

CANUSLANT



EXERCISE 2011 AFTER ACTION REPORT

Joint U.S. / Canada Response Exercise
May 19-20, 2011
Bar Harbor, ME

This was an international exercise for responding to a simulated cross-border environmental incident. This exercise was sponsored by the United States Coast Guard and the Canadian Coast Guard as part of the biennial joint exercise programs conducted under the Joint Maritime Pollution Contingency Plan.



Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	3
II. Background.....	3
III. Exercise Purpose.....	3
IV. Exercise Objectives.....	4
V. Plans.....	4
VI. Exercise Scenario.....	5
VII. Objectives for Exercise Workgroups and Participating Organizations	7
A. Major Areas of Emphasis/Objectives/Outcomes	7
VIII. Workgroup Discussion Topics.....	7
A. Command and Control	8
1. Initial Response Notifications	8
2. Standing-up Incident Command Organization.....	8
3. Setting Objectives.....	8
B. Response.....	8
C. Environmental	9
D. Salvage	9
E. Public Affairs - JIC/Media/VIPs	9
IX. Workgroup Summaries	10
A. Command and Control	10
B. Response.....	13
C. Environmental	17
D. Salvage	18
E. Public Affairs - JIC/Media/VIPs	19
X. Appendix.....	20
A. CANUSLANT 2011 Participant Evaluation Form Summary.....	20
B. Exercise Comments (transcribed from Participant Feedback Forms).....	21
C. Exercise Design Team.....	23
D. Exercise Participants by Workgroup Assignment.....	23
1. Command and Control.....	23
2. Response.....	24
3. Environmental	25
4. Salvage.....	25
5. Public Affairs.....	26
6. Credentialing	26
E. Acronyms	27



I. Executive Summary

The United States Coast Guard (USCG), First District, in conjunction with the Canadian Coast Guard Maritime Regions (CCG) hosted CANUSLANT 2011 – a required biennial Atlantic Geographic Annex response exercise.

This Table Top Exercise (TTX) occurred on May 19th and 20th, 2011 and was followed by the bi-annual Joint Response Team Meeting. All events occurred at the Atlantic Oceanside Hotel and Conference Center, Bar Harbor, Maine. In preparation for the TTX, a Design Team of select Canadian and U.S. representatives met several times to create the exercise scenario while simultaneously developing the exercise objectives. Based on the responses provided in the Participant Feedback Forms, the exercise met the majority of its objectives and was beneficial to all attendees. A summary of the data captured in the Participant Forms is included below.

II. Background

The United States and Canada recognized the need for an international marine pollution contingency plan for their adjacent contiguous waters more than 30 years ago. The first such plan was the Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan for the Great Lakes, promulgated in 1974 under the Canada-United States Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement of 1972. In September, 1983, four geographic annexes were added to the Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan, which cover the Atlantic Coast, Pacific Coast, Dixon Entrance, and Beaufort Sea. The CANUSLANT exercise series tests the geographic annex that covers the Atlantic Coast (Atlantic Geographic Annex) on a biennial basis.

Across our shared maritime border, a standing Joint Response Team (JRT) coordinates contingency planning and training exercises. The JRT is co-chaired by the CCG Director of Maritime Services and the USCG First District Chief of Incident Management and consists of representatives of specified agencies in Canada and the U.S. At the request of the CCG On-Scene Commander or the USCG On-Scene Coordinator (OSC), the JRT will convene and provide response support during cross-border incidents. The general functions of the JRT include:

- Counseling and giving advice to facilitate coordinated planning, preparedness and response to a harmful substance incident;
- Preparing JRT debriefing reports and recommendations concerning amendments to the JCP or its Geographic Annexes;
- Convening to provide advice and support to the CCG OSC and the USCG OSC. .

III. Exercise Purpose

Under the Atlantic Geographic Annex of the Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan (JCP), the U.S. and Canadian coast guards are required to conduct a biennial exercise to ensure the efficient management and deployment of resources in a cross-border oil pollution incident. The main objectives of this TTX are to ensure:



- Overall preparedness;
- Enhancement of the knowledge and skill of potential participants; and
- Effective deployment of people and resources to an environmental response incident.

The results of this exercise will be used to further update the Atlantic Geographic Annex, improve our future response capabilities, and identify issues that need to be addressed by the Joint Response Team.

IV. Exercise Objectives

The main objectives of CANUSLANT 2011 were to educate participants and promote agreements between Canada and the United States. The intent of this exercise was to:

- Test the ability of the Atlantic Geographic Annex (AGA) to support Mutual Aid and cross-jurisdictional support with government resources absent an immediate threat to the boundary.
- Focus on industry resource movements and needed support under the AGA/CANUSLANT based on involvement from potential Responsible Parties (RPs).
- Discuss the applicability and use of the Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan, AGA, and other processes in non-contiguous waters (outside Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy).
- Assess the need for trans-boundary support in salvage and lightering due to limited resources that may prompt more cross-border resource movements; build additional understanding of emergency provisions, processes, and limitations, especially related to salvage and coastal trading acts; test provisions of AGA relating to these laws and exemptions.
- Test the health and safety provisions in the AGA and discuss the equivalency and recognition of training issues during cross-border support.
- Test the formative fisheries closure/opening plan component of the AGA within the CANUSLANT scenario.
- Test the new draft wildlife response component of the AGA within the CANUSLANT scenario, including injury assessment aspects. Due to the offshore nature of the scenario, discuss and assess the broader capabilities of the plan.

