

Job Aid 11

Dispersant Use After-Action Report

Job Aid 11 Inclusions		Page
13.a	General reporting responsibilities and time frame	2
13.b	Special reporting for dispersant use in state waters	2
13.c	Template report outline	3

13.a General reporting responsibilities and time frame

The discussion and outline below are based on the Alaska RRT Dispersant Use Plan, <http://alaskarrt.org>, but can be modified as necessary and/or incorporated with other agency after-action reports (e.g., CG AAR).

The After-Action Report should include the elements identified in the Report Outline below.

Report Element		Lead Responsibility [Resources]
I	Incident overview	FOSC [SITL]
II	Description of the dispersant application	Dispersant Operations Unit Lead [Job Aids 3, 4, 9]
III	Description and results of Tier 1 (visual) SMART effectiveness monitoring	NOAA SSC [Strike Team, OSRO, Job Aid 5]
IV	Description and results of Tiers 2 and 3 (fluorometry) SMART effectiveness monitoring	NOAA SSC [Strike Team, OSRO, Job Aid 5]
V	Description and results of additional monitoring: Wildlife	Wildlife Branch Director [Job Aid 7]
VI	Description and results of additional monitoring: Air and Water Column	Air and Water Monitoring Branch Units/Directors [Job Aids 8, 9]
VII	Description and results of additional monitoring: Worker, Community and Seafood Safety	Health and Safety Officer, other Branch or Unit Leads as assigned [Job Aid 10]
VIII	Summary of response agency, trustee agency, stakeholder and other media outreach	As assigned [Job Aid 1, 2]
IX	Additional elements as requested by FOSC, RRT IX, State	As assigned

A draft dispersant use after-action report should be prepared within 30 days of completion of the dispersant operation(s) or a timeframe agreed upon by the RRT IX. It is understood that some elements of the draft report (e.g., monitoring results) may not be fully available within 30 days, but a draft summary of expected monitoring results should be provided as well as a timeline for receipt and inclusion of the full results. The draft shall be sent to all signatories of the Region IX Dispersant Use Plan (DUP) (USEPA, USCG, DOI, DOC, CA State) for a two-week review and comment period or a timeframe agreed upon by the RRT IX. The final report, which shall address all comments received by the signatories, shall be submitted to all signatories to the DUP in addition to the incident UC and all RRT IX members

13.b Special reporting for dispersant use in state waters

California Senate Bill 414 and Government Code Section 8670.13.3 requires that if dispersants are used in response to an oil spill in state waters, the Administrator “... shall provide written notification of their use to the [California] Legislature within three days of the use. The Administrator shall provide the Legislature with written justification of their use, including copies of key supporting documentation used by the federal on-scene coordinator and the federal Regional Response Team as soon as those materials are released. Within two months of the use of dispersants in state waters, the administrator shall also provide a report to the Legislature

on the effectiveness of the dispersants used, including, but not limited to, results of any available monitoring data to determine whether the dispersant use resulted in overall environmental benefit or harm. The written notification, justification, and report shall be submitted pursuant to Section 9795.”

Although not part of California law, it is expected that use of dispersants in federal waters should also be reported to the California Legislature as soon as their use has been approved by the FOSC and/or RRT, and a mechanism provided for providing any necessary or requested periodic updates as the federal dispersant use proceeds in response to an offshore oil spill. The initial notification could be included as part of DIS-1 IV in the Dispersant Use Decision Flowchart, with the notification made by the OSPR Administrator or the OSPR Primary representative to the RRT IX. The scope and timeframe for delivery of any after-action reports determined as part of each dispersant use incident in federal waters could be determined at that time. The most straight-forward and timely approach may be to make the federal after-action report available to the Legislature as it has been finalized and released by the FOSC and/or RRT IX.

13.c Template report outline

Outline provided is based on Alaska RRT Dispersant Use Plan, <http://alaskarrt.org>), but can be best supported by including and referencing copies of relevant Job Aid forms provided as part of Appendix 1.

- I. Incident overview
 - A. Background information
 1. Cause of potential cause of spill, if known
 2. Type and amount of oil spilled
 3. Location of spill
 4. Movement of oil slick, including any trajectories
 5. Weathering and behavior of oil
 6. Other pertinent information
 - B. Response actions taken/effectiveness (e.g., mechanical recovery, protective booming, *in-situ* burning, dispersant use).
 - C. Summary of decision-making process resulting in the authorization for dispersant use, including (but not limited to) the evaluation of whether the selected dispersant would work effectively on the oil discharged; if the dispersant could be effectively applied to the oil; trade-offs associated with the potential impacts of dispersants, dispersed oil, and non-dispersed oil on resources and resource uses, including when compared to other response options; and how Best Management Practices and other stipulations and conditions of use were taken into account.
- II. Description of the dispersant application
 - A. Description of dispersant application (including all dispersant application field test(s))
 1. Type and amount of dispersant applied
 2. Types(s) of aircraft and/or vessel(s) used and dispersant system(s) used
 3. Personnel directly involved in dispersant application and summary of their qualifications and experience

