SPILL PREVENTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE AND RESTORATION WORKING GROUP

[DATE REPORT SUBMITTED TO ADVISORY COUNCIL]

NOTE: This is a draft outline of a recommended format for a management plan review working group report to the Advisory Council. In this draft sanctuary staff has used the example of the existing Area to be Avoided (ATBA) Education and Monitoring Program, to show the level of detail and types of information that the sanctuary is requesting from the working groups. This is only an illustrative example and should not be taken as completed product. We assume that the working group will want to discuss many potential strategies, including this one.

I. INTRODUCTION

WG CHAIRS: Bob Bohlman and Chip Boothe
WG PARTICIPANTS: ___
WG MEETING DATES: ___
SUMMARY OF WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:
[Note: Short narrative of the findings of the group.]
SCOPE/RANGE OF ISSUES DISCUSSED:
[Note: How did the WG characterize the scope of this priority topic? How does this relate to the original 37 topics identified in scoping? What was the range of issues discussed? Bulleted response is fine]

II. RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES & ACTIVITIES

STRATEGY #1 TITLE:
Monitor compliance of the Area to be Avoided (ATBA)

WHAT IS THE DESIRED OUTCOME OF THIS STRATEGY?
Monitoring of the ATBA allows for assessment of compliance with this voluntary vessel traffic measure and, therefore, the degree to which this measure reduces the risk of and other hazardous materials from being spilled into marine waters and the risk of oil reaching Olympic Coast shorelines. Through monitoring, vessels that transit through the ATBA can be identified and targeted for outreach aimed at improving compliance.

ACTIVITIES NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE STRATEGY:

ACTIVITY A: Conduct monthly processing of Canadian Coast Guard radar data to evaluate voluntary compliance and identify vessels that travel within the ATBA

ACTIVITY B: For areas outside of the Canadian Coast Guard radar coverage acquire and review Automatic Information System (AIS) plots from the Seattle Marine Exchange.

PARTNERS:
Canadian Coast Guard; Seattle Marine Exchange

RESOURCES:

- Access to the Canadian Coast Guard Marine Communications and Traffic Services (MCTS) radar data for vessel traffic off the outer Washington coast and western Strait of Juan de Fuca.
- Staff proficient with geographic information system (GIS) software and OCNMS data processing routines and data base(s)
- AIS data from the Seattle Marine Exchange
- OCNMS program manager
- Payment of an annual GIS license
- Payment of annual subscription to Seattle Marine Exchange AOC
- Maintenance of appropriate IT equipment (computer, data storage).

STRATEGY #2 TITLE:
Conduct ATBA outreach to non-compliant vessels.

WHAT IS THE DESIRED OUTCOME OF THIS STRATEGY?
Notification of non-compliant vessels through a letter signed by the U.S. Coast Guard and OCNMS is conducted to improve voluntary compliance and to reinforce the importance of this vessel traffic measure to these federal agencies.

ACTIVITIES NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE STRATEGY:

ACTIVITY A: Send a letter with joint U.S. Coast Guard and OCNMS signatures to non-compliant vessels.

ACTIVITY B: Publish an ATBA flyer in the Vessel Traffic Service Puget Sound (VTSPS) Users Manual.

PARTNERS:
U.S. Coast Guard

RESOURCES:
OCNMS and USCG staff time.

STRATEGY #3 TITLE:
Report ATBA compliance in publication(s) distributed to vessel traffic and oil spill prevention interests.

WHAT IS THE DESIRED OUTCOME OF THIS STRATEGY?
Reporting of ATBA compliance informs maritime industry, regulatory agencies, and the public about the effectiveness of the ATBA, which can improve support for this vessel traffic measure.

ACTIVITIES NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE STRATEGY:

ACTIVITY A: Provide compliance data to Washington Department of Ecology for publication in their annual Vessel Entry and Transit (VEAT) report.

ACTIVITY B: Maintain the OCNMS web site with current ATBA background and compliance tracking data.

PARTNERS: Washington Department of Ecology (WDE)

RESOURCES:
OCNMS and WDE staff time.

III. OTHER STRATEGIES CONSIDERED BUT NOT RECOMMENDED

[Note: Please provide a brief discussion – bulleted notes are fine – of other strategies that your WG considered but decided not to recommend. What was the range of strategies you considered? Why did you decide against recommending certain strategies? What made you choose the strategies you chose? Again, bullets and brief synopses are fine. This is not intended to replicate your meeting notes. This is just intended to help the AC understand your decision-making without reading the notes from every meeting of every WG]