V. Plans

This TTX was developed in accordance with the latest revision of the AGA, as signed by Canadian and U.S. Coast Guard dignitaries in July, 2010. A copy of this plan can be found online at: <http://www.uscg.mil/d1/response/jrt/canuslant.asp>. The following is a comprehensive list of the critical plans used in the TTX that would be employed in the event of an actual incident requiring a multi-national and multi-jurisdictional response.

- Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan Atlantic Geographic Annex
- ME / NH Area Contingency Plan
- CCG Marine Spill Contingency Plan – Maritime Regional Chapter
- CCG Marine Spill Contingency Plan – New Brunswick Area Chapter



- Transport Canada Place of Refuge Contingency Plan - Atlantic
- RCCL SUMMIT Non-Tank Vessel Response Plan
- NRT Guidelines for Places of Refuge
- Transport Canada Cross-Border Emergency Response Guide
- U.S. Coast Guard Place of Refuge Policy (COMDINST 16451.9)

VI. Exercise Scenario

The exercise revolved around the grounding of a large cruise ship in the vicinity of Grand Manan Island near the U.S. and Canadian border:

After a delayed departure from St. John, New Brunswick, the ship was traveling in the outbound traffic separation scheme. On May 19th, at approximately 21:27, all power was lost, causing the ship to go dead in the water. With a heavy southeasterly wind, the ship began drifting towards Grand Manan Island. After repeated attempts to correct the problems in the engine room, the ship grounded on Murr Ledges, just south of Grand Manan Island. The hull was breached upon grounding, with the high threat of a potential spill of marine fuels in the area.

Minutes (local time):

May 19th 2011

18:30 Pre-departure meeting held for the voyage from Saint John, NB to Halifax, NS. Severe thunder storms are expected in the area with winds gusting to 35-40 knots. A heavy northerly current is also expected in the area. Departure was delayed due to late returning tours.

21:27 At 44°23.1' N 066° 39.5' W at Separation Lane Reporting Point 2B with course 232 and speed 20.2 kts, a total blackout of the ship occurred. All propulsion was lost with no control of the systems aboard the ship, except for emergency generators.

21:30 The Master, Staff Captain, and Chief Safety Officer were informed of the situation, as well as the Chief Engineer and Staff Chief. The control room confirmed that all power had been lost for unknown reasons. The proper navigational lights were displayed for a vessel not under command and the vessel began drifting to the northwest; RED condition was set.

22:39 After several unsuccessful attempts to regain power to the ship, Fundy Traffic (VHFCh 14) was informed of the situation. The Joint Rescue Coordination Center (JRCC) was notified. Canadian Coast Guard Environmental Response was subsequently informed of the situation.

22:41 Fundy Traffic (VHF Ch14) informed the ship that two tugs were being dispatched from Saint John and their ETA was approximately 2.5 hours. At the same time, a squall was approaching with lightning, thunder, and high winds.

23:00 Update: Ship is still without power and dead in the water. The ship is drifting in a north westerly direction towards Murr Ledges 5NM South of Grand Manan Island. Tug boats dispatched from Saint John are still approximately 2 hours from the ship. Winds are currently 25 knots with gusts to 40 from the southeast.



23:30 Update: The engine room is still working on restoring power to the ship. All attempts have been unsuccessful in gaining power. DPA Chris Van Raalten (+1 786 556 9630), AVP Nautical Capt Zissis Koskinas (+1 305 318 3885), and AVP Fleet Management Evangelos Sampanidis (+1 305 318 3885), were notified of the situation and will be continually updated as the situation unfolds.

23:40 Update: The ship is still drifting toward the northwest and is quickly approaching Murr Ledges. Canadian Coast Guard has been notified of imminent grounding should the propulsion system fail to start. Anchors have been readied for release as needed. Winds are currently 30-35 knots with occasional gusts to 50 knots. Heavy rain and thunderstorms are in the area. Tug boats are approximately 90 minutes from the scene.

23:41 JRCC notifies First Coast Guard District Command Center.

23:46 Port and Starboard anchors are released. Ship is currently drifting towards Murr Ledges.

23:50 Anchors are dragging due to high, gusty winds in the area. It is estimated that the ship will ground in approximately 5-10 minutes under current conditions. The engine room is notified to ensure all WTD's are still closed in the E/R and all valves and cross connection valves are secured.

23:56 The ship grounds in the vicinity of Murr Ledges off Grand Manan Island in position 44 degrees 30.326 Minutes North x 066 Degrees 49.716 Minutes West. BRAVO BRAVO BRAVO is announced on the public address system and all responding parties are readied for response.

