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Welcome to the 2017 Pacific States/British Columbia Oil Spill Task Force Annual Report. This report offers highlights of our accomplishments in 2016 and progress-to-date on our 2017 Annual Work Plan tasks plus a glimpse of our work ahead. Over the past year our attention has focused on transboundary spill prevention and preparedness. The Task Force is engaged in a study with Clear Seas Centre for Responsible Marine Shipping (of British Columbia) exploring the occurrence of drifting vessels in remote coastal waters of the West Coast. This project involves examining incident data, researching causal factors, and identifying prevention measures. We are also completing a five-year review of the Task Force’s Transboundary Oil Spill Response Capability Report initially issued in 2011. The results of this review will be released in mid-2017. In addition, the Task Force is coordinating the formation of a transboundary forum for marine safety and oil spill prevention. This forum will bring together stakeholders from Washington State and British Columbia to share ideas, exchange information and develop standards of care for safe vessel travel through the transboundary waters.

We are also continuing to monitor the movement of crude oil, as the sources, means of transport and destinations change over time. Prevention of small spills is the ongoing focus of our outreach arm, the Pacific Oil Spill Prevention and Education Team (POSPET).

Read about these efforts and more in the following pages.
The Pacific States/British Columbia Oil Spill Task Force was formed in 1988 by the Governor of Washington State and Prime Minister of British Columbia, after the oil barge Nestucca collided with its tug along the Washington State coast. The following year, the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Prince William Sound led Alaska, California, Oregon and California to join the Task Force. Hawaii became a member in 2001 creating a broad coalition of western Pacific states and British Columbia, united in their efforts to prevent and respond to oil spills across the West Coast. In 2012, the Task Force signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Coast Guard to formally recognize the collaborative working history and relationship held between the Task Force and U.S. Coast Guard. This on-going partnership helps align our work in oil spill prevention and response with our federal partners.

Task Force members represent the spill response organizations within each jurisdiction and the organization is structured with two committees. The Executive Members include the agency or spill program managers from each state or province; the Coordinating Committee is made up of spill prevention, preparedness and response program managers and staff who work closely with the Executive Coordinator to carry out work plan tasks. To learn more about each of the Task Force members and their oil spill programs, please see the Jurisdictional Overviews beginning on page 30.

Every five years, the Task Force reviews and refreshes its strategic plan. This allows the Task Force to shift and adapt to new and emerging oil spill risks, and to develop annual work plans that address these risks with specific tasks and targeted actions. Visit our website to learn more about our history, strategic plan, and our past accomplishments: www.oilspilltaskforce.org.
Long Term Vision Statement

No spilled oil.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Pacific States/British Columbia Oil Spill Task Force is to strengthen state and provincial capabilities to prevent, prepare for and respond to oil spills.

WHAT WE DO

- We share information on regional and national oil spill programs, oil spill policy, and emerging technology with member jurisdictions.
- We coordinate and facilitate projects, workshops, and forums on oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response topics of concern.
- We help create tools and resources to foster and encourage best industry practices.
- We engage with industry partners in spill prevention and response planning.
- We support federal policy initiatives that help prevent oil spills and protect resources at risk.
- We conduct on-going outreach and communications to share our accomplishments with the public and stakeholders.

Clean up crew examine the beach along Bella Bella, B.C. coastline following tug sinking. (photo: B.C. Ministry of Environment)
SIGNIFICANT INCIDENTS

A Union Pacific Railroad train derailed along the Columbia River, near Mosier Oregon on June 3, 2016. The 96-car train was hauling Bakken crude. Sixteen cars derailed, and three of the cars caught on fire. Approximately 47,000 gallons of crude was lost from the derailed train; 13,000 gallons entered a nearby wastewater treatment plant, 18,000 gallons were captured in the contaminated soil that was removed from the site, and 16,000 gallons burned.

The Nathan E. Stewart, a tugboat owned by Kirby Offshore Marine, ran aground on October 13, 2016 off Campbell Island near Bella Bella, British Columbia. Approximately 6,300 gallons of diesel fuel were removed before the tug sank. Salvage operators retrieved an additional 25,000 gallons from the vessel. An estimated 28,000 gallons of diesel fuels and roughly 650 gallons of industrial lubricants entered the marine waters at the site.
A Union Pacific Railroad train derailed along the Columbia River, near Mosier, Oregon on June 3, 2016. The 96-car train was hauling Bakken crude. Sixteen cars derailed, and 3 of the cars caught on fire. Approximately 47,000 gallons of crude was lost from the derailed train; 13,000 gallons entered a nearby wastewater treatment plant, 18,000 gallons were captured in the contaminated soil that was removed from the site, and 16,000 gallons burned.

