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About PSP’s role
Since 2009, the Legislature has asked the Puget Sound Partnership to:

– “independently assess and advise Washington State’s oil spill programs” through a special advisory group
– and...“Because this is a unique statewide program, the Partnership may invite participation from outside the Puget Sound region”
PSP formed an Oil Spill Work Group in 2010, and in the 2012 Action Agenda they recommended:

– the use of “maritime risk assessments and develop/apply risk reduction measures” (NTA C8.1.2)
– ECB ranked the NTA among the top 9 in the “Habitat Strategic Initiative”
Puget Sound Harbor Safety Committee (HSC) mariners contributed expert judgment for the ~$1M BP-Cherry Point VTRA study completed by GWU et al. in 2008...study released and presented to HSC in April 2012

Makah Tribal Council retained GWU via late-summer grant to researchers; updating the VTRA baseline traffic scenario from 2005 to 2010* and extending offshore

*2010 baseline – b/c last year of common data between US and Canadian vessel traffic services
Primary funding for VTRA...

– US Environmental Protection Agency

  • Approved Makah Tribe’s proposal to update with 2010 VTOSS data (US/Canada Vessel Traffic Service)
  • $200K to PSP (via Marine/Nearshore Lead Organization) to advance risk assessment and update VTRA
VTRA Steering Committee formed in fall 2012

- Integrating State and Federal regulatory agencies, Tribes, Industries, NGOs and Stakeholders into a VTRA update process
- Agreed that GWU VTRA is common language by which region evaluates relative maritime traffic risk system-wide
- Risk focus: probability not consequence
VTRA SC met every 5 weeks or so...

- **PSP and PSHSC** co-chair the Steering Committee
- **Makah, Ecology and USCG** were government leads, guiding the update process
About the model:

(1) Collaborative vs adversarial analysis in environmental policy (Busenberg 1999)

- Adversarial (debate) approach led to “distorted communication” and *stalemate*
- Collaborative approach gave all stakeholders oversight of joint research team—promoting mutually credible results and *resolution*
About the model:
(1) Collaborative vs adversarial analysis in environmental policy (Busenberg 1999)

• Adversarial (debate) approach led to “distorted communication” and *stalemate*

• Collaborative approach gave all stakeholders oversight of joint research team—promoting mutually credible results and *resolution*

☑ Collaborative: *cooperation* [Ikert survey score: 4.2/5]
About the model:

(2) Past VTRA (van Dorp and Merrick 2009) quantified contribution of different interventions on reducing relative spill risk (oil outflow)

Risk reduction measures

Tug escort = \( \downarrow 61.7\% \)
Double hull = \( \downarrow 23.6\% \)
1-way zone = \( \downarrow 6.3\% \)
About the model: (Slide 11) continued…

Risk Management of a Causal Chain

- Situations
  - Maritime Simulation

- Incidents
  - Incident Data

- Accidents
  - Expert Judgment

- Oil Spill
  - Oil Outflow Model

Risk Management Questions

- One-Way Zone
- Escort Requirements
- Double Hull Requirement

Kaplan’s (1997) Risk Definition

\[ R = \{< s_i, l_i, x_i > \} \]
VTRA 2010

Winter-spring:

• Researchers expanded classes of Focus Vessels, now includes cargo and bulk carriers (overall: FV=~25%, nonFV=~75% of exposure time)

• 10Ks of actual routes/segments and VTOSS data scrubbed

• VTRA SC obtained/shared the best available data projections on “What If” projects to be simulated
VTRA 2010

Summer-fall:

- Researchers simulated
  - “What If” changes in traffic:
    - Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion (Kinder Morgan) in B.C.
    - SSA Marine Gateway Pacific Terminal near Cherry Point, WA
    - Delta Port, Neptune, etc. expansion in Port Metro Vancouver, B.C.

  = 1250 arrivals/year (+ bunkering)

- Noting changes in potential ship interactions

- VTRA SC proposed mitigation measures to be simulated in model
VTRA 2010 – RMM simulations

• VTRA SC selected several mitigation measures to be simulated in model, e.g.
  – Secondary escorts for BC tankers, bulk carriers
  – Slowing container ships to 17 nmph
  – Reduction of human error for oil barges (to approximate benefit of 2nd watchstander)
  – Exclusion of bunkering operations...
VTRA 2010 – Major findings

SYSTEMWIDE

- Although shipping accidents leading to major spills are decidedly rare in Puget Sound (none >10,000 gallons in past 20 years)—if the 3 projects are built—the potential frequency of accidents, like groundings and collisions, could rise by 18% [from Finding 1]

SPECIFIC WATERWAYS

- Because of the sizeable shift in the mix of high-capacity cargo vessels going to and from Canada, the potential volume of oil that might be spilled west of the San Juans and in the Strait of Juan de Fuca—could more than triple, and double – respectively

...Suggesting that our region should examine new ways to manage traffic and reduce risk if the proposed projects are completed [Finding 2]
VTRA 2010 – Geographic Profiles

2010 Base Case

Combined Case for 3 projects:
- oil losses +68%
- new potential losses concentrated west of San Juans
VTRA 2010 – Major findings

RISK MITIGATION

• A portfolio of 6 risk mitigation measures—including availability of a supplemental rescue tug, reduced container vessel speeds and reduced human error rates for oil barges—and the potential accident frequency fell to 11% below today’s baseline [Finding 5]

• In light of the findings, the region should not ask what single risk mitigation measure should be implemented, but what combination of measures should be applied [Finding 3]
VTRA Future

i) Most of VTRA SC members plan to meet quarterly as a work group of Puget Sound Harbor Safety Committee

ii) Plan to meet with peers in Canada to:
   – Compare report/results with others (like Det Norsk Veritas’ risk assessment for TMEP) [June 2014]
   – Convene a transboundary: “Shipping Safety Summit” [2014 or 2015]

iii) Develop a Risk Management Strategy for Puget Sound
   – (Voluntary) changes to Harbor Safety Plan, SOCs, BMPs, etc.
   – Regulatory changes considered by USCG, WA-Ecology
   – Northwest Area Committee extends to its “Emerging Risks Task Force” report & applies findings to contingency planning, Geographic Response Plans, etc.
More info:

- [todd.hass@psp.wa.gov](mailto:todd.hass@psp.wa.gov); (360) 280 1588