23:58 Fundy Traffic (VHFCh 14), via VHF radio, and Canadian CG (+1 800 565 1633), via telephone, are made aware of the grounding. Bottom is rocky as per local charts of the area and inspections are being made to assess any damage to the ship.

May 20th 2011

00:08 Current weather conditions are 30-35 knot winds with heavy rain. The Safety Officer and Environmental Officer advised that lowering a boat to place the oil boom in the water will endanger the crew conducting the operation. The USCG National Response Center is informed in detail via telephone (+1 800 424 8802) and the relevant Spill Incident Reporting Form is sent via fax (+1 202 267 2165). The center instructs the ship to contact both the Maine DEP as well as the CCG Newfoundland Region (+1 800 5639089) and Canadian CG (+1 800 565 1633). Company Shoreside contact personnel as per EMERGENCY CONTACT LIST are informed via telephone.

At this time, the Canadian Coast Guard has activated the Joint Response Plan.

00:10 Emergency Ship Signal via Public Announcement System.

00:15 Communication between vessel and Lloyd's SERS is established (011 44 207 480 5541 / 4805546). Relevant updated stability information and calculations were provided.



00:24 All Guest have reported to their Muster Stations. ALL confirmed to be in good health.

00:30-08:00 All cruise ship passengers are safely transferred ashore while essential crew remain aboard the ship.

VII. Objectives for Exercise Workgroups and Participating Organizations

This TTX is similar in scope to a large scale workshop. The CANUSLANT 2011 exercise planning team selected objectives that focused on the evaluation of emergency response procedures, identification of areas for improvement, and the achievement of a collaborative approach. Using these objectives, participants were assigned to specific workgroups that focused on the following elements:

- Command and Control
- Response
- Environmental / Fisheries / Aquaculture
- Salvage
- Public Affairs/JIC/Media/VIPs

The overarching purpose of the May 19, 2011 TTX was for multi-agency responders to test and practice several key components of the plan while meeting biennial TTX requirements.

A. Major Areas of Emphasis/Objectives/Outcomes

A total of fifty-four discussion topics were distributed among the five participating workgroups as follows:

- Command and Control: 19 issues
- Response: 10 issues
- Environmental: 6 issues
- Salvage: 9 issues
- Public Affairs/JIC/Media/VIPs: 10 issues

The Opportunities for Improvement (OFI) identified within this After Action Report are suggested improvements by each respective workgroup that will be documented and tracked in CPS (a CG tracking software program) located at <http://lintra.comdt.uscg.mil/iCGSails/>.

VIII. Workgroup Discussion Topics

The below-referenced work groups were given numerous elements to brainstorm. Due to time constraints and the weight of the discussion topics, not all topics were fully addressed. The below-referenced tables list the topics that were discussed and detail the strengths and weaknesses identified in each area.



A. Command and Control

1. Initial Response Notifications

- Review the high-level roles of an Incident Commander in order to achieve a “Best Response” from the Incident Commander Job Aid (page 2).
- Obtain a brief from the Initial Incident Commander – how does this happen?
- Assess immediate operational implications of the information provided.
- Determine other critical information needed. What else do you need to know?
- Who would you need to brief up your command chain and how would this happen? What are unique implications of a cross-border incident?
- Who would need to be notified in addition to typical stakeholders?

2. Standing-up Incident Command Organization

- Who will the Incident Commanders be for this event?
- What Incident Command Organization would you use? What would be unique due to a cross-border Incident with a Cruise Ship Responsible Party?
- What do our agency executives in Ottawa and LANTAREA/DC/Augusta and elsewhere expect from us? How can we best meet these expectations?
- Two Incident Command Posts on either side of the border vs. Joint Command?
- Use of Liaisons to ensure connectivity if two ICPs are employed.
- Would an Area Command be stood up at this point or an expanded IMT at D1?
- How would a Mass Rescue Operation (MRO) to Spill Response Transition occur?
- Location and role of Responsible Party (RP) and RP’s Spill Management Team. RP decision-making process.
- Cost sharing and procurement – Who will cover the costs?
- Role of states and provinces.

3. Setting Objectives

- What makes a good objective? Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Reasonable, Time-related (S.M.A.R.T. objectives).
- Outline specific incident objectives (USCG Incident Management Handbook (IMH) chapter 4).
- Outline specific management objectives (IMH chapters 4-6).

B. Response

- Oil Spill Response Organization (OSRO) – Transboundary cooperation/Jones Act/Coastal Trading Act.
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations – HAZWOPER requirements.
- Offshore recovery.
- Incident Action Plan (IAP) development.



- Alternative Technologies from an operational perspective: Dispersant and Insitu Burning, and shoreline cleanup agents.
- Use of Volunteers.
- Surveillance, monitoring.
- Common Operating Picture: Information sharing, real time decision making.
- Logistics issues.
- Tank Vessels/Non Tank Vessel Response Plans (US/Canada).