Our Work: PREVENTION
CLEAR SEAS DRIFT VESSEL STUDY

The Task Force is participating in a study led by Clear Seas Centre for Responsible Marine Shipping (Clear Seas), to understand the causes of drifting vessels. According to research carried out by Clear Seas, data indicates that groundings account for about one-third of commercial ship accidents. Groundings rank second in frequency after ship-on-ship collisions, and a portion of these incidents are drift groundings resulting from a loss of propulsion.

Given the recent stranding of a container vessel off the B.C. coast and a barge drifting in Alaska waters, the Task Force supports Clear Seas’ efforts exploring how to reduce the likelihood of these incidents occurring. The risk of oil spills from drifting vessels due to loss of propulsion, navigation, human errors, and other causes is a concern given the remote coastline within West Coast vessel traffic routes. Clear Seas has initiated a study to explore the causes and frequency of loss-of-control occurrences by ship type, to analyze tracking data regarding the numbers of vessels transiting Canadian coastline, to review best industry practices for off-shore travel, and to explore opportunities to prevent groundings.

The Task Force offered to participate in the vessel drift study through a letter of interest submitted to Clear Seas in August 2016. Beginning in late 2016 (and continuing into 2017), the Task Force will participate in the following two working groups:

- Loss of Vessel Control Incident Data
- Marine Safety System Gaps and Limitations

A final report with recommendations from this study is expected in late 2017. For more information about Clear Seas and the drift vessel study, visit the Clear Seas website: www.clearseas.org
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International vessels transiting the West Coast that are not headed to a U.S. or Canadian ports are traveling in “innocent passage”, which means they are not required to have salvage or response equipment, they are not required to adhere to vessel traffic lanes, nor are they required to carry vessel tracking technology. With increased vessel traffic likely due to the opening up of arctic waters, innocent vessel transits along Alaska and British Columbia’s shorelines poses growing threat particularly in remote areas where response vessels and equipment are not readily available.

The recent multiple maritime incidents in Canadian and U.S. waters have raised concerns and interest in developing additional safety measures: the Russian cargo vessel *Simushir* loss of power and near grounding in heavy weather in 2014; the bulk carrier *MV Argos* loss of propulsion between in the Strait of Juan de Fuca in 2016; and the Matson *Consumer* container ship engine failure also in 2016. All of these incidents involved U.S. flag vessels or vessels engaged in U.S. trade and all were sailing on innocent passage through Canadian waters, limiting Canada’s jurisdiction in regulating these vessels.

To address the risk of oil spills by vessels in innocent passage, the Task Force has proposed a Reciprocal Prevention Agreement between the U.S. and Canada. This agreement would establish prevention standards and promote voluntary measures to increase vessel traffic safety including:

- Establishment of vessel routes and required compliance so vessels are kept a safe distance off shore to allow for substantial response time. The Task Force’s Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Study (conducted in 2008) recommends specific distances depending on the vessel type and risk posed.

- Early notification to the coastal jurisdiction when a vessel incurs a casualty or is disabled.

- Participation in a monitoring system to track vessels and provide assistance when needed.

- Identification of places of refuge with potential mooring buoys.

- Prepositioning of assets, such as towing packages and ship arrestors.

In early January 2017, the Task Force submitted letters to the U.S. Coast Guard and Canadian Coast Guard requesting the consideration of a reciprocal prevention agreement between the U.S. and Canada to address the risk of vessels in innocent passage. The Task Force will continue to promote dialog and discussion between the U.S. and Canada on this proposal through 2017.
OIL SPILL DATA

Since 2002, the Task Force has been compiling data on oil spills from Washington State, Alaska, Oregon, Hawaii, and California. This data is collected using a template based on the Task Force’s data dictionary which helps ensure consistency across the jurisdictions. Our Oil Spill data reports are shared with stakeholders and the public, and are available on the Task Force website.

In 2016, the Task Force partnered with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to incorporate our oil spill data into the Environmental Response Management Application (ERMA). Responders, spill planners and the public can now view maps of the Task Force data in ERMA by location, spill size, type of oil and medium, from 2002 through 2016.

Highlights of our 2016 Data

A total of 564 releases occurred during 2016, with a total volume of 326,814 gallons spilled. Of those, 3 releases were over 10,000 gallons.

