



CANUSDIX 2007

Ketchikan, Alaska
17-21 September 2007



After Action Report

Prepared by:

Mark C. Wagner
District Response Advisory Team Supervisor
U.S. Coast Guard District Seventeen (drm-4)
Juneau, AK
(907) 463-2807
mark.c.wagner@uscg.mil

A. Background:

CANUSDIX 2007 was conducted from September 17-21, 2007 in Ketchikan, AK. This comprehensive exercise included a formal Joint Session, a table top exercise, and an on-water deployment of offshore oil spill response equipment exercise, international wildlife and resource agency workshops, and a Joint Planning Workgroup meeting. (See Enclosure (2)) A notification exercise utilizing the same scenario was conducted one week prior to test and confirm both Coast Guards notification processes.

This report is intended to summarize the proceedings of the major events and provide recommendations to improve response in the Dixon Entrance region, as well as improve future CANUSDIX exercises.

The format for this report will be objective based. Each specific objective will be reviewed and evaluated for level of success.

B. Major Accomplishment Summary:

- A formal Joint Session was conducted. It included several key presentations: U.S. Coast Guard Sector re-organization, oil spill response incidents on both sides of the border, Places of Refuge decision making processes, vessel tracking systems used by the Canadian Coast Guard and the British Columbia Ministry of Environment agency overview.
- A table top exercise that included two separate command posts (U.S. and Canada) with liaisons from both countries and a field operations game board that simulated on-water oil spill response and shoreline cleanup. Cross training was conducted with several different participating agencies.
- First Responder Operations (HAZWOPER) level and refresher classes were conducted. Several agencies from both countries participated.
- An extensive multi-vessel on water field exercise was executed and was managed using the Incident Command System.
- A formal Joint Planning Group met to discuss the (2006-2007) 2-year work plan and develop the new (2008-2009) 2-year work plan.

C. CANUSDIX 2007 Objectives Summary:

The general objectives for this event were to exercise the CANUSDIX Annex to the Joint Plan, to improve emergency procedures for Dixon Entrance, and to expand the working relationships between all participants. Specific objectives included:

- Ensure and promote safety for all participants at all times.
- Provide a format for US and Canadian response agencies to improve working relationships.
- Provide a format for US and Canadian response agencies to receive cross training on each other's equipment and deployment processes.
- Provide a format for the CANUSDIX Wildlife Response Working Group and the CANUSDIX Resource Agency Working Group to meet and work on joint response projects.

- Conduct and evaluate a safe coordinated on-water equipment exercise incorporating lessons learned from past exercises and identifying potential improvements for equipment deployments and operations.
- Continue previous work assignments and identify the Joint Planning Group's future concerns for various Dixon Entrance Region response issues.

D. Specific Objective Review:

- **Ensure and promote safety for all participants at all times.**

No injuries or "near misses" related to the exercise were observed or reported. Weather conditions were not a factor. A site safety plan was developed by SEAPRO safety personnel and the Industrial Hygienist from the U.S. Coast Guard Integrated Support Command in Ketchikan. A dedicated safety vessel was provided by the U.S. Coast Guard Small Boat Station Ketchikan and was on scene and available for emergency use. Shore side medical facilities were alerted to our training. An official Notice to Mariners was broadcasted to alert local mariners of the on-water exercise in the vicinity of Refuge Cove, Ketchikan. Each unit involved in the exercise appointed their own safety officer, and instructed to conduct safety briefs prior to each step of the deployment process. No safety infractions were observed.

Recommendations:

- Continue to stress safety at all levels.
- Continue to have the host country provide the Safety Officer and develop the site safety plan.
- Continue to conduct safety briefs at each unit prior to getting underway and prior to starting each stage of equipment deployment.
- Continue to stress the small points: hard hats, ear/eye protection, safety communications, etc.

- **Provide a format for US and Canadian response agencies to improve working relationships.**

The Canadian Coast Guard, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), federal, provincial, state and local agencies along with private response companies worked together daily at all levels. Field personnel worked closely on logistical issues and equipment deployment training. Multiple agencies from both countries participated in a complex table top exercise sharing resource information, making joint decisions and utilizing a variety of resources to accomplish outlined exercise objectives. In addition to the formal portion of CANUSDIX, participants continued to build relationships at informal dinners and other social functions.

Recommendations:

- Continue to provide meaningful activities that improve response management and team building. Activities that may be considered include: joint objective development, joint training, and procedural discussions for command post liaison, communications procedures, and other areas of joint concern.

- **Provide a format for US and Canadian response agencies to receive cross training on each other's equipment and processes.**

Personnel from the U.S. Coast Guard, Canadian Coast Guard, Southeast Alaska Petroleum Resource Agency, Burrard Clean Operations, and several other agencies from both countries were spread among the various vessels and equipment to observe, instruct and provide assistance during the equipment deployment.

Recommendations:

- As discussed in previous lessons learned and if feasible, future exercises should continue to provide alternate platforms for cross training personnel.
- Look for other opportunities outside of the CANUSDIX Exercise to share valuable cross-training with other federal, state, provincial and local agencies, and oil spill response organizations.

- **Provide a format for the Wildlife Response Working Group and Resource Agency Working Group to meet.**

The **CANUSDIX Wildlife Response Working Group** met and discussed the Wildlife Response Guidelines decision making process used during the table top exercise, Effects of Oil on Wildlife Conference, 2007, updates to the *CANUSDIX Wildlife Response Guidelines*, special bands for oiled birds, International Oil Spill Conference (paper on CANUSDIX Wildlife Response Guidelines), U.S. "Best Practices for Migratory Bird Care during Oil Spill Response", and U.S. "Best Practices for Sea Otters during Oil Spill Response".

The **CANUSDIX Resource Agency Working Group** met and discussed the Places of Refuge decision making process used during the exercise, revisions/updates to the *CANUSDIX Guidelines for Resource Agency Input into Places of Refuge, Dispersant Use, and ISB Decision-Making*, International Oil spill Conference (paper on CANUSDIX Resource Agency Guidelines), sensitivity mapping, dispersant use, in-situ burning, and Places of Refuge updates.