C. Environmental

- Alternative Technologies (including dispersants).
- Rapid Response/Surveillance.
- Insitu burning.
- Wildlife response – identify at risk species/review, birds, mammals, fish.
- Waste disposal – across border.
 - Liquid product
 - Solids
 - Temporary storage
 - Waste oil
 - Waste disposal
- Fisheries – Closing and what is required for re-opening.
- Aquaculture – Improving coordination between government and private sector.

D. Salvage

- Cruise Ship grounding analysis.
- Resources.
 - Tugs
 - Lightering barges
 - Divers
 - Remotely Operated Vehicles (ROVs) for underwater operations
- Incident Action Plan input.
- Salvage master's role.
- Places of Refuge.
- Repairs
 - Temporary
 - Final
- Jones Act/Carriage of Goods Act/Snowe Amendment.
- Shipboard Rapid Assessment Team efforts to minimize additional impacts.
- Salvage Plan.

E. Public Affairs - JIC/Media/VIPs

- Joint press message/release.
- Joint press conference.
- VIPs and VIP management.



- Social networking – blogs, Facebook, Twitter.
- Joint Information Center standup.
- Incident-specific web site.
- Language – English and French.
- Identify/Educate the need-to-know stakeholders.
- Strategic Communications – “Getting ahead of the Story.”
- Controls/Pelorus.

IX. Workgroup Summaries

A. Command and Control

The command structure of the JCP establishes a mechanism for coordinating an effective response among the Incident Commanders of all major organizations that maintain jurisdictional responsibility for a maritime incident. This is achieved by linking the responding organizations to the incident and providing a forum for the agencies to make consensus decisions while also satisfying their internal responsibilities.

The members of the command and control group have the primary command responsibility for directing the response to a maritime incident in which time is of the essence. The members of the command group must develop synergy based on the various capabilities that are brought by each respective agency representative. In doing so, the command members should strive to recognize the unique capabilities of each respective agency, develop a shared understanding of the situation, and come to an agreement on the common objectives.

Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both governments expect their Coast Guard to be steadfast in approach. - Both countries expressed a desire to be as open as possible when communicating and making decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political leaders may become more involved in the response if they perceive that it is not progressing as quickly and efficiently as they would like. Recommend establishing a process for the generation of executive summary reports that consist of 1-2 pages for distribution to senior management and political leaders. - In Canada, municipalities have more influence and authority than in the U.S. As experienced during Deepwater, dealing with a politically empowered local parish level system poses challenges not experienced in the rest of the U.S.



Strengths

- Command Structure.
 - This TTX (and other workshops and small group meetings) is extremely beneficial in developing synergy (in advance of an incident) based on the significant capabilities brought by the various representatives.
 - Regional Environmental Emergencies Team (REET) and National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Scientific Support Coordinator (SSC) and other environmental response representatives have forged a Joint Environmental Team (JET) which is a mature, well-established process. Most likely two Command Posts would be established - one in each country.
 - Incident Command Post locations are pre-identified in each country
 - One Spill Management Team used by the RP (polluter) for an incident is advantageous to provide Common Operating Picture (COP) and resource tracking.
 - International Emergency Management Group (IEMG) has a system set up to facilitate goods and persons between states and provinces. This may enhance response time when dealing with an

Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

- Need to ensure that appropriate working and response relationships are established at the local level, particularly in Canada. Must also ensure consistent and adequate federal oversight is provided at the local level.
- CCG would issue a directive/order that would deploy CCG resources and direct the polluter's resources to the spill as required; USCG puts the onus on the RP (polluter) to clean up the spill.
- Command Structure
 - The US and Canada utilize different response systems (ICS versus RMS) in the Unified Command. Either one system needs to be agreed upon on or a mechanism established to coordinate the two systems.
 - The concept of an Area Command needs to be developed for cross-border incidents.
 - One ICP established in each country poses difficulties for the RP (i.e. salvage coordinated with one ICP and response coordinated with the other).
 - The RP most likely will set up its own "war room" during a spill or event that impacts its vessels (unless a Unified Area Command structure is used).
 - The use of two Command Posts will create challenging communications issues both internally (among responders) and externally (to the media). Processes should be put in place to ensure the Command Posts (countries) "speak" as one.
 - If two Command Posts are



Strengths

international incident.

- Alternative Technologies (In-Situ Burning, Dispersants)
 - USCG Federal On/Scene Coordinator (FOSC) and State On-Scene Coordinators (SOCS) have preapproval authority to use dispersants beyond 1 mile offshore to adjacent New England waters.
 - FOSC and SOCS have pre-approval. ME DEP has pre-approval for In-Situ Burning beyond 1 mile offshore.

- Liaison – concept of a liaison team was agreed upon, which will be used to coordinate planning, ops, safety, public affairs, logistics, and communications among command staff operating in separate ICPs.
 - Establish one JIC to ensure consistent messaging to all public media in both Countries.
 - The RP (cruise line industry) agreed that they must work with both governments on a day-to-day basis and would facilitate their messaging with the government(s) in order to allay any public fears or misperceptions.
 - NOAA has drafted a list of various definitions so that everyone is using common terminology.

Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

established, it is imperative to ensure for common objectives and maintain an open course of dialog at all times during the event.