Non-Crude Spills in 2016

- 547 releases were non-crude spills totaling 237,687 gallons.
- Vehicles (37%) and vessels (45%) were the major sources of non-crude spills, more than three quarters of the total non-crude volume.
- Over half of the total non-crude spill volume was attributable to organizational/management failure (38%) or human error (36%).
- Nearly half (47%) of the non-crude volume was spilled to marine waters.

Crude Oil Spills in 2016

- 17 Crude oil releases totaling 89,127 gallons
- Crude oil releases comprised 27% of the total volume
- Human error (51%) was the cause of about half of the crude oil spill volume
- Mechanical failure (98.7%) comprised virtually all spill volume due to equipment failure.

Crude spills to marine (50%) and fresh water (47%) comprised most of the total volume.

Trends

The 2002–16 data provides us with an opportunity to look at 15-year trends, which is also shown in this report. Here are the highlights:

- A total of 14,401, releases occurred during the 15-year period 2002–16, with a total volume of approximately 12.1 million gallons.
- Over the 15-year period, the combined volume of non-crude spills was more than 2.5 times that for crude spills.
- The top two crude oil spills during the 13-year period were 463,848 gallons in California (2008) and 267,000 gallons in Alaska (2006). The combined volume of these two incidents comprised 23% of the total crude oil volume released for the period.
- Overall, facilities (50%) and pipelines (19%) were the major sources of spills during the 13-year period.
- Facilities were the source of 53% of the Non-Crude spill volume.

Bella Bella Tug Spill
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Pipelines (53%) and facilities (43%) were the major sources of crude oil spills.

Overall, equipment failure (54%) and human error (30%) were the major spill causes.

Equipment failure (45%) and human error (37%) were the predominant causes for non-crude spills.

78% of the total crude oil spill volume was due to equipment failure.

To view the complete oil spill summary report for 2016, please visit the Task Force website: www.oilspilltaskforce.org/ourwork/data-project/

*California’s data submission does not include every spill reported to the State in 2016, compared to previous years. This resulted in a significant drop in the California data presented regarding the total number of spills and the total volume for the year, especially for spills to land. Hawaii’s data submission for 2015 represents only the first half of the year due to issues encountered in their new data management system.
NUMBER OF SPILLS AND VOLUME RELEASED 2002–16

### Number of Spills

- **2002**: 1,600
- **2003**: 1,400
- **2004**: 1,400
- **2005**: 1,600
- **2006**: 1,600
- **2007**: 1,800
- **2008**: 1,800
- **2009**: 1,400
- **2010**: 1,400
- **2011**: 1,200
- **2012**: 1,200
- **2013**: 800
- **2014**: 800
- **2015**: 800
- **2016**: 600

### Volume Released (Gallons)

- **2002**: 1.8M
- **2003**: 1.6M
- **2004**: 1.6M
- **2005**: 1.4M
- **2006**: 1.4M
- **2007**: 1.2M
- **2008**: 1.2M
- **2009**: 1.2M
- **2010**: 1.2M
- **2011**: 1.2M
- **2012**: 0.8M
- **2013**: 0.8M
- **2014**: 0.8M
- **2015**: 0.6M
- **2016**: 0.4M
NON-CRUDÉ SPILLS BY PRODUCT, ALL STATES 2016
(percent total volume)

- diesel oil/marine gas oil: 75%
- gasoline: 13%
- lube/motor oil: 2%
- hydraulic oil: 2%
- mineral/transformer oil: 2%
- aviation gasoline: 2%
- other: 5%

NON-CRUDÉ SPILLS BY MEDIUM IMPACTED 2016
(percent total volume)

- marine: 47%
- land: 42%
- fresh water: 6%
- impermeable surface: 5%
CRUDE SPILLS BY CAUSE, ALL STATES 2016
(percent total volume)

- Equipment failure: 48.5%
- Human error: 51.2%
- External conditions/unknown: 0.3%

CRUDE VS. NON-CRUDE SPILLS, ALL STATES 2016
(per cent total volume)

- Crude oil: 27%
- Non-crude oil: 73%
CRUDE BY RAIL

Crude oil prices dropped in 2016, leading to a slowdown in production from North Dakota and Alberta sources. Despite the lower price, crude transport by rail continues across the West Coast, and the risk of spills remains a concern. The recent spill in Mosier, OR, illustrates the vulnerability of inland and coastal areas to high-consequence spills based on the proximity of rail lines to major waterways and communities.

The Task Force continues to study the potential risks of oil spills from railroads, pipelines, barges, and vessels and has developed products and tools to better understand crude transport across the West Coast.

