ABSTRACT
The major oil spills that resulted from the T/V ERIKA and M/V PRESTIGE breaking up and sinking off the coasts of France in December 1999 and Spain in November 2002, respectively, underscored the need for regulatory authorities, natural resource trustees, and other stakeholders to conduct pre-incident planning for vessels needing assistance. Both of these incidents provided the impetus for the development of places of refuge guidelines. By the end of 2003, both the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the Australian Government had developed guidelines for places of refuges decision-making. By the end of 2006, places of refuge guidelines had also been developed and adopted by a number of entities in North America; including, the Alaska, Region 9, and Region 10 Regional Response Teams (RRTs) and the Pacific States/British Columbia Oil Spill Task Force (Pacific States/BC Task Force).

In August 2006, the United States (U.S.) National Response Team (NRT) created an NRT Places of Refuge Workgroup (NRT POR Workgroup) to develop nationwide places of refuge guidelines for use throughout the U.S. The resulting NRT Guidelines for Places of Refuge Decision-Making (NRT POR Guidelines), which were approved by the NRT in July 2007, were based on the places of refuge guidelines developed (and adopted) by the Alaska RRT in 2004.

This paper provides an overview of the development of the NRT POR Guidelines, a brief overview of key elements of the document, and a discussion of the successful implementation of the concepts included in the NRT POR Guidelines in five incidents in Alaska.

BACKGROUND
In December 1999, international attention was focused on the break-up and sinking of the T/V ERIKA, the subsequent loss of over 4 million U.S. gallons of heavy fuel, and the resulting impacts to France (Daniel et al., 2001 and Cabioc’h and Nedellec, 2005). Following the T/V ERIKA spill, the IMO took the lead internationally in preparing draft Guidelines for Places of Refuge for Ships in Need of Assistance (IMO POR Guidelines). Another high-profile incident occurred in November 2002, when the M/V PRESTIGE was towed out to sea following Spanish authorities’ refusal to grant the vessel a place of refuge. The vessel, which was carrying over 20 million U.S. gallons of heavy fuel oil and approximately 12,500 U.S. gallons of diesel fuel, ultimately broke apart and sank. The resulting petroleum discharges, and subsequent contamination, affected the resources of six European counties (Cabioc’h and Nedellec, 2005 and Albertson, 2005). Following the T/V PRESTIGE incident, the Ministers of the Australian Government, State Governments, and Northern Territory endorsed the National Maritime Place of Refuge Risk Assessment Guidelines in May 2003 (Australian Maritime Safety Authority, 2004). In December 2003, the IMO finalized and adopted the IMO POR Guidelines.

By 2004, two entities in North America were preparing region-specific places of refuge guidelines; namely, the Pacific States/BC Task Force and the Alaska RRT. The Alaska RRT Guidelines for Places of Refuge Decision-Making (Alaska RRT POR Guidelines) were adopted by the Alaska RRT in October 2004; the Pacific States/BC Task Force’s U.S. Coast Guard/USCG Pacific Area/Pacific States/BC Oil Spill Task Force Area Plan Annex for Places of Refuge (Task Force POR Guidelines) were endorsed by Pacific States/BC Task Force members in December 2004. Both documents complement the IMO POR Guidelines and take similar approaches to places of refuge decision-making. However, the Alaska RRT POR Guidelines include a more detailed and comprehensive approach to stakeholder (including Federal and State natural resource agency) input, and the concepts for stakeholder input had been “field tested” during the May 2004 grounding of the Alaska State Ferry, the M/V LE CONTE.

In 2005, the Region 9 RRT (which includes California, Arizona, and Nevada) adopted Guidelines for Places of Refuge Decision-Making (which was modeled after the Alaska RRT POR Guidelines) for use in California. In June 2006, the Region 10 RRT/Northwest Area Committee (which includes Oregon, Washington, and Idaho) included “Chapter 9690, Places of Refuge” (which was modeled after the Task Force POR Guidelines) in the Northwest Area Contingency Plan.

All of the guidelines developed to date throughout the world recognize, and are based on, the premise that vessels requiring
assistance (whether their fuel or cargo is already leaking or not) may need to be brought into a harbor or anchored or moored in protected waters to take action to prevent, or stop, the discharge of petroleum products and/or other cargo. The guidelines identify similar processes to help expedite decision-making on place of refuge locations with the goal of helping prevent, or minimize, adverse effects on stakeholder interests (e.g., public health and safety, sensitive natural and cultural resources, economic considerations, security, and/or critical infrastructure).