- Can a U.S. Spill Management Team [O'Briens or other] work across the border?

- Alternative Technology
 - CCG does not have a pre-approval standard for In-Situ Burning.
 - Dispersants in Canadian waters is an issue because deployment authority must come from Environment Canada. There is no pre-approval for the use of dispersants and tests are required.
 - No process is in place for U.S. / Canadian joint approval for the use of dispersants when a spill occurs close to international waters that likely impacts one or both countries.

- Liaison
 - Public communications for two entities:
 - ✓ the public media
 - ✓ political bosses
 - When dealing with an event that impacts two countries, definitions may differ and the messaging can be misconstrued. Recommend drafting a list of various definitions in advance and distributing it to all of the relevant parties to minimize confusion and misunderstanding.



B. Response

Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSRO – Transboundary cooperation/Jones Act/Coastal Trading Act. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Responder Immunity seems solid and well-supported. • OSHA regulations – HAZWOPER requirements. 	<p>General recommendation: No abbreviations in the JCP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSRO – Transboundary cooperation/Jones Act/Coastal Trading Act. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May need to develop a mechanism for granting permission to enter U.S. military air space (in general or when practicing). - Need to consider how the U.S. MARSEC defense alert system may impact operations when it is at its highest level. - Need to consider how waste disposal tactics and taxes may affect operations. - Limits of GAR may restrict actions, which doesn't seem to be an easy move. Changes between GAR need to be negotiated. Canadians can only respond in certain areas. - Need to consider that subcontractors may not/cannot be hired (directly) by the federal governments of both countries. One possible solution is that the OSRO might be able to do the hiring. • OSHA regulations – HAZWOPER requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There needs to be a mechanism recognizing or accepting that HAZWOPER = BOSRC. Possibly create a Table of Equivalencies into the CANUSLANT Annex. Competencies must be nationally agreed upon. - It is not clear who signs off on standard documentation/certification,



Strengths

operational perspective: Dispersant and In-Situ Burning, and shoreline cleanup agents.

- These resources are generally available for use.

- Use of Volunteers

- JCP, Appendix E has a Volunteer section.

- Common Operating Picture: Information sharing, real-time decision making.

- These resources are generally available.

Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

- Use of Volunteers

- Volunteer section of the plan needs to be updated to reflect the volunteer action programs that are currently available.
- There needs to be a mechanism that directs volunteers to specific organizations that will serve as volunteer management coordinators. (eg. FEMA has the capability to use a volunteer coordinator.)
- Volunteer mechanism needs to include information/advising of the specific needs in response to the incident.
- Identify trainers who can certify volunteers to perform tasks.

- Common Operating Picture: Information sharing, real-time decision making

- COP inter-operability is non-existent among countries. Recommend establishing common terminology; keep it simple and controlled (i.e. screen shots converted to pdf) and establish a single point of release.
- Existing procedures seem to result in the inconsistent application of field assignments. Recommend identifying common forms, defining distribution methods, and establishing feedback loop documenting procedures and confirming the progress of these



Strengths

- Logistics issues
 - Communications Plan – Canadians suggest BRIGIT technology
<http://www.webconferencing-test.com/en/tools/bridgit/review>.

Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)

measures.

- Logistics issues
 - Limited infrastructure in remote areas—pre-planning is critical:
 - ✓ Identify alternatives (if a road is the mainline, consider what it would take for air or water resources to be brought in).
 - ✓ Competing resources (identify existing knowledge pools, databases, people, etc. for use as a pre-existing collection of information about an area).
 - It is not clear what technology is available and in use by the various organizations, making quick setup difficult.
 - Workstation security settings/policies need to be predetermined with spill response in mind.
 - The border region is a fairly remote area. Adequate command post facilities, berthing, food facilities, information technology, and other logistical support needed to support a major response may be lacking. Alternative arrangements and workarounds need to be researched.



C. Environmental

Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alternative Technologies (dispersants) are a viable means of dealing with oil spill response and clean-up. ● Rapid Response / Surveillance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Geographic Response Plan (GRP) exists and provides valuable information. - State of Maine has a decision engine in place on booming strategies/priorities. ● In-Situ Burning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technology is available and effective. ● Wildlife Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fisheries Closure (and reopening) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Both countries have processes for determining when to close and when to reopen a fishery. - Identification of Sensitive Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Good mapping of the resources in some areas. ✓ Extensive local expertise available for quick consultation. Gulf of Maine Council has applications on the website that could be used; they are always mapping new areas and significant habitats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need to establish processes on both sides of the border to effectively utilize dispersants. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need more education on the topic and how to use it, including a decision matrix for the command. - Politics can influence the decision of whether or not to use. - Align U.S. and Canadian usage policies. - Recommend an additional decision matrix for alternative methods. ● Rapid Response / Surveillance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State of Maine's rocky coastline presents significant hardships in booming. - Would booming aquaculture work? ● In-Situ Burning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process is not in place on <i>both</i> sides of the border. ● Wildlife Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fisheries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Closing /re-opening processes are not compatible and need to be brought into alignment, especially in the Passamaquoddy Bay area. ✓ No protocols for ensuring market notifications. - Need for a "Joint Compliance Group" for endangered species to identify federal, state and local laws that need to be considered in the process. (Sec. 7



Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Aerial Surveillance through Transport Canada can quickly provide extremely valuable information. ✓ State of Maine and Canada seem to prioritize the same (marshes, mudflats, sheltered rocky shores with large tidal range, coarse flats). 	<p>consultation – emergency consultation process.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sensitive Resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Inventory data in some cases needs updating. ✓ Need to develop compatible data to easily share between countries and agencies, especially with map info. ✓ Need to investigate other possible protection strategies for aquaculture sites. Joint effort between JES and the industry. ✓ Locals need to hear from locals rather than federal authorities.