Map of Crude Oil Movement

In 2014, we created a map depicting the rail lines carrying crude oil along the West Coast. The map provides a general picture of where movement is occurring, including locations of existing and proposed refineries, offload facilities, and marine terminals. The map was updated in January 2017, to reflect the change in

Volumes of Crude Oil Transported

In an effort to track the trends in crude movement across the West Coast, the Task Force jurisdictions compiled annual volumes of crude transported by rail, pipeline, barge, and vessel (where available) in 2014–16. Note that a gallon may be reported more than once if, for example, it moved via rail to an offloading facility and then transferred by barge to a refinery. The intention of this data is to provide a general overview of the volumes moving across the region by vector.
In remote areas where response equipment and commercial services may be limited or unavailable, a jurisdiction may request that the U.S. Coast Guard accept Alternative Planning Criteria (APC) to meet their response plan requirements for vessels. These APC may include prevention strategies to reduce the risk of spills, or alternative response strategies (equipment or procedures) to respond to an incident should it occur. For Alaska, APC is an important option given the large areas of remote coastline this state occupies.

The U.S. Coast Guard has developed draft APC guidance and in early 2016 (and again in 2017), made the document available for review. The Task Force submitted a comment letter on April 10 2017 recommending that the U.S. Coast guard to emphasize prevention, clarify criteria for APC approval, and approve ACPs at the Sector level. The Task Force will monitor progress on the guidance development and will seek opportunities to promote dialog with the U.S. Coast Guard on APC during annual Task Force/ U.S. Coast Guard meetings.
The Pacific Oil Spill Prevention Education Team (POSPET) evolved from the simple premise that small oil spills can collectively cause significant environmental harm. In an effort to prevent small spills, the Task Force launched POSPET in 1992. POSPET members include representatives from Task Force jurisdictions, federal agencies, industry associations, and nonprofit groups. Since its inception, POSPET has been tackling the widespread problem of small spills through sharing ideas and outreach strategies, and collaborating and sharing educational tools and resources. Outreach has focused on preventing spills during fueling, utilizing appropriate cleanup methods when spills do occur, and reporting spills to the OILS 911 hotline.

In 2016, POSPET members met three times—once in person and twice via conference call—to share updates about clean marina certification efforts, boater outreach campaigns, and other activities of shared interest across POSPET jurisdictions. Additionally, POSPET members shared updates about progress on implementation of the 2016 POSPET work plan.

Accomplishments of the 2016 work plan:

- Online Platform for materials sharing. POSPET members established a shared-platform on Google Drive. This platform will better enable POSPET members to share resources and outreach materials and collaborate in a secure on-line environment.
- Modernize Spills Aren’t Slick design and materials. Spills Aren’t Slick materials are used throughout the West Coast but have not been updated since the early 1990s. In 2016, POSPET formed a work group to address this. The results are updated, freshened materials that were published in January 2017.
- Represent POSPET at conferences. POSPET presented an overview of its work at the 2016 Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference. Three POSPET members from Washington State and British Columbia collaborated to provide a 20-minute presentation focused particularly on small spill prevention and outreach efforts in the Salish Sea. The session was well received and was attended by over 40 individuals.

Additional member activities in 2016 include:

- POSPET members agreed that a priority task for the coming year was to identify and fill gaps in training and educational materials for marina and harbor managers and staff. As a result, the group formed a marina subcommittee. The committee is currently finalizing its purpose and objectives and expects to identify gaps and opportunities in the training materials arena in 2017, and begin taking steps to filling them.
- A significant effort for POSPET members was the completion of the Pollution Prevention for Washington State Marinas available at: https://wsg.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/marina-handbook.pdf. The handbook was a collaborative effort between numerous organizations and was led by two POSPET members: the Washington State Department of Ecology and the Puget Soundkeeper Alliance. In addition, POSPET members Washington State Dept. of Natural Resources and Washington Sea Grant contributed to the project.
The handbook is intended to help marina managers have information at their fingertips to better understand what needs to be done to operate a clean and safe marina. The project was a major topic of POSPET meetings throughout 2016, as other jurisdictions have expressed interest in learning from Washington State’s efforts and gleaning lessons learned for their own pollution prevention guidebook projects. In 2017, a virtual round-table will be scheduled with Washington State’s project leaders and POSPET members from California, British Columbia and Alaska so that details can be shared about how the process went, lessons learned, etc.

This collaborative, information-sharing partnership is exactly what POSPET was designed to achieve, and has already helped Oregon develop their own guidebook.

