Cook Inlet Risk Assessment Advisory Panel Meeting
Friday, February 22, 2013
8:30 AM – 4:30 PM
Meeting Summary

Advisory Panel Members

Catherine Berg (Primary-Land/Resource Manager);
Owen Boyle (Alternate-Mariner/Other);
David DeVilbiss (Primary-Marine Salvage);
Greg Duggin (Primary/Oil Platforms &
Mobile Drill Unit Operator);
Jack Harrald (Risk Assessment Subject Matter Expert);
Bryan Hawkins (Primary-Ports & Harbors);
Jack Jensen (Primary-Mariner/Tanker);
Ron Long (Primary-NGO);
George Lowery (Primary-Mariner/Freight Ship);
Michael Opheim (Primary-Subsistence Use);
Greg Pavellas (Primary-Mariner/Tug & Barge);
Bob Pawloski (Alternate-NGO);
Josh Weston (Primary-Marine Pilot);
Rick Wilson (Primary-Mariner/Other);
Jim Butler (Primary-Fisheries).

Management Team Members

Mike Munger (Cook Inlet RCAC);
Lt. Kion Evans (USCG);
Steve Russell (ADEC).

Facilitation Team Members

Tim Robertson, Sierra Fletcher, and Amy Gilson (Nuka Research & Planning Group); Leslie Pearson (Pearson Consulting).

General Public

Sarah Allan (NOAA);
William Britt (Hilcorp Alaska);
Delice Calcote (Alaska Inter-Tribal Council);
Steven Catalano (Cook Inlet RCAC);
Brad Dunker (ADF&G);
Matthew Forney (NOAA/Coast Service);
Matthew Gill (Tesoro);
Jesse Hale (Alaska Maritime Agencies);
Andrew Hartsig (Ocean Conservancy);

Amy Holman (NOAA);
Ed Jaroch (Hilcorp Alaska);
Scott Johnson (USCG);
Tom Lakosh (Alaska Inter-Tribal Council);
Ed Page (Marine Exchange of Alaska);
Kurt Gibson (Hilcorp Alaska);
Lynda Giguere (Cook Inlet RCAC).

Purpose
The purpose of the meeting was to review proposed Risk Reduction Options (RRO) and identify those that merit additional analysis for consideration.

The Management Team welcomed the group and emphasized the importance of this next step of the project, including citing recent examples of incidents that illustrate the need to carefully identify, consider, and implement risk reduction measures.

The Subarea Plan for Cook Inlet is slated to be reviewed and updated starting as soon as the Fall of 2013. Recommendations from this group could be incorporated into the next round of revisions to this plan, if appropriate.

Review Project Status to Date
Three reports have been completed to date as part of the Cook Inlet Risk Assessment (CIRA). Key summary information from each report was presented. The reports are: (1) Cook Inlet Vessel Traffic Study, (2) Spill Baseline and Causality Study, and (3) Consequence Analysis.

For more information, see: CIRA Report Update

Public Comment
Tom Lakosh, Alaska Inter-Tribal Council

Overview of Risk Reduction Process
Jack Harrald presented a framework for thinking about risk reduction options. For a catastrophic event to take place, a series of things must go happen throughout the causal chain leading up to the event. The purpose of an RRO is to break that chain. For example, the purpose of a double hull is to prevent oil from reaching water if an accident occurs. On the other hand, the use of pilots is intended to reduce the probability that human error will result in an accident. It is important to consider RROs throughout the chain, rather than focusing entirely, for example, on bridge management (where one additional person may significantly reduce risk, but the gains of adding two or three additional people are significantly less).

It is also important to consider whether RROs actually reduce risk in the system, or whether they simply relocate it. For example, closing an area due to extreme weather conditions may have the unintended impact of increasing risk in areas where vessels must remain because they are not allowed to transit the closed area. Finally, Dr. Harrald noted that maintaining rigorous oversight of the system is key.

For more information, see: J Harrald Presentation

Developments and Opportunities in Vessel Tracking
Ed Page (Marine Exchange of Alaska) presented an update on the use of Automatic Identification System (AIS) tracking for vessels in Alaska. Expanding or enhancing AIS was suggested as one RRO, though the vessel communication and monitoring that can be implemented using AIS relate to several other of the RROs.

AIS data is monitored and maintained by the Marine Exchange of Alaska, in coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard. The current Alaskan system has 95 terrestrial AIS stations in Alaska, with 5-6 covering Cook Inlet. Increasingly, receivers are also able to send information to vessels though this is not currently authorized. AIS sites are also being built to be able to collect weather data, and there is the technical ability, though not currently being used, to send real-time weather data to vessels.

For more information, see: E Page Presentation

Review of Risk Reduction Options
In preparation for the meeting, the Project Team compiled a list of potential risk reduction options from a public solicitation process (December 2012 – February 2013), the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (providing funding for this project), and two previous studies (the Cook Inlet Safety of Navigation Forum in 1999 and the Ports and Waterways Safety Assessment of 2000). During the meeting, four additional RRO were suggested by Advisory Panel members.