Recommendations:

- Continue to provide a format for the Wildlife Response Working Group and Resource Agency Working Group to meet and pursue activities that continue to support existing and new joint preparedness efforts in Dixon Entrance.

- **Conduct and evaluate a safe coordinated on-water equipment exercise incorporating lessons learned from past exercises and identifying potential improvements for equipment deployment and operations.**

The equipment deployment for CANUSDIX 2007 was completed without any safety infractions. Several skimming and collection systems were deployed by the CCG Tug and Barge, USCGC

ANTHONY PETIT, the SEAPRO Oil Spill Response Vessel RUDYERD BAY. The vessels “WHATUGOT” and “THE SPIRIT” towed Ro-boom in a u-shaped gated enhanced booming configuration. SEAPRO personnel deployed a beach flushing system at Refuge Cove, AK. Vessels and oil spill responders executed on scene tasking in accordance with orders issued under the Incident Command System (ICS) Form 204.

All response vessels were briefed and provided written tasking orders. Vessels understood their mission and executed orders. The operations brief (which included safety and communications) was held the evening prior to the deployment and an ICS 204 assignment form was provided to each platform supervisor.

Contracted vessels took approximately 1000 ft of SEAPRO owned Ro-boom off a reel from the SEAPRO facility dock and towed it to the vicinity of Refuge Cove, AK. The Ro-boom was deployed in an “enhanced” boom configuration to cascade oil into the collection systems of trailing vessels. Sunflower seeds were used in the water to simulate oil and give the trailing vessels an idea of product movement. This provided ships with a real life configuration, and provided ship handlers with the opportunity to practice skimming in close quarters.



Enhanced boom configuration



SEAPRO vessel RUDYERD BAY

A SEAPRO owned water deluge flushing system was deployed on the beach at Refuge Cove, AK. Personnel from different agencies along with SEAPRO were able to cross-train during the deployment.

Recommendations:

- Continue to include on water equipment deployment as part of CANUSDIX exercises.
 - Continue to have the host country direct the on water deployment using their particular response management system – Incident Command System for USCG and Response Management System for CCG. Appropriate forms should be used and briefs conducted as in a real incident.
 - Provide a more concise operations/communications brief prior to the field deployment. Identify vessel call signs prior to the initial operations brief and provide a hard copy of the operational area to the platform Supervisors.
- **Continue previous work assignments and identify the Joint planning group’s future concerns for various Dixon Entrance Region response issues.**

The Joint Planning Group met in private session to determine tasking required for continuous response improvement in Dixon Entrance.

The work group will continue to use the CANUSDIX exercise and pre-planning as a format for completion of their work plan goals and for annual group meetings. A written summary of project scopes and how the group plans to address the new tasks will be issued under separate cover (2008-2009 Joint Work Plan). These new tasks will improve response management in Dixon Entrance.

Recommendations:

- The Joint Planning Group should continue to meet annually to review the current state of response for Dixon Entrance, and provide direction and reach consensus on tasking as required.
- The Joint Planning Group should continue to support work groups to the maximum extent possible.
- The Joint Planning Group should include all Working Group Co-Chairpersons as part of the Joint Planning Group. This will help ensure that the Joint planning Group and the working groups arrive at mutually agreed-upon work activities.
- Exercise planners should continue to schedule meeting rooms and support needs for work groups at CANUSDIX exercises.
- The work group should continue to use CANUSDIX exercises as a meeting and work-scheduling platform for completing tasks.
- The work groups should continue to keep the Joint Planning Group informed of their progress.
- The work groups should continue to provide the Joint Planning Group with a written summary.

E. Table Top Exercise 19 September:

General Description:

The Seventeenth Coast Guard District facilitated the development and execution of a comprehensive table top exercise to evaluate the ability of several agencies in both Alaska and Canada to respond to a ship grounding and oil spill at the international border in Portland Canal, 60 nm southeast of Ketchikan, Alaska. The exercise scenario involved a vessel losing steering and running aground on Hattie, Island in Portland Canal. Portland Canal is divided in half by the U.S. and Canada borders. The scenario impacted both countries shorelines allowing for maximum agency participation. The exercise included a large command post exercise that dealt with issues typically arising in day two and three of a major response. Exercise play commenced at 0800, 19 September 2007, was secured at 1500, and was followed immediately by a participant/evaluator debrief.

Operational Data:

The command post exercise was held at the Ted Ferry Civic Center in Ketchikan. All communications to and operations in the field were simulated. The U.S. command post was set up in one section of the center while Canada set up a facsimile of their Prince Rupert, British Columbia command center in another area. Field equipment deployment was simulated in a third space through the use of a custom-designed game board. (See photograph below.)



The CANUSDIX 2007 game board was a custom designed mock-up of the incident and used game pieces to simulate response equipment. Game pieces were deployed and operated by field responders in real-time. This format was originally developed by the 17th Coast Guard District in 2000 and successfully used in cruise ship SAR exercises and an earlier CANUSDIX exercise.

Support Data:

Exercise play was guided by:

- Canada-US Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan, Annex 5 Canada-US Dixon Entrance Geographical Annex
- Wildlife Response Guidelines
- Places of Refuge Decision-Making Guidelines
- US Coast Guard Incident Management Handbook (COMDTPUB P3120.17A)
- Canadian Coast Guard Response Management System (Version 3.0 DFO/6249)
- Draft Waste Management Guidelines

Objectives

Seven evaluators, four Americans and three Canadians, developed an exercise specific evaluation form designed to determine whether each objective was met. The following seven major objectives were decided on by the Joint Planning Group to test each Incident Command Post.

- 1. Test the ability of the operations section to participate in the development of the next operational planning phase.** Both Canada and U.S. completed an incident action plan for the 3rd operational period that reflected the needs of the field. Evaluators noted frequent and consistent interaction between operations and planning sections. Operations provided accurate information to planning which was captured by the situation unit. Good communications

between the field (both U.S. and Canada) and the command post was established. An hourly scheduled allowed for sharing of detailed information from the field to both command posts.