### Clean Marinas/Clean Harbors

The Clean Marina/Clean Harbor program is a voluntary certification program whereby managers of these facilities follow best practices for oil spill prevention, waste reduction, and water quality protection. POSPET workgroup members are instrumental in reaching out to harbors and marinas to initiate new certification or renew existing certified facilities. The table below lists the number of certified facilities in each jurisdiction where the program exists. Every POSPET jurisdiction reported increases in certified Clean Marinas/Clean Harbors in 2016, and a large number of marinas are in the process of becoming certified.

Maintaining stable funding for Clean Marinas/Clean Harbor certification programs is a consistent challenge for POSPET members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/PROVINCE</th>
<th>NO. CERTIFIED</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.alaskacleanharbors.org">www.alaskacleanharbors.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><a href="http://www.georgiastrait.org/work/cleanmarinebc/marinas/">www.georgiastrait.org/work/cleanmarinebc/marinas/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>128</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cleanmarina.org">www.cleanmarina.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>63</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oregon.gov/OSMB/boater-info/Pages/Clean-Marinas.aspx">www.oregon.gov/OSMB/boater-info/Pages/Clean-Marinas.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>73</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cleanmarinawashington.org">www.cleanmarinawashington.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 96-car train was hauling Bakken crude. Sixteen cars derailed, and 3 of the cars caught on fire. Approximately 47,000 gallons of crude was lost from the derailed train; 13,000 gallons entered a nearby wastewater treatment plant, 18,000 gallons were captured in the contaminated soil that was removed from the site, and 16,000 gallons burned.
In 2008, the Task Force launched a comprehensive stakeholder engagement effort to assess the marine oil spill preparedness and response capabilities in the Canada-U.S. Pacific (CANUSPAC) and Canada-U.S. Dixon Entrance (CANUSDIX) transboundary regions. The resulting report, The Stakeholder Workgroup Review of Planning and Response Capabilities for a Marine Oil Spill on the U.S./Canadian Transboundary Areas of the Pacific Coast Project Report (2011 Transboundary Report) includes 140 specific recommendations in five topic areas—command, planning, operations, logistics, and finance. The 2011 Transboundary Report was a significant undertaking, which spanned three years, involved five committees, engaged 88 stakeholders and produced numerous in-depth white papers.

One of the 140 recommendations in the 2011 Transboundary Report was for the Task Force to assess the status of the Transboundary Report’s recommendations five years from its 2011 publication. The Task Force initiated the five-year review in the fall of 2016, with an estimated completion date of June 2017.

The original workgroup reconvened to scope the review effort. The workgroup included five individuals representing the state/provincial spill prevention, preparedness and response programs in the CANUSPAC and CANUSDIX regions: Dave Byers, WA Dept. of Ecology; Graham Knox, B.C. Ministry of the Environment; and Bob Mattson, AK Dept. of Environmental Conservation. The workgroup also included two representatives of response organizations: David Owings, Southeast Alaska Petroleum Response Organization; and Kevin Gardner, Western Canada Marine Response Corporation. The workgroup scoped the review effort, and designed and distributed a survey instrument that was sent to approximately 50 entities identified in the original report to implement the 140 recommendations. The workgroup is currently in the process of analyzing the responses and completing a status report, due for release in June 2017.

**Once completed, the report will:**

- Recognize the significant accomplishments of the transboundary spill preparedness and response community during the past five years
- Identify and prioritize gaps and opportunities to further improve transboundary response efforts, including prioritization of remaining, non-implemented recommendations
- Recommend key steps needed to implement these priorities

*Waters shared by British Columbia, Washington and Alaska*
Since 1999, the Task Force has hosted a hotline (OILS-911) for reporting spills and oil sheens, primarily targeting the small boating community. The line operates in CA, WA, OR, and B.C. The hotline number along with the Coast Guard reporting phone number is posted on signage at marinas and harbors, as well as in pamphlets and brochures and on the home page of the Task Force website. The intent is to provide a number that is easy to remember for reporting spills.

The figure to the left illustrates the trends in calls from 1999 through 2016. While CA typically receives the largest number of calls, this does not necessary mean that more spills occur there. Given the extent of populated coastline in CA relative to the other western states, sheens and other small spills are more likely to be spotted and reported.
Columbia River, near Mosier Oregon on June 3, 2016. The 96-car train was hauling Bakken crude. Sixteen cars derailed, and 3 of the cars caught on fire. Approximately 47,000 gallons of crude was lost from the derailed train; 13,000 gallons entered a nearby wastewater treatment plant, 18,000 gallons were captured in the contaminated soil that was removed from the site, and 16,000 gallons burned.