NRT PLACES OF REFUGE WORKGROUP

As noted above, by 2006, RRTs and/or Area Committees for the U.S. West Coast States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska had developed and adopted places of refuge guidelines. In recognition of the importance of developing nationwide guidelines for places of refuge decision-making and in keeping with its role of providing consistency among RRT and Area Committee preparedness activities throughout the U.S., the NRT formed the NRT Places of Refuge Workgroup (NRT POR Workgroup) in August 2006 to address this preparedness gap.

The NRT POR Workgroup included representatives from the following U.S. Federal agencies: U.S. Department of Commerce-National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (USDOCNOAA), U.S. Department of Homeland Security-U.S. Coast Guard (USDHS-USCG), U.S. Department of the Interior-Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance (USDOI-OPC), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and U.S. Department of Defense-Navy Supervisor of Salvage (USDOD-NSS). Less than one year later, the resulting NRT POR Workgroup presented the NRT with the NRT POR Guidelines, which were subsequently adopted by the NRT in July 2007. The speed at which this work was completed was due in large part to the NRT POR Workgroup's decision to model the NRT POR Guidelines after the Alaska RRT POR Guidelines, which, as described in more detail below, had been implemented successfully in a number of incidents in Alaska.

NRT POR GUIDELINES OVERVIEW

General Information

The purpose of the NRT POR Guidelines is to provide:

1. An incident-specific decision-making process to assist USCG Captains of the Port (COTP)\(^6\) in deciding whether a vessel needs to be moved to a place of refuge\(^7\) and, if so, which place of refuge to use; and
2. A framework for developing pre-incident identification of potential place of refuge (PPOR) locations(s) for inclusion in appropriate Area Contingency Plans.

The NRT POR Guidelines address places of refuge decision-making in waters subject to U.S. jurisdiction; however, the guidelines also acknowledge that this decision-making may occur in trans-boundary locations. The guidelines are consistent with the IMO POR Guidelines and the July 2007 USCG Commandant Instruction 16451.9, “U.S. Coast Guard Places of Refuge Policy.” The NRT POR Guidelines provide COTPs with a process which helps: (1) expedite place of refuge decision-making, and (2) ensure stakeholders and other technical experts are consulted as appropriate. This in turn, helps ensure that COTPs have appropriate input, and the best available information, prior to making a place of refuge decision.

Pre-Incident Planning

The NRT POR Guidelines address both “pre-identification” and the “pre-approval” of places of refuge, and provide policy guidance with respect to those two activities. The guidelines emphasize that each incident will be unique (e.g., the vessel size, fuel carried, and reason assistance is needed) and that factors to be taken into account during decision-making (e.g., weather, sea conditions, fish and wildlife resource locations, locations of other activities in the area, and resources available to respond) will vary over time and by location. However, because the NRT also recognized that there are no places of refuge that are suitable for all vessels and in all situations, the NRT POR Guidelines state that the NRT “…does not support the pre-approval of places of refuge in waters subject to U.S. jurisdiction” (NRT 2007, p. 8).

The NRT did, however, support the pre-incident identification of PPOR location(s), which will then receive incident-specific evaluations if the location(s) is considered as a place of refuge during an incident. As further clarification, the NRT POR Guidelines, state that “[i]t is important to note that identifying PPORs during pre-incident planning does not require that those locations be used as a place of refuge. Likewise, it does not eliminate the need to review and refine (as appropriate) during the incident, information specific to the PPORs.” (NRT 2007, p. 8.) As outlined in the guidelines, the incident-specific evaluation of PPORs (whether they have been pre-identified or not) is to be completed in accordance with the framework provided in the NRT POR Guidelines for places of refuge decision-making (i.e., Appendix 1). Pre-incident PPOR identification gives the COTP (and other responders) a “head start” on identifying what may (or may not) be a suitable place of refuge. However, because PPOR information is typically never complete and a subset of PPOR information (especially for sensitive resources such as wildlife) varies over time, as stated above, appropriate stakeholders and other technical experts will need to provide “real time and best-available” information for PPOR location(s) to the COTP during the incident.

To help support (and encourage) pre-incident identification of PPORs, the NRT POR Guidelines include an appendix (i.e., Appendix 3) that outlines the rationale for conducting PPOR pre-incident identification, and provides a list of recommended steps for PPOR document development and recommended PPOR document contents.