2. Test the ability of two command posts (U.S. and Canada) to share planning documents and action plans for the 3rd operational period. Liaison officers from Alaska were assigned to the Canadian command post and vice versa. Liaison officers, when questioned, felt fully utilized.



Figure 2: Members of SEAPRO, Alaska Steamship Response and a USCG Liaison from Sector Juneau confer with Burrard Clean in the Canadian Command Post.

U.S. and Canada command posts demonstrated good interaction by jointly developing or sharing the following:

- Incident objectives.
- Division of tasks to avoid duplication of effort and drain of limited resources.
- Draft waste management plan.
- Wildlife recovery plan.
- Places of Refuge decision making.
- Joint shoreline cleanup and assessment.
- News releases and press briefings.

3. Test the joint decision making process of two command posts (U.S. and Canada) for identifying a Place of Refuge (POR). The Canadian and U.S. Incident Command posts separately identified three potential Places of Refuge on each side of the border. A total of six potential Places of Refuge were identified and prioritized.

4. Exercise the Guidelines for Resource Agency input to Places of Refuge Decision-Making. The CCG and USCG Incident Commanders identified six potential Places of Refuge based on operational characteristics. This information was provided to the U.S. Environmental Unit and the Canada Regional Environmental Emergency Team (REET). By exercising the Resource Agency Guidelines, They jointly reached a consensus ranking of the six potential Places of Refuge based on the operational characteristics provided by the Incident Commanders, environmental concerns and other Resource Agency perspectives. This was the first time that agencies from both countries worked together using the guidelines to reach consensus on six potential Places of Refuge.

5. Exercise the Wildlife Response Guidelines decision making process. Resources agencies used the Wildlife Response Guidelines decision making process and jointly recommended to the

Incident Commanders capture and cleaning of oiled migratory birds, which was approved by both U.S. and Canadian Incident Commanders. Due to exercise time constraints Resource Agencies were not able to exercise other portions of the guidelines.

6. Determine logistics requirements for field waste management in remote areas and develop an action plan that addresses those needs. U.S. and Canadian responders took steps to develop an international waste disposal plan. They addressed the immediacy of oiled bird disposal, additional storage requirements and trans-boundary issues. Waste disposal planning was initiated by the U.S. and a draft waste management plan was passed to Canada for comment and revision. A single waste management plan draft was developed and utilized within the operational period.

7. Exercise the finance sections, including cost tracking. Finance and logistics sections worked together to track costs. U.S. Finance Section determined costs expended during day one of the scenario and estimated the daily ‘burn rate’ or cost of resources deployed or on standby. Both Canadian and U.S. government agencies communicated their expenses to the responsible party.

Lessons Learned TTX

There were several major lessons learned during the table top exercise. In addition, several less critical lessons learned related to incident management, improvements in exercise design and general observations are described in the proceeding sections.

Section 1. Major Lessons Learned

(#1)

Title of Lesson Learned: Division of Tasks between U.S. and Canada

Recommended action: Amend Canada-U.S. Joint Contingency Plan for CANUSDIX

Observation:

Early in the exercise, the U.S. and Canadian Incident Commanders developed joint objectives and agreed to a division of tasks to avoid duplication of effort and drain of limited resources. Specifically, the U.S. agreed to take on development of the vessel salvage plan.

Discussion:

Even though the vessel was grounded in the waters of Canada the salvage plan was tasked to the U.S. The scenario had the majority of the oil impacting Canadian border. The Canadians quickly realized that to work efficiently they would need help, to delegate tasks and divide response activities between nations. They were willing to do this because joint contingency plans and prior CANUSDIX exercises had developed trust and respect for each response organization’s respective capabilities.

However, for an actual incident, participants were not sure whether this type of division of tasks, which is irrespective of jurisdiction, could be carried out. The U.S. and Canada should refer this scenario to legal counsel for evaluation and comment.

Lesson Learned:

In an incident that impacts both U.S. and Canada the incident commanders can quickly develop joint objectives and assign tasks to various units and agencies based on ability, not the border.

Recommendation:

Discuss division of tasks and responsibilities in the Canada-U.S. Joint Contingency Plan in order to memorialize the lesson learned from this exercise. Obtain legal opinions from respective countries regarding the legal implications of such an approach. Continue to produce scenarios in future exercises that push responders to divide tasks.

(#2)

Title of Lesson Learned: Coordination within the U.S. Environmental Unit and the Canada Regional Environmental Emergency Team (REET)

Recommended Action: Incident Command Post Training

Observation:

During the one-day command post exercise the U.S. Environmental Unit and the Canada Regional Environmental Emergency Team (REET) were quite productive. They provided consensus ranking of the six potential places of refuge identified, developed a waste management plan and jointly recommended capture and treatment of oiled migratory birds.

Discussion:

The U.S. Environmental Unit and the Canada Regional Environmental Emergency Team (REET), which are comprised of several agencies and organizations, quickly and efficiently coordinated efforts to meet the exercise objectives using the pre-approved guidelines. However, not all CCG and USCG command post participants (outside of the environmental units) were familiar with the guidelines.

Lesson Learned:

Pre-approved guidelines and protocols are essential if Incident Commands expect to produce site/incident-specific protocols and action plans to address wildlife, waste management and places of refuge. To be efficient, CCG and USCG responders require training and familiarization in these guidelines.

Recommendation:

Provide formal classroom training or distance learning for guidelines on places of refuge, waste management, and wildlife handling protocols to CCG and USCG command post personnel.

Comment:

A simple web-based or electronic document that allows the trainee to read the guidelines while being periodically prompted to test his/her knowledge and retention would be effective, or formal classroom training prior to an exercise.