Our Work: COMMUNICATIONS
The Task Force held its 2016 Annual Meeting in conjunction with Clean Pacific, which was held in Seattle, WA. The Annual Meeting took place on June 21 (the day prior to the start of Clean Pacific) and was hosted by the Washington State Department of Ecology. The half-day event focused on Task Force member and Executive Coordinator updates, followed by a panel discussion on Best Achievable Technology. Panelists included state representatives (Sonja Larson, WA ECY; Kristin Ryan, AK DEC; and Ryan Todd, CA OSPR), federal agencies (Scott Knuston, US Coast Guard; and Tim Steffek, BSEE), and industry (Paul Smith, Ocean Smith Services; Michael Lowry, Western Canada Marine Response Corporation; and Stephanie Baron, National Response Corporation).
API Spills Advisory Group Meetings
The Task Force participates in biannual American Petroleum Institute Spills Advisory Group (SAG) meetings in Washington D.C. The SAG consists of leadership from oil spill programs across industry, federal agencies and state/regional organizations. Meetings are an opportunity to update The SAG on projects and initiatives the Task Force has underway, and share news from the West Coast on preparedness and response issues and policy initiatives. The Task Force benefits from the interaction and information exchange between agencies and industry represented at the SAG.

MOU with the U.S. Coast Guard
In 2012, the Task Force signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the U.S. Coast Guard, formalizing the ongoing work that has developed over the years. In December 2016, Task Force Executive Coordinator Sarah Brace was joined by Task Force Executive Tom Cullen and Coordinating Committee member Ryan Todd to brief Vice Admiral Midgette at the Pacific Area headquarters on current and future projects and accomplishments.

LETTERS AND COMMENTS
The Task Force offers a collective voice of the jurisdictions on the West Coast, and we often use this voice to submit comments to federal leadership on proposed rulemaking, regulations, or new guidance on issues related to oil spill prevention or response planning. In 2016 and early 2017, the Task Force sent comments letters to the following federal entities on these initiatives:

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, September 2016
Regarding proposed rulemaking addressing oil spill response plans and information sharing for railroads.

U.S. and Canadian Coast Guards, Transport Canada, January 2017
Regarding proposed reciprocal prevention agreement; vessels in innocent passage.

U.S. Coast Guard, April 2017
Comments on the proposed updates to the Alternative Planning Criteria National Guidelines.
ALASKA

MISSION
Prevent, respond, and ensure the cleanup of unauthorized discharges of oil and hazardous substances.

OVERVIEW
The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation’s (ADEC) Division of Spill Prevention and Response (SPAR) is responsible for protecting Alaska’s land, waters, and air from oil and hazardous substance spills. ADEC has several jurisdictional updates in addition to news concerning active spills. Our update topics include State budget, environmental legislation, drills improvement and area planning.

State Budget
The State of Alaska has cut its budget by 44% in the last four years, while revenues for the same period are down more than 80%. A $3 billion fiscal gap remains. The price of oil hovers at about $50 per barrel, an improvement over last year when it was at $26 a barrel. ADEC’s Division of Spill Prevention and Response remains funded through the Oil and Hazardous Substance Release Prevention and Response Fund.

The State is focused on making the government more efficient, in part through shared services. Several initiatives including the Motor Fuel Tax and the Permanent Fund legislation, are part of Governor Walker’s proposal to solve the fiscal crisis.

Legislation
In December 2016, ADEC proposed new regulations in 18 AAC 75 for the registration of Class 2 facilities—facilities that store non-crude oil in aboveground storage tanks and have storage capacities of 1,000 gallons or greater but less than 420,000 gallons. The department’s goal is to determine the number and location of Class 2 facilities in the state. Currently the department does not have this information and often only finds out about these facilities after a spill has occurred. Gathering this information will allow the department to provide technical assistance to these facilities to help prevent spills and gauge the response measures of facilities when spills occur.

This regulations project is closed for public comment and is now under internal review. For more detail on this project see: www.dec.alaska.gov/spar/regulation_projects/pprClass2Fac.htm

Drills Improvement
ADEC continues to work on improving the spill response exercise program to better serve regulators, operators, spill response organizations, and other stakeholders, while maintaining or improving response readiness. A workshop on this topic is planned in Anchorage for April 2017. Details of our work in this arena may be found here: www.dec.alaska.gov/spar/ppr/drills.htm.

