

SIC 29	Petroleum refining
SIC 131	Oil production
SIC 16	Contract construction
SIC 20	Food and kindred products
SIC 28	Chemicals and allied products
SIC 32	Stone, clay, glass, concrete
SIC 33	Primary metal industries
SIC 20-39	Other manufacturing
SIC 401	Railroad fueling
SIC 411/413, 414/417	Bus transportation
SIC 42/446	Trucking and warehousing/water transport
SIC 456	Air transportation
SIC 46	Pipelines
SIC 491	Electric utility plants
SIC 5171	Petroleum bulk stations and terminals
SIC 554	Gasoline service stations
SIC 5883	Fuel oil dealers
SIC 751	Vehicle rental
SIC 801-807	Health care
SIC 808	Hospitals
SIC 821	Education
SIC 822	Colleges
SIC 97	Military installations

Using several national databases, facilities were selected to ensure that the sample facilities reflect the actual universe of facilities that produce, use, or store oil products. EPA's approach for calculating the survey sample will allow EPA to make statements about surveyed

industries to within 10 percent of their true value and within the 95-percent confidence interval.

### Survey schedule

EPA is implementing the 1994 SPCC Facilities Survey in two phases. In the first phase, a pilot survey was administered to 10 percent of the selected sample. The pilot survey assisted EPA in evaluating the adequacy of the survey forms, the sample size, the survey administration procedures, and the survey management system. EPA initiated the pilot survey in May 1994 and completed it in September 1994. Using information gained in the pilot survey, EPA modified the survey form, sample size, and administration procedures and administered the survey to the remaining 90 percent of facilities in the survey sample throughout the fall and winter of 1994. The agency expects to have all survey questionnaires returned by early 1995, with initial survey results available in mid-1995.

### Author

Janet LaFiandra Weiner is the attorney/advisor for EPA's Emergency Response Division. She is a graduate of Columbia Law School, where she was editor-in-chief of the *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law*. She also holds a masters degree in government administration from the University of Pennsylvania.

---

## CALIFORNIA'S AREA CONTINGENCY PLANS: A SUCCESSFUL STATE/FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP

*Adam Sutkan*  
State of California  
Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, California 94244

**ABSTRACT:** *The area planning effort that took place in California in 1993 was unique in its level of coordination between state, local, and federal offices, as well as in its strict organizational format to get the job done. The completed documents stand as models for the rest of the nation to follow, and the methods used to accomplish this goal highlight a useful approach to complex programmatic tasks.*

A strange thing happened on the West Coast while complying with the complex mandates found within the Oil Pollution Act of 1990—the State of California and the U.S. Coast Guard bypassed potential pitfalls and turf battles and cooperated side by side to produce a comprehensive planning document that ensured that the concerns of both groups, and many others, were properly addressed.

Under OPA 90, all coastal regions of the United States must undertake an extensive planning process that will outline all the response procedures for any person or group that may be involved with a major oil spill cleanup. The list of groups that the act requires to participate in this planning exercise is impressive: ranging from federal, state, and

local government agencies, to environmental groups, industry, academic institutions, and the public.

Given the length and diversity of California's coastline, and the powerful special interest groups that cover the state, the project was expected to be difficult, divisive, and controversial. Three different Coast Guard offices alone would be involved with the effort, as well as their district staff headquarters. Getting these Coast Guard offices to communicate on a statewide level would be difficult enough; but in addition, other federal agencies and the State of California had their own expectations about the project. California's contact for the project was the Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office (OSPR), located within the Department of Fish and Game, newly created in 1991 as yet another outgrowth of the *Exxon Valdez* disaster in 1989. A dizzying array of state regulatory packages, memoranda of agreements, and negotiations with federal agencies were underway at the OSPR office and the area planning project had to avoid being in conflict with any one of these efforts. At the same time a group of environmental and public interest groups were readying themselves for the massive planning project to make sure that the proper environmentally sensitive sites would be protected in the correct manner. The stage was set for a

potentially difficult quagmire of contradictory policy proposals to clash.