(#3)

Title of Lesson Learned: Joint Canada-U.S. Command Post Needed

Recommended Action: Review Canada-U.S. Joint Contingency Plan for CANUSDIX

Observation:

U.S. and Canada operated two separate incident command posts. For this exercise the U.S. Unified Command was in Ketchikan and the Canadian Incident Command in Prince Rupert, British Columbia (simulated). Although the cooperation between nations was excellent, players and observers noted that two separate Incident Command Post's lead to duplication of effort and occasional disruption in the flow of information. In addition the responsible party was stretched to produce adequate representation in both command posts.

Discussion:

The Canada-U.S. Joint Contingency Plan for CANUSDIX prescribes two separate Incident Command Post's, for incidents and spills impacting both countries.

Lesson Learned:

Coordination is excellent between Canada and the U.S. for incidents in Dixon Entrance. In the opinion of most observers, many efficiencies and economies could be realized through a joint command post.

Recommendation:

Review the policy prescribing two-separate Incident Command Post's. Perhaps co-location of the Incident Command Post's would be a helpful compromise.

(#4)

Title of Lesson Learned: Continue Work on Waste Management Plan

Recommended Action: Exercise waste management plan at next CANUSDIX

Observation:

The draft Waste Management Plan (WMP) used was developed by Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) and British Columbia Ministry of Environment (BCMOE) prior to the drill. The authors had hoped that it would be exercised in the drill and lessons learned would be incorporated into the development of the final CANUSDIX WMP template. The WMP was sent over from the U.S. ICP to the Canadian ICP for review and revision by the responsible party in conjunction with the Canadian Coast Guard. The WMP was not finished by the conclusion of the exercise.

Discussion:

Once developed and before it can be implemented, the draft WMP must be reviewed by the Canadian Response Management System (RMS) and U.S. ICS Environmental Unit to ensure the plan meets applicable environmental and hazardous waste regulations. The exercise period was not long enough to allow this step to be completed.

Lesson Learned:

Incident specific waste management plans take time to develop process and implement.

Recommendation:

Ensure the waste management plan implementation objective is incorporated in the next exercise. If there is an actual incident before then, U.S. and Canadian Incident Command Post's should be aware of the potential for implementation delay and adjust resource assignments accordingly.

(#5)

Title of Lesson Learned: Incident Command Posts Require Significant Floor Space and Several Separate Rooms

Recommended Action: Specify minimum space and room requirements

Observation:

Over 120 persons from 28 organizations participated in the incident command post exercise. The U.S. ICP was comprised of a single 1470 sq foot room. The size and noise generated by the general staff made it difficult to conduct briefings or conference calls.

Figure 3: One hundred and twenty people participated in CANUSDIX 2007 table top exercise.



Discussion:

Normally the U.S. would occupy most of the Ted Ferry Civic Center. A third of this space was given up to the Canadians for their simulated Prince Rupert command post. The US side could have used other parts of the facility. In fact, the Incident Commanders used the lobby for their discussions and decision making. If the exercise had been prolonged, the players would have no doubt made adjustments and procured extra space.

Lesson Learned:

Always provide more space and rooms than the anticipated need. If additional space is unavailable, use room dividers where possible to limit the amount of noise.

Recommendation:

Develop generous minimum space and room requirements for multi-agency responses. There should be a room for unified command, a room for planning meetings, a room for the Joint Information Center (JIC), and another room for specialized team meetings. This is in addition to the large command post space.

Section 2: Observations and Lessons learned for incident management

Canada Response Management System (RMS) and Incident Command System (ICS) require training and advance preparation. RMS and ICS refreshers should immediately precede an exercise.

1. There was – and should be – lots of informal interaction between the environmental unit, operations section and situation unit. This necessary interaction is not readily apparent from the incident management handbook. In fact, individuals formally trained in ICS typically

adhere to rigid up-and-over information exchange (i.e. EU → PSC → OSC → recovery branch). On the other hand, by-passing the section chiefs can lead to inefficient planning.

2. Unit briefings are important. Initially, there was confusion regarding the identity of unit leaders. Common responsibilities (see chapter two of the USCG Incident Management Handbook) require responders to report to their supervisor, receive a briefing and know their position.
3. The U.S. Coast Guard Sector should dedicate a person(s) to work with the environmental unit on Places of Refuge. The Coast Guard develops the initial list of potential sites and provides detailed information on vessel pollution plans and marine pilot preferences. This input is then provided to the Environmental Unit. Although the Captain of the Port makes the final call on POR on the U.S. side of the border, a representative of the COTP assigned (early on) to the multi-agency environmental unit can provide input and coordination for the process.
4. All ICP rooms should have conference call and wireless capability.
5. Provide a one-stop website that contains all potential response plans, permits and guidelines. The following website is useful: <http://www.dec.state.ak.us/spar/perp/permits/master.htm>
6. Tactical displays (“Wall of Knowledge”), while having all the information, don’t easily show the big picture. Big picture tactical displays are especially helpful for incident commanders needing a quick update or responders and stakeholders arriving later in the response. The ICS job aids do not clearly show how to create an easily understandable tactical display. A good big-picture tactical display would allow an individual to view the display from 10-feet and quickly understand the essential elements of the incident and the response. The job aid for tactical displays should be revised and a model “wall of knowledge” provided. The situation unit may consider using computers with overhead projectors to improve the visuals and potentially save wall space.
7. The capture and display of key information is always difficult in any large exercise or significant casualty response. During the exercise, the U.S. Unified Command gave instructions to OPS and PLANS that the Situation Unit must be in attendance at all calls coming in from the field, the reason being that experienced responders recognize that OPS will not take the time to brief the Situation Unit on the important situational details exchanged during the call from the field. By tasking the Situation Unit with aggressively shadowing OPS Section during the calls to/from the field the capture of new situational information is greatly increased. With an aggressive Situation Unit becoming the acknowledged source of current and predicted incident status information there is a great improvement in decision making and more credible public and stakeholder outreach. During this exercise, the Situation Unit was observed to be actively involved with the Environmental Unit and Operations Section.
8. Both IC’s recognized the need for a dedicated yeoman/historian to track events and maintain the unit log, documenting the decisions of the Incident Commanders.