Regional/Area Planning
A joint proposal by the ADEC, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and U.S. Coast Guard to consider adjusting the existing Unified Plan for oil spill and hazardous substance releases is under consideration to become consistent with the National Contingency Plan and the National Response Framework. The proposal in effect reduces the current ten subareas for planning purposes to four Area Plans. For additional information see: www.dec.alaska.gov/spar/PPR/plans/regional_plan.htm.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
ADEC’s Division of Spill Prevention and Response consists of three programs:

- Contaminated Sites
- Prevention Preparedness and Response Program
- Respond Fund Administration

Hilary Wilkinson (Task Force Executive Coordinator Team) and Dale Jensen, (WA Ecology, Executive Task Force Member) during 2016 Annual Meeting in Seattle.
MISSION
Provide best achievable protection of California’s state waters and natural resources by preventing, preparing for, and responding to spills of oil and other deleterious materials, and through restoring and enhancing affected resources.

OVERVIEW
The Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR), of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, is the lead state agency for surface water pollution in California. OSPR was established by the Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act in 1990. The Act provides the OSPR Administrator with authority to direct oil spill preparedness and response, as well as natural resource damage assessment and restoration.

OSPR substantively reviews and approves the oil spill contingency plans of tank vessels, non-tank vessels, railroads, and facilities that pose an oil spill risk to state surface waters. To test these plans, plan holders and OSPR engage in announced and unannounced equipment deployment drills and tabletop exercises, in an effort to promote readiness in the event of a spill. Participants include OSPR staff, the plan holders and their contractors, and federal and local government members. The capabilities of oil spill response organizations are rated by OSPR, and plan holders are required to maintain a minimum level of pollution insurance.

OSPR has also established an Oiled Wildlife Care Network (OWCN), which is managed by the Wildlife Health Center at the University of California, at Davis. Over 30 organizations stand ready to care for oiled birds, mammals, pinnipeds, and other wildlife affected by spills.

When a spill occurs, OSPR deploys a field response team of wardens, environmental scientists, oil spill prevention specialists, and other staff to evaluate the incident and direct response efforts. OSPR works closely with the U.S. Coast Guard and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as on-scene coordinators and with other state and local government representatives to ensure the impacts of the spill are mitigated.

Harbor Safety Committees (appointed by the OSPR Administrator) and Port Area Committees (jointly led by the U.S. Coast Guard and OSPR) meet regularly at the state’s busiest ports to improve safety and best practices within the ports.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
OSPR consists of these branches:
- Readiness
- Preparedness
- Environmental Response
- Fiscal & Administrative Services
- Enforcement
- Legal
BRITISH COLUMBIA

MISSION
Exemplary environmental emergency management through leadership, organization, team work, and shared responsibility.

OVERVIEW
The British Columbia Ministry of Environment works to protect people, property, and the environment from spill hazards through its Environmental Emergency Program.

On average, 3,500–4,000 spills are reported to the Ministry annually; most are accidental oil and hazardous material releases. Highly trained Environmental Emergency Response Officers located in ten regional offices throughout the province are available to respond to these spills. For large and complex spill incidents, the Ministry can also activate its Incident Management Team. The team is tasked with the provincial delivery of the B.C. Marine Oil Spill Response Plan and the B.C. Hazardous Material Response Plan. The team functions according to the internationally accepted and provincially adopted Incident Command System, which includes the application of Unified Command with the Responsible Party (spiller) and other responding jurisdictions.

This year, British Columbia is continuing in its efforts to develop a more comprehensive spill program for the province. B.C. Ministry of Environment has participated in a number of projects aimed at improving spill response, preparedness and prevention for oil and other hazardous materials both on land and in the marine environment. We have consulted extensively with industry, First Nations, government, and other stakeholders on focused policy options for land-based spills. In May 2016, the Government of British Columbia passed the Environmental Management Amendment Acts, which strengthen provincial authority to prepare and respond to spills in the province. Regulations are being developed.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
B.C’s Environmental Emergency Program consists of:

- 18 Environmental Emergency Response Officers deployed around the province
- 14 headquarter staff housed in Victoria
- One Provincial Incident Management Team
- Technical Specialists from within the ministry who may be called upon to provide incident specific knowledge and expertise as needed

TASK FORCE MEMBER
Wes Shoemaker
Deputy Director, B.C. Ministry of Environment
**HAWAII**

**MISSION**
Provide leadership, support, and partnership in preventing, planning for, responding to, and enforcing environmental laws relating to releases or threats of releases of hazardous substances.