### Procedures for producing the contingency plans

To deal with expected problems that could derail the effort, the two principle actors on this project met early on to create a strict procedural format that would recognize clear due dates, lines of authority, and methods of communication. Captain Bill Boland of the USCG district headquarters and Pete Bontadelli, administrator of California's Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office, developed the managerial structure that would keep the effort on schedule.

First, the coastline was separated into seven geographical sections with each of the three Coast Guard MSO's having clear authority over certain areas. Second, local grants were made available to all coastal administering agencies for them to write their own local oil spill contingency plans, with a condition attached: they had to take an active role in the Coast Guard's area planning process. Third, a subcommittee format was developed that encompassed every necessary topic to be covered in the final area plan. Fourth, clear lines of responsibility were created for each participant in the process, all the way from senior management on down through the individual MSO's to volunteers at the local area level. To minimize confusion, a clear set of written directions outlining this process was distributed to all participants before the effort began. Twenty-two subcommittees were eventually formed in each of the seven planning areas, leading to over 100 subcommittees meeting regularly with an estimated 1,000 individuals participating across the state.

Both the Coast Guard and the state OSPR understood that to obtain consistency among the seven different plans on sensitive issues, key topics had to be developed by qualified individuals and accepted by each of the area committees. A procedure was therefore developed to produce boilerplate texts of different subject areas by assigned experts from all concerned groups. As a result, the individual subcommittees in the seven planning areas wrote the text for these primarily "local" topics and statewide experts continued to coordinate policy through a single negotiated document on a larger scale for the issues requiring statewide conformity.

In addition to the thorough written instructions on this project, the key Coast Guard coordinators began to meet regularly with their state counterparts on a monthly basis. This face-to-face coordination had never been accomplished before between these actors. Particular issues of concern were brought up at these meetings; if not resolved, they were highlighted as topic points to be resolved by senior management at their own monthly meeting.

Clear deadlines and expectations were communicated early in the process. Both the Coast Guard and state OSPR staffs knew they had six months to accomplish this major task, January to July, and that no extensions would be granted. The MSOs had to have the final document into district headquarters on July 1, no questions. In similar fashion, the priority of completing the plans was transferred to OSPR staff through complementary lines of communication from the state headquarters of the OSPR. The information to be contained in the

area plans would be vital to other ongoing projects with which the state OSPR office was currently involved. The area plans were also chosen to become an annex of California's own Marine Oil Spill Contingency Plan, in recognition of the vital local information that was being collected statewide. The senior managers in both organizations had no confusion about the importance of this project being completed properly and on time.

After many hours in the field and contentious subcommittee meetings, the plans were delivered on time to the Coast Guard 11th District headquarters in Southern California. Seven separate plans of approximately 1,000 pages each covering every important oil spill topic became "official" for the first time. Everyone breathed a sigh of relief when the completed plans were submitted for review.

### Conclusions

The benefits of this exercise were many, but above all the relationships that were established cemented a communication network of response personnel that will work hand in hand on any future oil spill. All of the major players now know each other well; and the emergency response process is understood by all, as well as extensively documented.

One of the keys to this planning project's success was the strong management commitment on both sides of the planning team. The Coast Guard and the state OSPR both understood the importance of having this project done well, and on time. Resources were allocated and the message was clearly sent to the field that this will be completed correctly as planned, no excuses. Additionally, the structure of the process helped assure success. Lines of communication and responsibility were clear, and the guidelines given to the many different players were concise and straightforward. All the players knew their responsibilities, the time lines, and expected outcomes. Considering the potential pitfalls, the process went forward without any major incident.

If this joint project between federal and state governments is any indication, it's possible for any complex project among governmental agencies to be accomplished as planned—just as long as the expectations are clear from the beginning, roles have been spelled out, and there is firm management commitment. In this particular case, the State of California and the Coast Guard have the documents now in hand to prove that it can indeed be done.

### Author

Adam Sutkus holds a B.A. in environmental science from the University of California, Los Angeles, and a masters in public administration from the University of Southern California. He has worked at the federal EPA, the U.S. Senate, and for local and state governments. He now heads the state's area planning efforts at the California Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office.