Stakeholder Input

The NRT POR Guidelines recognize that multiple interests typically need to be considered when identifying a suitable place of refuge. These will include one or more of the following: (1) protecting human life, sensitive natural and cultural resources, historic properties, national defense, security, economic considerations, and critical infrastructure; and/or (2) reducing or eliminating a hazard to navigation. As described above, the NRT POR Guidelines acknowledge that the selection of the best location for a place of refuge needs to take incident-specific characteristics and real-time input by appropriate stakeholders and other technical experts into account. Appendix 2 of the guidelines (1) includes a list of potential stakeholders who will provide information on interests to be included in places of refuge decision-making, and (2) identifies when each of those stakeholders needs to be included in the decision-making process (see Table 1). For example, if the vessel is within, or may enter, U.S. waters, then Federal and State natural resource trustees will need to be included. Similarly, if there is (or may also be) a security risk, then appropriate Federal, State, and local security entities also need to provide input into the places of refuge decision-making process.

Vessel Options and Decision-Making Timeframe

The NRT POR Guidelines recognize that when a vessel is in need of assistance, even if the vessel master requests to take the vessel into a place of refuge, each of the following vessel options need to also be considered:
• The vessel remaining in the same position.
• The vessel continuing on its voyage.
• The vessel moving farther from shore.
• The vessel being intentionally scuttled in deep water.
• The vessel being intentionally grounded.

The decision-making framework included in Appendix 1 of the NRT POR Guidelines helps ensure that each of the vessel options, identified above, is considered.

The NRT POR Guidelines also recognize, and account for, the reality that there are “temporal” considerations with respect to places of refuge decision-making, which in turn, affect the notification and consultation process with stakeholders and other technical experts and ultimately, the resulting COTP decision. In general, the timeframe for COTP decision-making falls into the following three categories:

1. The vessel’s situation requires immediate action, leaving no time for “pre-decision” notification of, or consultation with, appropriate stakeholders and/or other technical experts.
2. The vessel’s situation requires rapid action, leaving time for notification of, and consultation with, some, but not all, appropriate stakeholders and/or other technical experts.
3. The vessel’s situation allows time for notification of, and consultation with, all appropriate stakeholders and/or other technical experts.

Incident-Specific Places of Refuge Decision-Making

As stated above, Appendix 1 of the NRT POR Guidelines provides the overall framework for incident-specific places of refuge decision-making. The framework includes the following 10 steps:

Step 1. Place of Refuge Requested. This step includes a list of information (e.g., status of the vessel and the vessel systems, and types and quantities of petroleum products, hazardous substances, and other cargo onboard) to be requested by the COTP from the individual onboard the vessel (typically the vessel master or his/her representative) who is making the request to move the vessel to a place of refuge. This step also accounts for incidents (1) where there are no individuals on the vessel authorized to make the request, such as when the vessel has been abandoned; and (2) where more than one COTP zone is, or may be, involved.

Step 2. Immediate Action Required by COTP. This step outlines actions to be taken by the COTP in the event the vessel’s situation requires immediate action, leaving no time for consultation with appropriate stakeholders or other technical experts, including salvage operators or spill response organizations. The guidelines emphasize that Step 2 should only be used when “...an incident truly requires immediate action, since selection of a place of refuge without incident-specific consultation with appropriate stakeholders and technical experts may result in a decision based on incorrect and/or incomplete information.”

Step 3. COTP/Unified Command® requests input from stakeholders and other technical experts on vessel options. This step outlines actions to be taken when the vessel’s situation does not require “immediate action.” In this step, input is requested from appropriate stakeholders and other technical experts on issues related to: (1) protecting human life, sensitive natural and cultural resources, historic properties, national defense, security, economic interests, and critical infrastructure; and (2) reducing or eliminating a hazard to navigation. This input is requested for all vessel options that are appropriate for the incident, in addition to the vessel moving to a place of refuge. This includes any issues associated with any pre-identified PPOR location(s) that could be used for the incident.

The number of stakeholders and other technical experts involved in this and remaining steps, and how quickly requested input is needed by the COTP/Unified Command, will depend on the vessel’s situation. The resulting input from stakeholders and other technical experts is combined into the following categories:

• Vessel status and risk considerations.
• Response and salvage resources considerations.
• Public health and safety considerations.
• Natural and cultural resources and historic properties considerations.
• National defense, security, and economic and critical infrastructure considerations.
• Other considerations (e.g., liability, insurance, and compensation issues and limits).