**OVERVIEW**
The Hazardous Evaluation and Emergency Response (HEER) Office serves the people of the State of Hawaii by addressing all aspects of releases of hazardous substances, including oil, into the environment. Our work includes preventing, planning for, and responding to hazardous substance releases or risks of releases. The HEER Office accomplishes this mission by addressing contaminated sites with the highest risk to human health and the environment first, preventing contamination rather than cleaning up after the fact, and basing decisions on sound scientific principles and common sense. As a Task Force member for over 10 years it is good to know that if needed the resources of the other members, equipment and personnel, are available under the Mutual Aid Agreement.

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**
The HEER Office is comprised of three operating sections:
- Emergency Preparedness and Response
- Site Discovery, Assessment, and Remediation
- Hazard Evaluation

**TASK FORCE MEMBER**
Keith Kawaoka  
Deputy Director for Environmental Health, Hawaii Department of Health

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBER**
Curtis Martin  
Emergency Response, Preparedness and Prevention Coordinator, Hawaii Department of Health

**KEY WEB LINKS**
Hazardous Evaluation and Emergency Response (HEER) Office  
www.hawaii.gov/doh/heer

---

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBER**  
Graham Knox  
Director, Environmental Emergency Program, B.C. Ministry of Environment

**KEY WEB LINKS**
Environmental Emergency Program  
http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/air-land-water/spills-environmental-emergencies/environmental-emergency-program

---

*Kristin Ryan (AK DEC) and Curtis Martin (HI DOH)*
OREGON

MISSION

Carry out and support the agency’s environmental priorities by preventing and reducing toxic chemical releases and reducing risks by cleaning up new releases of toxics on Oregon’s environment.

OVERVIEW

The Emergency Response Program at the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) supports the agency’s strategic direction to protect human health and the environment by preventing, preparing for and minimizing the danger posed by catastrophic and other significant releases of oil and hazardous materials.

Oil and hazardous material spills pose a major potential threat to Oregon’s waters, air, land, and wildlife. Large volumes of oil move along the Columbia River and along the state’s transportation corridors. Hazardous materials are shipped through state waters, along the highways and by rail. DEQ works with other agencies and industry to prevent and respond to spills of these materials.

DEQ provides leadership to the Northwest Area Committee and the Region 10 Regional Response Team and related emergency response committees, work groups and task forces.

WASHINGTON

MISSION

To protect Washington State’s environment and economy, as well as public health and safety, through a comprehensive spill prevention, preparedness, and response program.

OVERVIEW

Washington State’s Spill Prevention, Preparedness and Response Program, coordinated by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), focuses on the prevention of oil spills to state waters and land. Ecology also plans for and conducts an effective response to oil and hazardous substance spills whenever they occur.

The Program carries out a broad scope of activities, including:

■ Oil spill prevention actions including vessel and facility inspections, as well as overseeing state oil transfer pre-booming requirements
■ Oil spill contingency plan review and approval, oil spill contingency plan drills, participation in the Northwest Area Committee, and development of geographic response plans
■ Acting as the state’s lead organization for environmental emergency response. This work focuses on providing a rapid, aggressive, and well-coordinated response 24/7 to oil and hazardous materials spills statewide from our four regional and two small field offices
Leading the state oil spill Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration (NRDAR) efforts

Working with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife in planning for and managing oiled wildlife care

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
Ecology’s Spill Prevention, Preparedness and Response Program is made up of four collaborative sections:

- Prevention
- Statewide Resources
- Preparedness
- Response

TASK FORCE MEMBER
Dale Jensen
Program Manager, Spill Prevention, Preparedness & Response Program, Washington Department of Ecology

COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBER
Linda Pilkey-Jarvis
Spills Program Preparedness Section Manager, Washington Department of Ecology

KEY WEB LINKS
Washington State Department of Ecology’s Spill Prevention, Preparedness, and Response Program
www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/spills/spills.html

Oil Spills 101
www.oils101.wa.gov

Spill maps—our stories
https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/coastalatlas/story-maps/spills/spills_sm.html?CustomMap=y&BBox=-14083010,5497472,-12792753,6241663&Tab=nt3&Opacity=1&Basemap=esriLightGray&StartDate=7_1_2011&EndDate=3_31_2015

Oil Transportation in Washington
www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/spills/oilmovement/index.html

Task Force briefing to the VADM Midgette in December, 2016. From left: Ryan Todd, OSPR, Tom Cullen, OSPR, VADM Midgette, and Sarah Brace.

Oil Transportation in Washington
WWW.OILSPILLTASKFORCE.ORG