

Grace Cochon

Hello, Attached are the U.S. Department of the Interior's comments on the proposed revisions to Alaska Oil Spill Prevention and Response Contingency Plan regulations (18 AAC 75, Article 4, Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plans and Nontank Vessel Plans). Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and please let me know if you have any issues opening the document. Thank you very much, Grace

U.S Department of the Interior Comments
Alaska Regulations - 18 AAC 75, Article 4

No.	Point of Contact	Organization/ Commenter	Section #	Page #	Comment or Specific Change	Rationale for Recommended Change
1	Philip Johnson	DOI-OEPC	18 AAC 75.447	45-47	It is unclear why ADEC is proposing revocation of the section requiring periodic examination of new technologies. We recommend retaining some requirement to evaluate new technologies.	New technologies may result in more effective or efficient spill response capability. These efficiencies might reduce impacts to DOI-managed lands and/or species.
2	Philip Johnson	DOI-OEPC	18 AAC 75.449 (6)(F)	52	We support the proposed requirement that "...sufficient oil discharge response equipment, personnel, and other resources must be maintained and available for the specific purpose of preventing discharged oil from entering these environmentally sensitive areas or an areas of public concern that would likely be impacted if a discharge occurs, and that this equipment and personnel will be deployed and maintained on a time schedule that will protect those areas before oil reaches them... ."	Requires the identification and protection of environmentally sensitive areas or areas of public concern.
3	Bridget Crokus	DOI-USFWS	18 AAC 75.449 (6)(M)	54	We support the proposed addition of the text, "... plans for wildlife protection, recovery, disposal, rehabilitation, and release of wildlife should follow the recommendations of the Alaska Regional Response Team Wildlife Protection Guidelines for Oil Spill Response in Alaska."	Provides clear guidance to contingency plan holders about wildlife standards of response in Alaska.
4	Philip Johnson	DOI-OEPC	18 AAC 75.449 (6)(N)	54	We generally support the following language, "...if applicable, a description of procedures for the deployment of shoreline cleanup equipment and personnel, including cleanup and restoration methods and techniques to be used if the shoreline is impacted by the discharge;..." However, we offer the following comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who determines if this requirement is applicable, and what criteria are used when making that decision? • We recommend adding the following language after the word "discharge": "...or response to the discharge;... ." • We recommend the scope of this restoration not be limited to just shorelines. Construction of staging areas, access roads, heliports, etc., may disrupt natural vegetation and require restoration. • We recommend ADEC endorse the concept of using natural vegetation (e.g., from Alaskan seed banks or other sources) that are certified to be weed-free. Such requirements could help prevent the inadvertent introduction of invasive species. 	Requiring restoration of discharge-impacted shorelines is ecologically important. However, it is also important to restore any areas that were impacted by response actions, including those associated with support facilities, access roads, etc. It would also be ecologically beneficial to require plan holders to ensure that restoration efforts do not inadvertently result in the introduction of invasive species.
5	Philip Johnson	DOI-OEPC	18 ACC 75.449 (8) including (A-G)	56-57	We support the various requirements for nonmechanical response, including requiring information regarding assessment of potential environmental consequences, provisions for continuous monitoring, and real-time assessment of environmental effects, toxicity of dispersants, and permits required. We recommend ADEC consider adding language that would also require toxicity information for non-dispersant chemical countermeasures, such as herders, surface washing agents, biodegradation products, etc.	Comprehensive pre-planning for nonmechanical response techniques should help contingency plan reviewers identify deficiencies and ensure that these potential response techniques are conducted in a way that minimizes harm to fish, wildlife, and other ecosystem components.

U.S Department of the Interior Comments
Alaska Regulations - 18 AAC 75, Article 4

6	Bridget Crokus	DOI-USFWS	18 AAC 75.449 (8)(G)	57	We support the proposed addition of the text, "... a plan for protecting environmentally sensitive areas and areas of public concern identified in 18 AAC 75.451(k), and the public from adverse effects of the nonmechanical response option."	Provides clear guidance to contingency plan holders about the planning standards for the protection of environmentally sensitive areas, areas of public concern, and the public during the use of nonmechanical response methods (i.e., dispersant use or in situ burning).
7	Bridget Crokus	DOI-USFWS	18 AAC 75.451 (k)	70	We support the addition of the word "mapped" to "Protection of environmentally sensitive areas... mapped identification of environmentally sensitive areas and areas of public concern that may be impacted by a spill... ."	Provides clear guidance to contingency plan holders to demonstrate their knowledge of the environmentally sensitive areas and areas of public concern in their areas of operation that could be impacted by an oil spill or spill response activities.
8	Philip Johnson	DOI-OEPC	18 AAC 75.452 (4)(a)(1)(D)	72	We support the requirement that contingency plans include technologies that would be used for ..."wildlife capture, treatment, and release procedures and methods described under 18 AAC 75.449(a)(6)(M)."	This explicit requirement helps ensure that wildlife capture, treatment, and release procedures are addressed.