Step 4. COTP/Unified Command selects vessel option based on input from stakeholders and other technical experts. Based on the input received in Step 3, in this step, the COTP/Unified Command evaluates the information and determines whether the vessel should remain in the same position, continue on its voyage, move farther from shore, be intentionally scuttled in deep water, be intentionally grounded, or move (or be taken) to a place of refuge. If the COTP/Unified Command selects the option of moving the vessel to a place of refuge, the remaining steps in the appendix are to be completed.

Step 5. COTP/Unified Command requests input from technical experts on operational considerations for PPOR locations. In this step, the COTP/Unified Command gathers information on operational considerations for PPOR locations. Technical experts to be consulted (depending on the specifics of the incident) will include: the USDOC-NOAA Scientific Support Coordinator (e.g., for information on sea states, tides, currents, water depths, and spill trajectories), marine pilots or other mariners (e.g., for port or anchorage criteria), salvage experts (e.g., for availability of recovery tugs/tow vessels, additional information on vessel status/seaworthiness, and availability of lightering equipment), oil spill response organization representatives (e.g., for ability/feasibility to respond to discharges/releases), and port or harbor authorities and land owners and land managers (e.g., for permits or other requirements).

Step 6. COTP/Unified Command selects PPOR location(s) based on operational considerations. Based on input received from technical experts in Step 5, in this step, the COTP/Unified Command selects one or more PPOR location(s) based on the considerations related to port or anchorage criteria; response, salvage, and repair resources; and other command management factors (e.g., liability, insurance, and compensation issues and limits).

Step 7. COTP/Unified Command provides stakeholders with PPOR location(s) based on operational considerations. In this step, stakeholders are provided with PPOR location(s) which are based on operational considerations. In addition, stakeholders are provided with additional information (as shown in Table 2) necessary to enable stakeholders to provide timely input to the COTP/Unified Command on PPOR location(s). The level of detail provided to stakeholders will vary according to the characteristics of the incident. For example, in some cases, there will be time for a written salvage plan to be prepared, which will be provided to stakeholders for review. Typically, the more complete the “operational” information that is provided to stakeholders, the more quickly stakeholders will be able to review the proposal and provide their input. Affording stakeholders the opportunity to discuss (e.g., through a conference call) proposed PPOR location(s) with representatives of the COTP/Unified Command enhances the ability of stakeholders to provide timely, and consensus-based, input on the proposed PPOR location(s).

Step 8. Stakeholders provide ranking of PPOR location(s) to COTP/Unified Command. The goal of this step is for all stakeholders, or each stakeholder group, to provide to the COTP/
Unified Command, a consensus ranking of the PPOR location(s), including the identification of any special considerations or constraints and/or any permits or other authorizations required for any PPOR location(s). This step also includes stakeholders providing the COTP/Unified Command with documentation of the considerations that the stakeholders took into account when ranking the PPOR location(s).

Step 9. COTP/Unified Command selects place of refuge based on input from stakeholders and other technical experts. Based on input received from stakeholders and other technical experts, in this step the COTP/Unified Command: (1) directs or allows the vessel to move to a place of refuge in accordance with any identified special considerations or constraints and any permits or other authorizations, (2) informs stakeholders and other technical experts of the decision and of any additional response-related assistance required, and (3) continues overseeing or directing, as appropriate, response activities until the case is closed. This step also addresses actions to take in the event the PPOR location(s) identified in Step 7 are not workable or circumstances have changed and moving the vessel to a particular place of refuge location is no longer an option.

Step 10. The COTP/Unified Command prepares documentation of the places of refuge decision-making process.

USE OF NRT POR GUIDELINES CONCEPTS IN ALASKA

Concepts that were included in the Alaska RRT POR Guidelines were initially “field tested” during the places of refuge decision-making following the grounding of the Alaska State Ferry, the M/V LE CONTE, near Sitka, Alaska, in May 2004. This included a process for providing consensus-based stakeholder input to the COTP/Unified Command.