The Advisory Panel discussed each RRO to ensure that all participants shared the same *basic* understanding of what it meant, what it was intended to do, whether it was feasible, and whether it fit within the purview of this group and the current legal scheme. Based on this discussion, the Advisory Panel agreed on: (1) RROs that merit further consideration, (2) RROs that should be implemented immediately (or are being implemented already), and (3) RROs that should be excluded from further consideration in this project. At this stage, the RROs are being discussed in broad categories; refining these into specific actions – and then evaluating them – will be the next step.

More detailed descriptions of the RROs the Advisory Panel found meriting further consideration will be developed for subsequent review and discussion. The list below is intended to document the decisions made at the meeting.

1. **RROs that merit further consideration at this time**
   The Advisory Panel and Management Team will review and refine this list. The Project Team will then develop a workplan for the detailed evaluation of the final list of RROs for consideration.

   - **Enhance vessel monitoring, situational awareness, and communications through application of Automatic Identification System (AIS) technology, 2-way communications via AIS, and sharing weather observation from ships and other sources.**

   - **Enhance current navigational charts, current gauges, and the Coast Pilot**
     - Update the Coast Pilot

   - **Improve ice monitoring capabilities**
     - Consider the application of ice monitoring through enhanced radar and dissemination of information over the Internet.

   - **Increase rescue towing capability**

   - **Encourage harbors to notify USCG if they deem a vessel unseaworthy**

   - **Construct cross-Inlet pipeline from Drift River to Nikiski**

   - **Map sub-sea infrastructure (both abandoned and active)**

   - **Encourage alternate inspections or audits for workboats**

2. **RROs that should be implemented immediately, or are being implemented already**

These items are relatively easy to implement, or, in some cases, are already being implemented. This list will be further refined.

- **Continue to improve of crew training, bridge team management, and communications.**
  - Encourage the establishment of best practices for crew training standards for vessels operating in ice conditions.

- **Continue to improve winter ice rules and guidelines**

- **Establish a Harbor Safety Committee to promote implementation of RROs and support ongoing improvement of safety by the maritime community**

- **Improve Subarea Oil and Hazardous Substance Contingency Plan** (Slated to begin in late 2013)

- **Ask the federal government to promulgate final regulations requiring vessel response plans for non-tank vessels (USCG)**

- **Seek continuous improvements in spill response equipment that is appropriate for Cook Inlet conditions**

- **Maintain project depth in Cook Inlet, especially at Knik Arm Shoal through dredging**

- **Improve cell coverage on marine waters in Cook Inlet**

3. RROs that should be *excluded* from further consideration

The Advisory Panel removed the items below from the list warranting further consideration. The reasons for their elimination are briefly noted.

- **Traffic Separation Scheme (TSS) and Vessel Tracking Service (VTS)**

  The Advisory Panel prefers a non-regulatory approach to establishing routing measures and vessel monitoring. TSS and VTS require implementation through U.S. Coast Guard regulations and are not likely to be funded in today's fiscal climate.

- **Establish International Maritime Organization (IMO) Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA)**

  Cook Inlet's vessel traffic is primarily domestic, and it is not an international waterway. PSSAs are used to regulate international waterways and vessel traffic.

- **Satellite tracking of vessels**

  The Advisory Panel prefers the real-time data on ship location that is gained from AIS; the delay in satellite data transmission makes it less useful for quickly identifying and responding to potential problems.

- **Long-range identification and tracking system (LRIT)**

  Similar to satellite tracking, the Advisory Panel prefers the real-time data from AIS to the delayed LRIT data. LRIT was intended for port security purposes, not to identify and address problems such as potential collisions or powered

groundings. LRIT data is not available quickly enough and to the right people to serve this function.

- **Improve aids to navigation**

  No improvements were identified.

- **Remove out-of-service platforms and subsea pipelines**

  State agencies do not have the authority to require the removal of this infrastructure *while leases are still active*. Therefore, even if equipment is not currently in use, removal cannot be required until the leases end.

- **Place quick-release mooring line hooks at the Port of Anchorage**

  Placing quick-release mooring line hooks at Anchorage may have unintended consequences, and are not necessarily needed.

- **Position/pre-approve use of Oil Spill Eater Product**

  The use of bioremediation products is up to the Alaska Regional Response Team. Also, it is not within the purview of this group to recommend specific products.

Public Comment
Tom Lakosh, Alaska Inter-Tribal Council
Delice Calcote, Alaska Inter-Tribal Council

Next Steps
The next steps for the project are to:

1. Distribute draft and final summary of this meeting
2. Convene via webinar to further refine list of priority RROs (additional information will be provided)
3. Establish workplan for evaluation of priority RROs