4. Location (shown on a map of appropriate scale), date, time, ratio of dispersant to oil, and total amount of dispersant applied for each dispersant application
 5. Weather conditions at time(s) of each application, including sea state, water temperature, water salinity
 6. Staging area, distance to area of application, and specifics regarding logistics (including time) involved in supporting the dispersant application
 7. Communications used
 8. Interaction between UC and field units
 9. Summary of spotter (wildlife, SMART) aerial observations (greater detail will be provided in sections III – V of the report)
 10. Description of any adverse environmental effects associated with the dispersant application, such as impacts to fish and wildlife (e.g., disturbance, unintentional over-spray or spray drift)
 11. Health and Safety Plan requirements (including Personal Protective Equipment required and subsequently used)
- B. Lessons learned
1. What worked well
 2. What needs improvement
 3. Recommendations
- III. Description and results of Tier 1 (visual) SMART effectiveness monitoring
- A. How the monitoring was carried out (e.g., method, vehicle, monitors)
1. Specifics regarding equipment and suitability of application platform(s) used
 2. Description of observations regarding oil dispersion effectiveness
 3. Communications used and any associated problems
 4. Operational support from the staging area, etc.
 5. Interaction between the Incident Management Team (IMT) and the field units carrying out guidance received from the IMT
- B. Results of Tier 1 monitoring, including a copy of the NOAA SSC's documentation on monitoring results (including QA/QC process summary) and other SSC and/or ART Lead TS recommendations to the FOSC
- C. Lessons learned
1. What worked well
 2. What needs improvement
 3. Recommendations
- IV. Description and results of Tiers 2 and 3 (fluorometry) SMART effectiveness monitoring
- A. How the monitoring was carried out (e.g., method, vehicle, monitors)
1. Specifics regarding equipment and suitability of the vessel(s) used
 2. Description of observations regarding oil dispersion effectiveness
 3. Communications used and any associated problems
 4. Operational support from the staging area, etc.
 5. Interaction between the IMT and the field units carrying out guidance received from the IMT
- B. Results of Tier 2 and Tier 3 monitoring, including a copy of the NOAA SSC documentation on monitoring results (including the QA/QC process summary) and other SSC and/or ART Lead TS recommendations to the FOSC

C. Lessons learned

1. What worked well
2. What needs improvement
3. Recommendations

V. Description and results of additional monitoring: Wildlife

A. How the monitoring was carried out (e.g., method, observation platforms used, monitors used)

1. Specifics regarding equipment and suitability of the observation platforms used
2. Description of observations regarding wildlife presence in the dispersant operational area and avoidance measures taken
3. Platform-to-platform communications (e.g., wildlife spotter plane to dispersant spotter plane) used and any associated problems
4. Operational support from the staging area, etc.
5. Interaction between the Dispersant IMT and the dispersant field units (application plane, dispersant spotter plane, SMART and wildlife observers) carrying out guidance received from the Dispersant IMT

B. Results of wildlife monitoring

C. Lessons learned

1. What worked well
2. What needs improvement
3. Recommendations

VI. Description and evaluation of additional monitoring: Air and Water Column

A. How the monitoring was carried out (e.g., method, observation platforms used, monitors used)

1. Specifics regarding air and water monitoring sampling equipment and suitability of the tools and approaches used
2. Ability and availability of remotely-operated sampling systems
3. Affiliations and experience of personnel conducting the air and water column sampling
4. Timeliness of sampling (e.g., real-time, near real-time) relative to operational event (e.g., before and after dispersant application)
5. Location of sampling stations (e.g., inside and outside treated slick, before and after treatment, depths (e.g., 1m, 5m, 10m) from which water samples collected, above-surface altitudes from which air samples collected)
6. Platform-to-platform communications used and any associated problems
7. Operational support from the staging area, etc.

B. Results of air and water column monitoring, including any copies of documentation and QA/QC process summary

C. Lessons learned

1. What worked well
2. What needs improvement
3. Recommendations

VII. Description and evaluation of additional monitoring: Worker, Community and Seafood Safety

- A. Describe if and how the air and water column monitoring was used to support safety of (and safety messaging to) workers and the broader potentially-impacted communities
 - B. Describe if and how water column sample data for dispersed oil concentrations were shared with the seafood safety evaluation team
 - C. Results of air and water column monitoring
 - D. Lessons learned
 - 1. What worked well
 - 2. What needs improvement
 - 3. Recommendations
- VIII. Summary of response agency, trustee agency, stakeholder and other media outreach
- A. Notification approach
 - B. Risk communication
- IX. Additional elements as requested by FOSC, RRT IX, State

Appendices

- 1. Copies of (or links to) all Job Aid completed forms
- 2. Copies of (or links to) all FOSC and RRT IX briefing packet materials and reports
- 3. Copies of (or links to) all FOSC and RRT IX decision records
- 4. Copies of (or links to) all press and outreach materials and events
- 5. Copies of (or links to) any additional materials as requested by FOSC, RRT IX, State