Following adoption by the Alaska RRT in October 2004, the Alaska RRT POR Guidelines have been used in a number of Alaska-based incidents, including:

- F/V JOHNNY A. This July 2005 case (under the jurisdiction of the COTP for Southeast Alaska) involved the sinking, re-floating, lightering of remaining fuel, and moving to a place of refuge for repair/salvage, a 58-foot fishing vessel near Sitka. The vessel had approximately 5,000 U.S. gallons of diesel on board at the time that it sank.
- F/V SYLVIA STAR. This July 2005 case (under the jurisdiction of the COTP for Western Alaska) involved the sinking, re-floating, and moving to a place of refuge for lightering remaining fuel and conducting temporary repairs, a 58-foot fishing vessel that sank near Kodiak Island. The vessel had approximately 1,200 U.S. gallons of diesel on board at the time that it sank.
- T/V SEABULK PRIDE. This February 2006 case (under the jurisdiction of the COTP for Western Alaska) involved the grounding, re-floating, and moving to a place of refuge for temporary repairs, a 600-foot tanker in Cook Inlet. The vessel had approximately 224,500 U.S. gallons of bunker oil, 46,670 U.S. gallons of gasoline, and 520,800 U.S. gallons of Heavy Vacuum Gasoline Oil, and 100,500 U.S. gallons of diesel fuel on board.
- M/V COUGAR ACE. This July-August 2006 case (under the jurisdiction of the COTP for Western Alaska) involved the severe listing of this roll-on, roll-off cargo vessel and towing to a place of refuge in the Aleutian Island to stabilize the vessel and perform temporary repairs. This 654-foot vessel had approximately 142,100 U.S. gallons of Intermediate Fuel Oil 380 and 34, 200 U.S. gallons of Marine Diesel Oil onboard in addition to approximately 4,800 vehicles.
- Freight Barge BARANOF PROVIDER. This November 2006 case (under the jurisdiction of the COTP for Southeast Alaska) involved moving a barge with 94 containers (primarily municipal solid waste) onboard, in which some of the containers caught fire, to a place of refuge south of Juneau for firefighting and cargo recovery.

Each of these cases presented unique and varying circumstances including, but not limited to: (1) amount of time available for making a place of refuge decision; (2) size and type of vessel involved; (3) amount and type of petroleum products, hazardous substances, and cargo onboard; (4) access to existing ports and infrastructure; (5) stakeholder interests; (6) potential impacts to natural resources; historic properties; recreational, commercial, and/or subsistence use of natural resources; and/or human health; (6) safety of responders; and (7) level of media, public, and local community interest. Practical experience with the Alaska RRT POR Guidelines demonstrated that the concepts included the guidelines, which allow for “real-time” input by stakeholders and other technical experts, resulted in timely and appropriate decision-making by the COTP, which in turn, eliminated or minimized public concern regarding the decision.

SUMMARY

The NRT POR Guidelines provide for the first time: (1) an incident-specific decision-making process to assist COTPs throughout the U.S. in deciding whether a vessel needs to be moved to a place of refuge and, if so, which place of refuge to use; and (2) a national framework for pre-incident identification of PPOR location(s) for inclusion in appropriate Area Contingency Plans. The NRT POR Guidelines emphasize consultation with appropriate stakeholders and other technical experts from multiple disciplines to assist the COTP in the decision-making process during an incident and including USCG COTPs, Unified Commands, RRTs, Area Committees, natural resource trustees, and other stakeholders and technical experts in the identification of PPOR locations during pre-incident planning.

Based on concepts first included in the Alaska RRT POR Guidelines and successfully implemented in incidents in Alaska, the NRT POR Guidelines are consistent with existing guidelines for Alaska and the U.S. and Canadian West Coast as well as with the IMO POR Guidelines and the USCG Commandant Instruction on places of refuge. This consistency is helpful to the owners and operators of vessels operating inside, or in proximity to, U.S. waters. In addition, the NRT POR Guidelines emphasize on including stakeholders and other technical experts in identification of PPOR locations and in places of refuge decision-making helps ensure that stakeholder interests are considered and protected and that potential controversy surrounding places of refuge decision-making is minimized or eliminated.
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ENDNOTES

1 The IMO is a specialized agency of the United Nations, established by Convention in 1948, with 167 Member States and three Associate Members. The main task of the IMO is to develop and maintain a comprehensive regulatory framework for shipping. (IMO 2007, p. 1.)

2 The Pacific States/BC Task Force provides a forum for task force members (who represent the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Hawaii and British Columbia) to work with stakeholders on spill prevention and preparedness initiatives along the western U.S. coast and Alaska. (Pacific States/BC Task Force 2003.)

3 Like the NRT, described in Endnote 5, the U.S. National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 300, Subpart B, Section 300.115) establishes the RRTs and their roles and responsibilities in the National Response System, including coordinating preparedness, planning, and response at the regional level. The RRT consists of both a standing team made up of representatives of each Federal agency that is an NRT member, as well as State and local government representatives; and an incident-specific team of members of the standing team that is activated for a response. The RRT also provides oversight and consistency review for area plans within a given region. (USEPA 2006.)