D. Salvage

Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - U.S. / Canada have existing relationships (personal contacts between agencies). - Technical capabilities of the vessel and RP (polluter). - International / national / industry vetting. - Similar requirements between countries regarding repair / transit. • Cruise Ship grounding analysis that highlights the technical capabilities of the vessel and RP (polluter). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Real time connectivity between ship and shore on ship systems including stability. - Class society near real time technical support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Logistics: remote location, limited support infrastructure, difficulty in accessing Grand Manan Island. • Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is concern regarding competition for resources between salvage and response. Appendix B in the Atlantic Geographic Annex references resources on both sides of the border. However, references to U.S. resources are not made entirely clear and are only to government



Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Places of Refuge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quick decisions by Government Agencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ USCG COTP and FOSC. ✓ Canadian, TCMS, CCG, EC through REET and Port of Refuge protocols. 	<p>resources (not OSRO). Recommend compiling a working list of resources (i.e. in the U.S. each OSRO is certified to meet AMPD, MMDD and WCD response levels and list corresponding equipment). This list should be compiled for both sides of the border and a mechanism established to ensure the list is current / accurate.</p>

E. Public Affairs - JIC/Media/VIPs

Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Website / Social Media: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Websites and social networks are recognized as an effective means to inform the public. ● Stakeholders / VIP Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders are pre-identified by contingency plans. ● Press Conf. / Messaging / Languages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Translating information from English to French and vice versa is an additional step 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Website / Social Media: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since the JIC is an ICS component (and Canada is utilizing RMS), need to ensure Canadian presence and participation in the JIC. - Recommend establishing a “dark site” in advance so that specific information can be quickly uploaded and the site made available to the public at the time of the incident. ● Stakeholders / VIP Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A general misconception exists that the PIO manages VIPs and stakeholders. Recommend increasing the number of liaison officer staff/presence to share and coordinate this workload. ● Press Conf / Messaging / Languages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need a mechanism in place to ensure the selection of a proper



Strengths	Opportunities for Improvement (OFI)
<p>in the process of developing media information; however, the ability to quickly and accurately translate is not perceived as a problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Communications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is established working cooperation among UC players. - Emphasizing the positive actions. • JIC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Media lists are already in place. 	<p>spokesperson / subject matter experts who will present to the media and/or serve as the face of the response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Communications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to ensure cooperation between agencies with different communication processes (especially if two ICPs and/or two JICs are established). • JIC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish level of release authority. - In may be helpful to pre-identify potential locations to stand up a JIC. - Recommend one JIC.

X. Appendix

A. CANUSLANT 2011 Participant Evaluation Form Summary

	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
Ability to Meet Exercise Objectives	5	4	3	2	1
The exercise helped improve cooperation between members of the U.S. and Canadian response communities.	24	18	3		
The exercise helped address outstanding and relevant issues for bi-national cross-border response.	21	16	16	2	
This exercise has enhanced our joint cross border planning and preparedness efforts.	15	25	5		

	Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree	
CANUSLANT Format and Content	5	4	3	2	1
Overall Sequence	13	19	10		



The sequence of events was a beneficial exercise format (education, breakouts, tabletop, equipment deployment)	13	19	10		
The outcomes from this exercise will help to drive corrective actions for the following year.	17	22	5	2	
Breakout Group component	5	4	3	2	1
The breakout group component allowed participants to communicate on a facet of their specific areas of expertise.	24	19	2		
Breakout Group facilitators were beneficial to the sessions.	23	20	2		
The proper amount of time was spent on Breakout sessions.	17	19	7	2	
The Breakout Group component was a beneficial part of CANUSLANT 2009	23	18	3	1	
Tabletop Exercise component	5	4	3	2	1
The Tabletop session helped participants respond to a Spill of national Significance.	8	23	5	1	
The Tabletop included the appropriate level of detail.	8	17	11	1	
The proper amount of time was spent on the Tabletop.	10	19	6	2	
The Tabletop Exercise was a beneficial part of CANUSLANT 2011.	14	18	3	2	

		Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree
Exercise Support and Materials	5	4	3	2	1
The Participants Handbook provided a good overview of the exercise agenda, objectives, and format.	19	19	3		
Registration was timely and efficient.	33	7	1		
Exercise staff was professional.	38	3	1		
Exercise staff was well organized and helpful.	35	5	2		
The site for the exercise was adequate.	24	13	3	1	

B. Exercise Comments (transcribed from Participant Feedback Forms)

Ability to Meet Exercise Objectives: Did the exercise: help improve cooperation between members of the U.S. and Canadian response communities; address outstanding and relevant issues for bi-national cross border response; and enhance joint cross border planning and preparedness?

