



Upper Narragansett Bay/Providence River Geographic Response Plan (GRP) Project

April 28, 2008, 1:00 p.m.
Save the Bay
100 Save the Bay Road
Providence, RI 02908

Attendees

Brian Cox – Coast Line Services
Ryan Cox – Coast Line Services
Mark Bisnett – USCG Sector Providence
Lori Gibson – RIDEM/Fish and Wildlife
Elise DeCola – Nuka Research
Dan Goulet – RI CRMC
Josh Hill – Promet Marine Services, Inc.
Jim Ball - RIDEM
Howard McVay – Northeastern Marine
Pilots

Ash Kinzel – Sprague
Elizabeth Hernberg – Sprague
Peter Croteau - Sprague
Michael Mulhare – RI DEM/Emerg Resp
Jay Osenkowski – RI DEM DPW
Christopher Raithel – RI DEM
Michael Sullivan – Motiva Enterprises
Erin Lambie – USCG Sector SE N England
John Torgan – Save the Bay
John Whyte – Clean Harbors
Kate Wright – Nuka Research

Introduction & Opening Comments

Michael Mulhare welcomed group back and thanked John Torgan for opportunity to meet at Save the Bay.

John Torgan spoke of the history of the Save the Bay building. Torgan led the group of attendees on a tour of the facility and reiterated that the building would be offered for use as an command center, should an oil spill occur. The group toured the building and took note of a large conference room (>100 people) with AV setup, two classrooms, a lab, an outdoor amphitheater, and a locker room. The building also contains a business wing with business equipment and supplies.

Review of Study Area and Prioritization of Sites

Elise DeCola of Nuka Research and Planning Group explained that the purpose of the meeting was to move forward with site selection for GRP development in the study area. Prior to the meeting, DeCola had compiled information on potential sites within the upper Narragansett Bay region. She stated that the study area ran from Warwick Neck to Prudence Island (Mike Mulhare of RIDEM later elaborated that the study will likely continue in the future to include other inlets beyond the study area).

- DeCola explained that GRP projects typically begin with a long list of candidate sites, from which sites are prioritized for GRP development, and a smaller sub-set is selected as GRP sites. However, since the Upper Narragansett Bay/Providence River project includes a relatively small study area, with a total of 23 candidate sites identified, there is a high level of likelihood that GRP will be developed for all candidate sites. DeCola stated that while for this project, site prioritization was less important at this point in the process, it is still useful and necessary to catalog the



sensitivities at each site and assign relative priorities, because this information could be used during a response to prioritize among GRP sites.

DeCola explained that there are three criteria typically used to prioritize sites for GRP development:

- Sensitivity and vulnerability to oil spill impacts (i.e. habitat, species);
- Probability of oil spill Impacts (i.e. vessel traffic, tides);
- Feasibility of GRP deployment (can existing technologies be applied to protect a given site?).

Sprague Energy Booming Strategies

DeCola invited Ash Kinzel to speak on behalf of Sprague Energy about a recent initiative they took to develop GRP for the Providence River. Kinzel explained that Sprague Energy had developed their own GRPs about a year ago. They used the booming strategies in the Area Contingency Plan and overlaid them on aerial photographs and maps of the area. They then developed ICS-204 forms that identify the resource needs to implement each strategy, so that in the event that Sprague was the RP they had the pre-planning in place to implement the GRP. Kinzel noted that they are still working through the 204 processes (overview maps are done but not each specific site). Kinzel stated that Sprague Energy is appreciative of the opportunity to test their GRPs and DeCola reciprocated that Motiva, DEM and Nuka are appreciative for Sprague's generosity in sharing their booming strategies.

Site Survey Plans and Volunteers

DeCola referred the group to the Site Prioritization Matrix and explained that the matrix includes information for each site that can be used to consider priority based on the site prioritization criteria of sensitivity, probability, and feasibility. DeCola displayed base maps for each of the 23 sites and invited the group to verbally offer feedback for each site, relative to the criterion. Elizabeth Hernberg asked for clarification regarding subjective criteria and several other members of the group asked similar questions. Lori Gibson of RIDEM/Fish and Wildlife questioned whether DeCola wanted to know about rafting birds and wildlife in the bay, rather than just the coastline.

DeCola clarified that determining priority is a subjective process and that all information is welcome and valuable. The group determined that they would provide feedback to DeCola regarding specific sites via phone or email at a later time, following further investigation. Mike Mulhare further stated that he helped industry folks would provide their input based on past deployment exercises.

DeCola explained that the next phase of the GRP development would involve surveying each of the 23 proposed sites from the water. She explained that survey trips are typically comprised of representatives from local, state, and federal agencies, and other interested parties. DeCola invited volunteers to go out on site surveys and asked people to put an asterick next to their name on the sign in sheet to indicate that they'd like to volunteer to participate in one or more site surveys. She noted that these would take place in late May and early June.

Deployment Test on May 14

John Whyte of Clean Harbors discussed boom deployment testing on May 14th. Clean Harbors is planning 2 days of on-water testing of new skimmers and conducting on-water qualification training for their boat operators. They offered to let the GRP group test one of the Sprague Energy boom deployment strategies during the exercise.



Timeline and Next Meeting

DeCola explained that the next few months would be spent collecting field data and then developing draft GRPs for each site. The next meeting of the full work group will be held toward end of summer, and at that meeting the group will be reviewing the draft GRPs and discussing a GRP testing plan. In the interim, project information will be disseminated through the project website and through e-mails.