9. The U.S. Customs and Boarder Protection presence in the Incident Command to address trans-boundary issues with movement of resources, response workers/staff, and wastes streams across the border was invaluable.

Section 3: Lessons learned for exercise planning

1. Good overall pre-planning and organization by design team in developing an achievable exercise. There was great cooperation of diverse agencies and flow of weekly activities. Table Top exercise objectives were achieved followed by a good field training exercise.
2. Participants liked the scenario in which play started with the 2nd day. The incident commanders noted that this allowed the responders to get into a new level of pro-activity.
3. Planning of the next exercise should combine field training exercise with table top.
4. Scenario assumptions should be developed and clearly articulated prior to the exercise so that assigned units can focus on meeting exercise objectives. Scenario assumptions were embedded within the comprehensive scenario, which were several pages long. It would have been helpful if assumptions had been listed in opening sections of the scenario description, or in the exercise handbook. Some assumptions were missed or unanticipated. Assumptions should include permits approved (e.g. "shoreline permit for SCAT grant").
5. In a complex exercise that starts play in the second operational period the design team should allow more time for Incident Command Post setup or have table top exercise contractor provide a complete Incident Command Post setup.
6. Recommend the contractor submit before the final design team planning meeting the following (20 days prior to start of exercise): exercise plan, MSEL list, Controller/Evaluator handbook with complete evaluation plan, and a template for the after action report. This would allow the design team enough time to conduct a final review.
7. Agencies had alternative objectives for the exercise that could not be covered without disrupting the official design team objectives within the timeframe of the exercise. If agencies want other objectives covered during the exercise, those objectives must be installed during the exercise design and not during the exercise.
8. Provide enough Incident Command vests to identify all personnel in the Incident Command Post's.

Section 4: Other general comments

- Cross training of the different Incident Command organizations (U.S. Incident Command System & Canadian Response Management System) would be beneficial prior to the start of future exercises.

- Exercise should include First Nations and other federally recognized tribes.
- Great lunch provided by Coast Guard Integrated Support Command Ketchikan galley.
- The shore zone map set provided by British Columbia Ministry of Environment was very helpful.
- On water and land waste management issues should be worked on in planning, not separately. There are many logistical & operational concerns that need to be addressed when moving waste from water to land for disposal.
- Hold training for the CCG and USCG on Places of Refuge decision making.
- Good job of Logistics providing a list of general messages (Incident Command System-213 form)
- Worked good having SEAPRO and Coast Guard in finance. Missed having State representative. Personnel in finance well trained.
- Procurement should be in finance not logistics.
- Define the liaison role better.
- Routine communications schedule with the field was beneficial.
- Pre-made resource t-cards a plus. Allowed time to focus on other issues.
- The game board used to simulate field operations kept players honest. It helped responders learn what really happens on-scene and in the command post.
- Establish better monitoring of lunch handouts, ensuring lunches requested and paid for are given out accordingly.

F. Equipment Deployment Exercise 20 September:

General Description

On the day following the command post table top exercise, both Canadian and US agencies and organizations deployed spill response equipment from cutters, barges and response boats underway in the vicinity of Refuge Cove, Ketchikan, Alaska.

Deployments emphasized command, control, safety and training of personnel. Operations, safety and communications briefs were conducted using the ICS-204 form the evening prior to the on water exercise. Each unit conducted an internal debrief for the equipment and process that was used.

The following equipment was deployed during the on water exercise.

U.S. Coast Guard:

The CGC ANTHONY PETIT deployed the Vessel of Opportunity Skimming System (VOSS) with the fast sweep boom and the Lancer 25,000 gallon storage barge. The CGC ANTHONY PETIT was the designated Task Force Commander and provided response direction to all on scene assets.

Coast Guard Small Boat Station Ketchikan provided on scene safety. The USCG base and the SEAPRO facility provided all necessary shore side logistics.

Suggested improvements and observations:

- Cooperation between CGC ANTHONY PETIT crew, DRAT and Pacific Strike Team during deployment was outstanding.
- Conduct a better operations brief.
- Identify all field platforms and assign call signs.
- All lines used to deploy the VOSS need to be replaced and all lifting cables/slings need to be load tested.
- A pick and pennant needs to be used or a quick release added to the VOSS equipment for a safer/quicker initial deployment of the barge.
- Insure all necessary tag-lines are attached to the fast sweep boom prior to deployment.
- The CGC ANTHONY PETIT is a good platform for deployment of the VOSS. The z-drive capability adds to the ease of deployment.
- Develop a shorter critique form.
- Develop the V.I.P. list ahead of time to allow for planning purposes.
- Too much maneuvering of the CGC ANTHONY PETIT tended to disrupt the VOSS configuration.
- Develop better communications between deck and bridge during maneuvering to allow for changes (i.e. slack lines, tighten lines, etc.)

Canadian Coast Guard:

The CCG utilized the Wainwright Marine Services Tug & Barge and deployed the Ro-boom side sweep with jib arm and GT 185 weir skimmer. A communications trailer was provided on the barge and monitored by CCG personnel.

Suggested improvements and observations:

- Pre-staging equipment prior to the exercise would have helped with overall deployment.
- CCG personnel could use more hands on training of equipment.
- Purchase a quieter generator.
- The loading ramp on the barge was steeper then the crew was used to.

- Make a bridle for the jib-arm and mark the jib-arm so it can be set upright. Both would help to eliminate confusion during installation. Provide a drawing of a completed set-up and post it on the barge.
- Load more personnel protective equipment on board for field observers.
- Make sure the barge is equipped with a portable restroom.
- Add impact wrenches to the on board tool box for repairs and assembly.
- Practice more in-house safety procedures.
- Add an additional tug boat crew member to the barge for better coordination between the tug and barge.
- Cooperation of the diverse crew (U.S. and Canadian) on the barge was outstanding and all personnel jobs assigned were outlined well.
- A good safety brief was conducted prior to deployment and a good overall de-brief was conducted at the conclusion of the deployment.
- Include DECON in the next exercise.
- Practice better communications between on scene commands.
- Install extra radios for marine and aviation assets.