- There was some unfamiliarity with the Joint Contingency Plan and the Atlantic Geographic Annex. It would have been beneficial to have those documents available to participants.



- It was beneficial for all potential parties involved to sit down and discuss issues that may arise prior to an actual incident.

Overall Sequence: Were the sequence of events organized in a beneficial exercise format, including the breakout group component and the tabletop exercise component?

- There was not enough time to fully address all of the issues for an exercise/incident of this size.
- This exercise was good for developing United States/Canada relations and opening up channels of communication.

Exercise Support: Did the exercise plan provide a good overview of the exercise agenda?

- Participants would like printed copies of the presentations for note-taking.

Priorities for Improving Cross-Border Response Coordination and Measures to Ensure Effective Response:

- Development of joint approval processes for various issues (e.g. dispersant use, in-situ burn, press releases, etc.).
- Maintain current resource lists for both countries.
- Improve communications, command and control, volunteer management, and community outreach.
- Pre-identify command post locations within each country.
- Address issues relating to the use of two separate response management structures (ICS (U.S.) /RMS (Canada))
- Provide the discussion topics a few days prior to the exercise, so participants have time to prepare.
- Using technology to link operations in geographically separate areas.
- Conduct more exercises.
- Focus on updating the plan.

Average overall participant rating for this exercise was 8.05 on a scale of 1 to 10.



C. Exercise Design Team

The following people were members of the CANUSLANT 2011 Exercise Design Team. This group of individuals worked for the past ten months in preparation for the exercise. Without their commitment and dedication, this exercise would not have been possible. The Canadian and U.S. Coast Guards as well as the Joint Response Team thank the CANUSLANT 2011 Exercise Design Team for their hard work and preparation for this important exercise. The members of the Exercise Design Team include:

- Joe LeClair, CCG Maritimes, Dartmouth
- Ryan Green, CCG St. John
- Ron McKay, CCG PEI
- Mary Corr, Maine DEP
- Steve Lehmann, NOAA
- Nicholas Rose, RCCL
- Rich Pruitt, RCCL
- CDR Wayne Clayborne, USCG D1
- Scott Lundgren, USCG D1
- LTJG Annjea Tanton, USCG D1
- Ron Catudal, USCG D1
- Wyman Briggs, USCG Sector Northern New England

D. Exercise Participants by Workgroup Assignment

1. Command and Control

Facilitator	
Wyman Briggs	US Coast Guard
Agency	Participant Name
Canadian Coast Guard	Assistant Commissioner Gary Sidock
US Coast Guard: D1	Rear Admiral Daniel Neptun
Canadian Coast Guard	Mike Voigt
Canadian Coast Guard	Joe LeClair
Canadian Coast Guard	Sergio Difranto
Environment Canada	Geoff Mercer
Transport Canada	Mihai Baliban
Atlantic Emergency Response Team (ALERT)	Donovan Case
US Coast Guard: D1 Response	CAPT Kevin Sareault
US Coast Guard: Sector Northern New England	CAPT Jim McPherson
US Coast Guard D1 Legal	LT Gary Murphy
US Coast Guard D1 Legal	LTJG Tom Leonardo
US Coast Guard D1 Staff	LTJG Jonas Klemm
Maine Dept of Environmental Protection	Barbara Parker
Maine Dept of Environmental Protection	Peter Blanchard



NOAA	Steve Lehmann
Celebrity Cruises	CAPT Michael Kucharski
O'Briens	Dave Tinly
Maine Dept of Environmental Protection	Patty Aho
Maine Dept of Environmental Protection	Ron Dyer
Maine Dept of Environmental Protection	Mary Corr

2. Response

Facilitators	
Lyle Hall and Eric Simonds	ME Department of Environmental Protection
Mike Grebler	Canadian Coast Guard
Sam Kornreich	US Coast Guard D1
Agency	Participant Name
Canadian Coast Guard	Keith Laidlaw
Transport Canada	Kazi Shah Jalal
Transport Canada – Aerial Surveillance	Serge Legere
Eastern Canada Response Corp (ECRC)	Addison Vickerd
Atlantic Emergency Response Team (ALERT)	Robert Totten
New Brunswick Emergency Measures Organization	Greg MacCallum
Public Safety Canada	Paul Ouellette
US Coast Guard SNNE	CDR Phil Thorne
US Coast Guard D1	Mike Popovich
USCGC JUNIPER	CWO4 Jeff Chase
US Coast Guard Sector Boston	LT Garrett Meyer
US Coast Guard SILC	Jackie Dickson
US Customs and Border Patrol	James Doherty
ME Department of Environmental Protection	Jason Fish
ME Department of Environmental Protection	John Woodward
Celebrity Cruises-Senior Environmental Auditor	Rich Pruitt
Marine Spill Response Corporation (MSRC)	Rich D'Allassandro
Marine Spill Response Corporation (MSRC)	Tom Gallant
National Response Corporation (NRC)	Joe McCarthy
National Response Corporation (NRC)	John Hillshire
Department of Labor (DOL)	Fred Malaby
ME Department of Labor	Dave Wacker
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Mike Nalipinski
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Mike Gallagher
Maine Emergency Management Agency	Jeremy Damren