4 The NCP (40 CFR, Part 300, Subpart C, Section 300.210) provides for Area Committees, which consist of Federal, State, and local agencies with responsibilities that include preparing an Area Contingency Plan for a specific geographic area. Area Contingency Plans are to be implemented in conjunction with the NCP and RRT Regional Contingency Plans. (NRT 2000.)

5 The NCP (40 CFR, Part 300, Subpart B, Section 300.100) establishes the NRT, which is an organization of 16 Federal departments and agencies, with the USEPA serving as the chair and the USCG serving as the vice-chair. Section 300.100 further establishes the NRT roles and responsibilities in the U.S. National Response System, including planning and coordinating responses to major discharges of oil or hazardous waste, providing guidance to RRTs, coordinating a national program of preparedness planning and response, and facilitating research to improve response activities. (NRT 2006 and USEPA 2006.)

6 USCG OPRs (which are also the designated Federal On-Scene Coordinators (FOSC)) have authority to order vessels into and out of ports, harbors, and embayments in order to protect the public, the environment, and maritime commerce (USCG 1986).

7 The NRT POR Guidelines, define a “place of refuge” “…as a location where a vessel needing assistance can be temporarily moved to, and where actions can then be taken to stabilize the vessel to: (1) protect human life, sensitive natural and cultural resources, historic properties, national defense, security, economic interests, and critical infrastructure; and (2) reduce or eliminate a hazard to navigation. A place of refuge may include constructed harbors, ports, natural embayments, or offshore waters with the necessary maritime support infrastructure.” (NRT POR Guidelines 2007, p. 7.)
The NRT POR Guidelines acknowledge that COTP response activities will occur within an Incident Command System (ICS) and recommend where within the ICS, places of refuge decision-making could occur. In addition, the guidelines also acknowledge that in some cases, activation of a Unified Command is not appropriate or necessary. Subpart B, Section 300.135(d) of the NCP establishes the unified command structure, which is the basic framework for the response management structure that (as appropriate) brings together the functions of the Federal Government, the State government(s), and the responsible party to achieve an effective and efficient response, where the FOSC maintains authority (USEPA 2006.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: POTENTIAL STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Federal and State natural resource trustees, when the vessel is within, or may enter, U.S. waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federally-recognized tribes, if the interests of Federally-recognized tribes have been, or may be, affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. possessions, territories, and commonwealths, if the vessel will, or could be, directed to waters of a U.S. possession, territory, and commonwealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreign governments (e.g., Canadian Federal and Provincial, Mexican Federal and State, and Russian Federal), if the vessel is, or could be, in a trans-boundary area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State On-Scene Coordinators, when the vessel is within, or may enter, State waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal, State, and local safety and public health entities, if there is, or may be, a risk to public safety and/or health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal, State, and local critical infrastructure entities, if there is, or may be, a risk to critical infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal, State, and local security entities, if there is, or may be, a security risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal, State, and local economic entities, if there are, or may be, economic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal, State, and local agricultural entities, if there are, or may be, invasive species and/or animal or plant disease onboard and/or if there is animal, plant, or food cargo onboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local governments, if there is, or may be, a risk to their jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Port authorities, if the vessel will, or may be, taken to their port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private landowners and business owners, if their property will, or may be, affected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2. INFORMATION PROVIDED TO STAKEHOLDERS (AS APPROPRIATE) REGARDING OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INCIDENT-SPECIFIC PPOR LOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Principal reasons for selecting each location (e.g., location of repair facilities and distance vessel can travel without sinking).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ How the vessel will transit to the area (e.g., on its own power or assisted by a tug) and transit route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Amount, location, and type of petroleum products and/or other hazardous substances remaining on the vessel; the likelihood of discharge/release; and the anticipated trajectory for any products released at any point along the vessel's intended transit route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ The presence (or suspected presence) of animals, plants, food products, invasive species, and/or animal or plant diseases onboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ What incident-related activities will occur in the place of refuge (e.g., lightering and underwater welding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ What support vessels/aircraft will be required (e.g., salvage vessel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ The estimated duration the vessel will be in the place of refuge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Transit route of the vessel upon leaving the place of refuge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Anticipated weather and sea states (including prevailing winds, tides and currents, and seasonal considerations relevant to PPOR location(s)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Other pertinent information, if any.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>