SEAPRO, Burrard Clean and support vessels

SEAPRO deployed the Oil Spill Response Vessel RUDYERD BAY. This vessel has a sweep width of about 46 ft. using two Lori brush skimmers and 65 bbl. on board recovery capacity and provides a rapid (15-20 minutes) deployment time once on scene. Offload is accomplished using DOP 160 pump with water injection flange. The vessel is suited for recovery for near shore operations.

Burrard Clean did not deploy Burrard Clean response equipment for this exercise. Burrard Clean utilized this exercise as a learning platform and helped with deployment of SEAPRO assets.

The M/V “WHATUGOT” and the F/V “THE SPIRIT” retrieved 1000 feet of Ro-boom, which was pre-staged at the SEAPRO facility in Ward Cove, AK and transported it to the operations area in Refuge Cove, AK. The Ro-boom was deployed in an enhanced “U” shaped booming configuration with a 10-foot gate.

In addition, SEAPRO coordinated deployment of a beach deluge system in the vicinity of Refuge Cove, near the road system, to accommodate exercise observers.

Suggested improvements and observations:

- Good overall cooperation with Canadian counterparts.
- Good brief prior to deployment.
- Need to improve coordination of radio communications between on scene assets.
- Make sure all necessary attachments and connectors are included in beach deluge systems.
- Research compatible parts (Canadian/U.S.) and add to system kits.

- Coordination of both boom towing vessels needs practice and vessels towing boom should be of similar horse power.

G. Future Exercise Recommendations:

A meeting of the Joint Planning Group and exercise planners was held to discuss CANUSDIX 2009. The following input was provided to the planners for consideration:

- Develop the 2008-2009 Joint Work Plan in March 2008.
- CANUSDIX 2009 will be held in Prince Rupert, Canada. Joint planning for the 2009 exercise will begin in September 2008.
- Include an equipment deployment exercise as part of CANUSDIX, and use the response management system of the host country to control.
- Continue exercising different portions of the Wildlife Response Guidelines.
- Establish a workgroup to develop a list of resources that can support on scene response personnel.
- Review the CANUSDIX Annex and update as required.
- Continue development of a waste management plan and incorporate into the CANUSDIX Annex and exercise in future CANUSDIX.
- Continue to include and support all work groups during the annual exercise.
- First Nations and other federally recognized tribes should be incorporated in the exercise planning process, participating in all activities.
- Other areas of concern which may require establishment of workgroups include:
 - Legal opinions (cost recovery)
 - Dissemination and sharing of electronic information (What information electronically is available that can be combined and shared?)

H. Exercise Participants: Enclosure (1) contains a detailed participant list.

Over one hundred and twenty (120) persons from the following agencies and organizations participated in the exercise:

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Alaska Department of Natural Resources
Alaska Steamship Response

British Columbia Ministry of Environment
British Columbia States Task Force
Burrard Clean Operations
Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Canadian Coast Guard
Cape Fox Lodge
Environment Canada
F/V Spirit
Indian & Northern Affairs Canada
Ketchikan Gateway Borough
Marine Exchange of Alaska
M/V Whatchagot
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Petro Marine
Southeast Alaska Petroleum Response Organization
Ted Ferry Civic Center
U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary
U.S. Coast Guard Cutter Anthony Petit
U.S. Coast Guard ISC Ketchikan
U.S. Coast Guard MSD Ketchikan
U.S. Coast Guard Sector Juneau
U.S. Coast Guard Seventeenth District
U.S. Coast Guard Station Ketchikan
U.S. Coast Guard Pacific Strike Team
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Department of the Interior – Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. Department of Commerce - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
U.S. Navy Supervisor of Salvage
Wainwright Marine Services

Enclosures:

- (1) Participants list
- (2) CANUSDIX 2007 Schedule of Events

CANUSDIX 2007 Participants:

The below contact information was provided by participants during the exercise.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>E-MAIL</u>
Clara Crosby	ADEC	907-269-3064	clara.crosby@alaska.gov
Bob Fultz	ADEC	907-225-6200	bob.fultz@alaska.gov
Geoff Harben	ADEC	907-465-5234	geoff.harben@alaska.gov
Bob Mattson	ADEC	907-465-5347	bob.mattson@alaska.gov
Sharry Miller	ADEC	907-835-1471	sharry.miller@alaska.gov
Clare Pavia	ADEC	907-465-5245	clare.pavia@alaska.gov
Robert Petit	ADEC	907-4408661	robert.petit@alaska.gov
Scot Tiernan	ADEC	907-465-5378	scot.tiernan@alaska.gov
Mary Kowalczyk	ADEC	907-247-8574	mary.kowalczyk@alaska.gov
Lynda Giguere	ADEC	907-321-5491	
Paul Lhotka	ADEC	907-451-2175	
Amber Bethe	ADF&G	907-250-8947	amber.bethe@alaska.gov
Tom Schumacher	ADF&G		
Doug Sanvik	ADNR	907-465-3513	doug.sanvik@alaska.gov
Mary Kowalczyk	ADNR	907-247-8574	
Brett Farrell	Alaska Marine Exchange	907-957-0622	
Mike Conway	ASR		
Dave Eley	ASR		
Robert Kuikhoven	ASR	907-225-2707	robertk@sousteve.com
Jennifer Lewis	ASR	907-225-7153	
Debbie Azure	ASR		
Bob Berto	ASR		
Les Cronk	ASR	907-617-1207	
Rick Erickson	ASR		
John Kimmel	ASR		
Rex Westergaard	ASR	907-225-6777	
Tim Robertson			
Tom Gemmel	ASR	907-723-3358	
Rhonda Brett	BCMOE	250-565-6456	rhonda.brett@gov.bc.ca
Mike Drumm	BCMOE	250-847-7723	mike.drumm@gov.bc.ca
Norm Fallows	BCMOE	250-847-7259	norm.fallows@gov.bc.ca
Maurie Hurst	BCMOE	250-615-4800	maurie.hurst@gov.bc.ca
GrahamKnox	BCMOE	250-812-4167	graham.knox@gov.bc.ca
Dennis Redford	BCMOE	250-851-6574	dennis.redford@gov.bc.ca
Sean Sharpe	BCMOE	250565-6443	sean.sharpe@gov.bc.ca
Reg Marquardt	BCMOE	250-262-5803	reg.marquardt@gov.bc.ca
Dennis Redford	BCMOE	250-851-6574	
Stafford Reid	BCMOE		
Terry Sawchuk	BCMOE	250-787-3391	terry.sawchuk@gov.bc.ca
Ian Sharpe	BCMOE	250-877-9237	ian.sharpe@gov.bc.ca
Sean Sharpe	BCMOE	250-961-8765	
Don Piche	BCO	250-627-9145	
Jean Cameron	BC Task Force	503-392-5860	jeancameron@oregoncoast.com
Craig Dougans	Burrard Clean	604-313-7871	craigd@burrardclean.com
Kevin Gardner	Burrard Clean	604-788-5138	keving@burrardclean.com
George Penman	Burrard Clean	250-213-6865	georgep@burrardclean.com
Dave Zroback	Burrard Clean		
Barry Cunningham	CCG	250-627-0347	cunninghamb@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Jody Goffic	CCG	250-624-5390	gofficj@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Brian Hennessy	CCG	250-627-9462	hennessyb@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Ian McDonald	CCG	613-991-5716	macdonaldi@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Nora McCleary	CCG	613-990-6718	mcclearyn@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Daniel Reid	CCG	604-816-1882	
Don Rodden	CCG	604-270-3273	roddend@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Jamie Toxopeus	CCG	604-250-0256	
John Palliser	CCG	250-480-2621	palliserj@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Helen Wong	CCG	604-270-3371	wongh@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Randy Wongkee	CCG-MCTS	250-627-3074	wongkeer@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Joy Hillier	CDOFO	250-627-3449	hillierj@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Bruce Shepherd	CDOFO	250-627-3453	shepherdb@pac.dfo-mpogc.ca
Pamela Bergmann	DOI	907-271-5011	pamela-bergmann@ios.doi.gov
Catherine Berg	DOI-FWS	907-271-1630	catherine_berg@fws.gov
Nathalie Lowry	EC	867-333-9917	nathalie.lowry@ec.gc.ca
Ken Morgan	EC	250-363-6537	morgank@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Paul Ross	EC	604-666-6950	paul.ross@ec.gc.ca
Dave Smith	EC	604-816-3396	dave.smith@ec.gc.ca
Andrew Spokley	F/V Spirit		
Tim Powers	INAC	604-775-5157	powerst@mac.gc.ca
Jim Pomplun	KGB	907-254-0432	
Jace Johnson	Navy SUPSALV	907-229-8859	johnsonjw@essmnavy.net
John Whitney	NOAA-SSC		
Paul Avila	Petro Marine	907-225-2106	
Randy Pickrell	Petro Marine	907-225-2106	
Craig Cannon	SEAPRO	907-617-2832	craig@seapro.org
Dr. Scott Ford	SEAPRO	360-271-7008	akeaglevet@yahoo.com
Pete Frank	SEAPRO	907-617-2834	mv5had@aol.com
Cheyrl Fultz	SEAPRO		
Bill Kruger	SEAPRO		
George Mahoney	SEAPRO		
Dave Owings	SEAPRO	907-617-2831	dave@seapro.org
Connie Renniger	SEAPRO		
K.A. Swiger	SEAPRO		ka@seapro.org
Linda Murphy	SEAPRO	907-723-6101	linco@ak.net
Tony Knuteson	SEAPRO		
Bill Kruger	SEAPRO		
Jon Nyberry	SEAPRO	907-617-8986	
Jason Thomas	SEAPRO	907-617-9493	
Gilbert Varela	USCBP	907-225-2254	gilbert.varela@dhs.gov
YN3 Jamie Baker	USCG	907-321-5302	jamie.k.baker@uscg.mil
CDR Scott Bornemann	USCG	907-463-2452	scott.w.bornemann@uscg.mil
PA3 Richard Brahm	USCG	907-321-4203	
SK1 Caryl Brennan	USCG	206-240-5203	caryl.l.brennan@uscg.mil
MST1 Eric Capestany	USCG	361-563-7519	eric.a.capestany@uscg.mil
CAPT Mike Cerne	USCG	907-463-2226	michael.s.cerne@uscg.mil
LCDR Bradley Clare	USCG	907-957-0156	
LT Richard Eggen	USCG	907-321-0274	richard.e.eggen@uscg.mil
MSTC Andy Grow	USCG	907-957-6561	andrew.c.grow@uscg.mil
CAPT Mark Guillory	USCG	907-463-2836	mark.s.guillory@uscg.mil
Kathy Hamblett	USCG	907-463-2487	kathy.a.hamblett@uscg.mil
LT Jennifer Hnatow	USCG	907-463-2806	jennifer.l.hnatow@uscg.mil
Rick Janelle	USCG	907-463-2808	rick.n.janelle@uscg.mil
SKCS Karl Keyes	USCG	360-460-9245	karl.g.keyes@uscg.mil
CDR Scott LeMasters	USCG	907-523-8434	scott.b.lemasters@uscg.mil
LT Emily McIntyre	USCG	907-463-2473	emily.s.mcintyre@uscg.mil
MKCM Barry McMinn	USCG	907-228-0370	barry.l.mcminn@uscg.mil
Cecil McNutt	USCG		
OSC Chad Mountcastle	USCG	907-957-0154	chad.c.mountcastle@uscg.mil
Eileen Nally	USCG	907-463-2461	eileen.nally@uscg.mil
MSTC Steve Natale	USCG	907-225-4470	
MSTC Matt Odum	USCG	907-463-2814	matt.j.odum@uscg.mil
LT Ken Phillips	USCG	907-463-2821	kenneth.g.phillips@uscg.mil
CDR Rick Rodriquez	USCG	907-463-2804	ricardo.rodriquez@uscg.mil
LCDR Sara Unthank	USCG	907-228-0229	sarah.c.unthank@uscg.mil
Mark Wagner	USCG	907-463-2807	mark.c.wagner@uscg.mil
LCDR Michele Webber	USCG	907-723-2856	michele.r.webber@uscg.mil
MST1 Jeff Wenciker	USCG	907-225-4496	jeff.s.wenciker@uscg.mil