3. Environmental

Facilitators	
Glenn Angel	ME Department of Environmental Protection
Rob Keenan	Environment Canada
LT Phil Mikan	US Coast Guard D1
Agency	Participant Name
Canadian Coast Guard	Ryan Green
Environment Canada	Gerard Chisholm
Environment Canada	Georges Long (via telephone/Skype)
Environment Canada	Rob Keenan
Transport Canada Aerial Surveillance	Louis Armstrong
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	Carol Jacobi
N.B. Dept of Agri/Aqua and Fisheries	Barry Hill
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	Colleen Smith
Canadian Wildlife Services	Andrew Boyne
US Coast Guard SNNE	MSTC Ann Logan
US Coast Guard D1	LCDR Riley Gatewood
Maine DEP	John Sellick
Maine DEP	Steve Flannery
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Dave McIntyre
Department of Interior/ Trustee	Andrew Raddant
ME Department of Marine Resources:	Seth Barker
ME Department of Marine Resources	Jon Lewis
US Fish and Wildlife	Steve Mierzykowski
ME Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife	Don Katnick
Celebrity Cruises	Nicholas Rose
US Dept of Agriculture	Kurt Shively
Maine Aquaculture Association	Sebastian Belle -Executive Director
Maine Dept of Marine Resources-Sea Run Fisheries	Ernie Atkinson
Maine Dept of Marine Resources	Jon Lewis-Aquaculture Program Mgr

4. Salvage

Facilitators	
George Anderson	Transport Canada
CDR Wayne Clayborne	US Coast Guard D1
Agency	Participant Name
Canadian Coast Guard	Seward Benoit
Transport Canada	Yusuff Ahmad
Saint John Port Authority	Darryl McGrath
US Navy Emergency Preparedness	CAPT Andre Smith, USNR
USCG: D1	Dave Waldrip
USCG SILC	Karen McElheney
USCG: SNNE	MST1 Sheridan McClellan



USCG: Prevention Dp	CDR Dawn Kallen
USCG: Strike Team	LTjg Ben Tuxhorn
Maine DEP	Thomas Smith
Maine DEP	Bob Shannon

5. Public Affairs

Facilitators	
CWO Kim Smith	US Coast Guard D1
David Jennings	DFO Canada
Agency	Participant Name
Canadian Coast Guard	Steve Bornais
Canadian Coast Guard	Ron MacKay
Transport Canada Public Affairs	Steve Bone
USCG D1 Public Affairs	LT Joe Klinker
USCG D1 Public Affairs	PAC Jeff Hall
SNNE – PIO	CDR Paul Wolf
SNNE	LCDR Paul Rooney
SNNE	LT Brierley Ostrander
ME DEP – PIO	Samantha Depoy-Warren
Celebrity Cruises – Corporate Communications	Cynthia Martinez

6. Credentialing

Agency	Participant Name
US Coast Guard Auxiliary	CAPT Frank Wiswall, USCG Aux
US Coast Guard Auxiliary	Mrs. Libby Wiswall, USCG Aux
US Coast Guard Auxiliary	Lisa L. Wotton-Drake, USCG Aux
US Coast Guard Auxiliary	Raymond A. Monreal, USCG Aux
US Coast Guard Auxiliary	Scott D. Warner, USCG Aux
US Coast Guard Auxiliary	Stephen A. Makrecky ,USCG Aux



E. Acronyms

Acronyms

AOS	Atlantic Operational Supplement
CAPP	Community Action Partnership Program
CCG	Canadian Coast Guard
CSA	Canada Shipping Act
CWS	Canadian Wildlife Services
DFO	Department of Fisheries and Oceans
EMS	Emergency Medical Service
FOSC	Federal On-Scene Coordinator
ICS	Incident Command System
IJC	International Joint Commission
JCC	Joint Command Centre
JCG	Joint Coordination Group
JCP	Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan
JEERT	Joint Environmental Emergency Response Team
JES	Joint Environmental Section
JIC	Joint Information Centre
JP	Joint Plan
JRT	Joint Response Team
MLCLANT	Maintenance & Logistics Command Atlantic (USCG)
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
NRDA	Natural Resource Damage Assessment
OSC	On-Scene Commander (Canada)
OSC	On-Scene Coordinator (United States)
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
OSRO	Oil Spill Response Organization
PI	Public Information
PPM	Parts Per Million
RMS	Response Management System
RO	Response Organization
RP	Responsible Party
SCAT	Shoreline Cleanup and Assessment Technique
SSC	Scientific Support Coordinator
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USF&WS	United States Fish and Wildlife Services