Workshop would likely not be able to inform the interim report or the next permit.

9:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Panel members

- How does Work Group progress tie in? Status reports from Work Groups:
 - Technical Feasibility (Reinaldo, Bert, and Silke) – Once all the edits from Sections 3 and 4 are captured, the group plans a conference call to finish Section 5. Planned in next 2-3 weeks.
 - Environmental Benefit (Michelle, Lincoln, Mark, and Ken) – Lincoln and Michelle have been working on sections of this Section. Lincoln sent his draft out to rest of the group and is waiting responses.
 - Economic Costs (Juha, Hermann/Thomas, Simon, and Steve) – Juha is trying to get costs from vendors. Not looking for whether application is economically feasible, but actually creating spreadsheets to be able to compare costs between systems (\$/gm BOD or \$ per person) and different sized ships. Krista will circulate the draft spreadsheet created in Juneau to the group to review and update. Hermann to provide some text and a figure discussed during the work group.

Next Steps

- Rob will circulate the legislative testimony and his review notes to the Panel.
- Krista will provide the draft BAT spreadsheets to the Panel. Panel to review and provide comments on the structure, criteria, and methods to Krista by November 18.