CANUSDIX 2007 After Action Report

LT Chris Williammee	USCG	907-463-2430	christopher.j.williammee@uscg.mil
LTJG Davis Holden	USCG	907-617-1186	
CWO2 Robert Shaffer	USCG	907-617-5513	robert.schaffer@uscg.mil
EM3 David Brown	USCG	540-336-4463	david.c.brown@uscg.mil
DC3 James Wells	USCG	907-617-7240	james.t.wells@uscg.mil
YN3 Erin Pressley	USCG	907-228-6434	erin.f.pressley@uscg.mil
LT Karen Jensen	USCG	907-321-5138	karen.c.jensen@uscg.mil
YN3 Christine Carol	USCG	907-228-6477	
Kerri Willoughby	USDA-USFS	907-228-6267	kwilloughby@fs.fed-us

Schedule of Events

CANUSDIX 2007
17-21 September
Ketchikan, AK

17 September: Monday

Training/Equipment

Travel Day for Majority of Participants

0800-1600 HAZWOPER (1st Responder Operations)
USCGC Anthony Petit and Canadian Response personnel
Location: USCG Base (upper base), Crow's Nest

0800 VOSS Equipment Preparation
DRAT
Location: SEAPRO Facility - Ward Cove

18 September: Tuesday

Joint Session

Location: Ted Ferry Civic Center - Naha Bay Room

0800 Sign-in and receive I.D. badges

0845 Welcome
Safety brief, facility layout and accommodations

0850 Introductions

0900 Opening Comments
Capt Mark Guillory - USCG Sector Juneau COTP
Don Rodden and Susan Steele – CCG

0920 USCG Reorganization Update
USCG - LCDR Scott LeMasters

0950 Queen of the North
CCG - Don Rodden

1020 2007 Oil Spill Responses
USCG – LT Chris Williammee

1050 Break

1100 Places of Refuge – Canadian Progress
Don Rodden – CCG

1130 Places of Refuge – New USCG Commandant Policy
LCDR Rick Rodriguez - USCG

1200 Lunch

1300 Places of Refuge Guidelines Update
Pamela Bergmann – DOI

1320 Overview of Dixon Entrance Vessel Traffic
Randy Wongkee – CCG Marine Control Traffic Center

1335 British Columbia Ministry of Environment (BCMOE) overview
Mike Drumm

1400 Waste Management Working Group
Mike Drumm – BCMOE
Bob Mattson – ADEC

Table Top Discussion

1500 TTX Scenario Introduction and rules
Dave Eley – Alaska Steamship Response
All TTX players, evaluators, coaches, etc. should attend

1600 TTX Field Operations Game Board explanation and rules
Brett Farrell – Alaska Marine Exchange
Only game board players and evaluators need to attend

1700 TTX Command Posts Set-up

1900 Evaluators meeting
Roles and responsibilities
Dave Eley – Alaska Steamship Response
Cape Fox Restaurant

Training

0800-1200 HAZWOPER (1st Responder Operations/Refresher)
USCGC Anthony Petit and Canadian Response personnel
Location: USCG Base (upper base), Crow's Nest

19 September: Wednesday

0730 Sign-in
**Location: US Command Post – Naha Bay room
Canadian Command Post – Alava Bay room
Field Operations Game Board – Manzanita Bay Conference Room**

0800- 1500 Table Top Exercise (TTX)

1200 TTX Working Lunch

1500 TTX Concludes
Players de-brief
Evaluators de-brief

1600 TTX Hot Wash

Equipment Preparation

0800-1400 Equipment Preparation: SEAPRO/Burrard Clean/USCG/CCG
CGC Anthony Petit: Load/Train on VOSS: Set Up & Safety

1700 FTX Operations Brief
Safety Brief
Communications Brief
Evaluation forms
**Location: Ted Ferry Civic Center – Manzanita Bay Conference Room
Representatives from each agency/company/vessel participating in
the equipment deployment should attend.**

20 September: Thursday

0800-1130 Wildlife Response Workgroup meeting
Location: Ted Ferry Civic Center – Manzanita Bay Conference Room
Conference call information
Toll free number – (877) 917-8116
Pass code – 2168195 (20 lines)

1130 Lunch

1300-1600 Resource Agency Workgroup meeting
Location: Ted Ferry Civic Center – Manzanita Bay Conference Room
Conference call information
Toll free number – (877) 917-8116
Pass code – 2168195 (20 lines)

Equipment Deployment:

0800- 1200 1/2 speed equipment display
SEAPRO/Burrard Clean
Location: Cape Fox

0800- 1400 Underway Equipment Deployment
Location: Refuge Cove

1500 Equipment Deployment Debrief- Each agency will debrief their crew separately, fill out evaluation/lessons learned sheet.

1600 Operations Supervisors debrief
Location: Ted Ferry Civic Center – Manzanita Bay Conference Room
Reminder: Supervisors bring filled out evaluation sheets

Reception

1800 Dinner Reception/No Host Bar
Location: Cape Fox – Shaa Hit “A” Room
40 person maximum @ a time / \$20.00 per person (U.S. dollars)

21 September: Friday

Joint Session

Location: Ted Ferry Civic Center – Naha Bay Room

0900 Summary Debrief

1000 Closing Remarks

1030 Joint Work Group meeting
Set date in 2008 for pre-planning cycle
2009 Exercise Prince Rupert

1100 2-Year Work Plan discussion
USCG and CCG

Equipment

0800 – 1300 Complete Equipment Maintenance and Repack

TBD Travel Day for Participants