

Ad-hoc Alaska Abandoned & Derelict Vessel Task Force Meeting Summary – FINAL

Tuesday, October 27, 2015

10 AM – 4 PM

Anchorage, AK

ACTION ITEMS are in RED

Action Items from the meeting are summarized in the table below. PLEASE REVIEW.

WHO	WHAT
ALL	Send Rachel pertinent information you have on Steamboat Slough
ALL	Review the ADV database and collector tools and provide Wyn with feedback on menus, user interface, etc.
ALL	Send VOC report forms to your colleagues and encourage their use!
Bryan	Get more information from the Marine Adjusters of Alaska on vessel insurance questions
DNR/Kyle (IT)	Draft and send Rachel a brief memo outlining the estimated hours needed to complete a robust legacy ADV database from the records available.
Holly	Get Rachel the legislative history on Article 3
Holly/Katie	Set-up one-on-one short conversations with Task Force members to garner feedback
Holly/Katie	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review riparian right laws regarding private landowners• Look into the definition of ‘waterways’ and revise keeping in mind the DNR definitions and the issues with the term ‘navigable’• Look into options for post-impoundment hearing timeline• Provide more feedback to the group on definitions of ‘Ownership’ and ‘Operator’

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look into the term 'nuisance' as it may or may not be pertinent in state statute.
Mike	Ask about single vs. multiple agencies with enabling authority in statute
Rachel	Check with private industry on Article 3
Rachel	Re-send out the Northern Economics ADV cost report to the Task Force

A participant list is included at the end, including emails and phone.

Introductions and Overview

Participants went around the table to introduce themselves and their agency/roles. The group reviewed the agenda and Wyn provided a safety overview for the meeting space.

Updates and Action Items

Rachel reviewed action items from the previous meeting (August 19) and asked leads for updates on each.

NOAA ADV Project (Wyn). Case studies were selected by NOAA, and their national ADV Info Hub should be live online in the next few months.

ADNR ADV ListServ (Jusdi). Jusdi hasn't sent out a test email, however she's also not receiving any new VOC reporting forms. There is interest from several legislators and others as to how to engage the public, and although this will hopefully be a good avenue at this point the mapping component probably needs to be live to show people there is some result from sending information. Everyone should encourage co-workers/agency folks to utilize, and consider outreach to tribes and villages through IGAP (perhaps Bob with EPA would be a good person to help with that outreach?), Bryan will encourage AAHPA members to utilize – all should include photos whenever possible. **Rose will send out a copy to the Watershed Council.** The VOC Report form can be found on the ADV webpage on the Clean Harbors website: <http://alaskacleanharbors.org/resources/harbor-management/derelict-vessels/>

Database (DNR) - All ADV data have been entered into the database that has come in so far on the new VOC report forms. Task Force had given some feedback at the last meeting on how to modify the drop down menus, etc. Jusdi showed an example map from Steamboat Slough that pulled information from the database. Each dot you can click on for the information included on the reporting form. Photos are also attributes when you have them. Database is internally live, but not pushed out yet. Some questions about permissions to modify, etc. Don't need to collect information on vessels already in the area, but gives you the opportunity to see what's recorded to be there, and also update if there are new conditions to note. Would be good to be able to note site visits over time and update the records, especially if vessels are moving from one jurisdiction to another (i.e. harbor to DNR land). Alissa asked about the vessels recorded in Steamboat Slough - 33 vessels identified/recorded in 2014. Wyn clarified that if a vessel is pushed all the way up on private land, it's not a high concern for DNR but they would note it if they had time/saw it. But if there is any connection with DNR lands they would have recorded it. Steve noted that identified vessels were all done before anyone tried to establish ownership/land ownership. Entry of vessels into the database is open to all stakeholders/landowners, not just

for DNR tidelands etc. AFE might be a great timeline for getting pushed out the door. Rachel will check back in with them about having it live by early-Feb, and will check in on a demo account for people to sign in to. Rachel will wrap around to get a memo from Kyle/DNR on creating a legacy database.

File Sharing (Rachel) – It sounds like agencies are able to use YouTube now. Think they can use Wikishare. Rachel can put large files on the website at this point.

Steamboat Slough - Rachel gave an overview of the status of pulling together information on Steamboat Slough and the current NOAA funding opportunity (due Nov2). At this point the deadline won't be met for putting in a proposal, but we're getting closer to understanding what products and information are needed to help DNR move forward. Wyn - DNR is the landowner out there, they are still looking at a litigation strategy. If they go to court and ask for the RPs to remove their vessels, the court is going to ask how much will that cost and how? So for a product, having salvage and removal cost estimate and methodology would be very helpful. Delta Chief & Shenk's Ark are clearly the most important/highest priority (in the channel and submerged). Rachel suggested getting more prioritized vessels from the list of 33 out there, looking for a total of maybe 8-10 representative vessels to include in a cost estimate, which would help lower the initial project costs. Steve had been quoted ~ \$25k from Magone to land in Bethel and go take a look at the Delta Chief. Cost for actually removing those vessels will be quite large. DNR has sent trespass notice to all vessels. Walsh gave a \$100k price tag for pulling out the vessel at cost to make the thing go away to Greg. Steve - problem is that the dispute exists that he put the barge there, and so even if he's not the 'owner' not ready to pay him to take it out if it sank under his watch. Alissa asked if it would be possible to ask someone else to pull it out and pay them. Wyn - DNR could take custody and take care of it, then duke it out later as far as who takes care of the bill. Issues: money has to put up front and DNR doesn't have the money to do it. Still have to have the money for going to court to pay for the legal battle. No bond and no insurance. Steve - most of the barges are unregulated, uninspected, uninsured. Permits do require bonding, but almost none of them have permits (Crowley is an exception). DNR is looking to reject permit applications from certain companies because they have trespass notices out there.

Rose asked if the removal of Shenk's Ark could be a "special project" to train people how to remove a vessel that sunk? Ideas were floated to partner with corporate/private folks in the area to get some outside funding (mitigation). Steve – it would be great if the community would provide laborers/techs, but there's also economic opportunity for getting folks trained on management/coordination aspects of these projects. Certified emergency responders, etc.

Rachel asked what the best role is for the Task Force moving forward. Rose - Murkowski talked about getting the villages getting a barge to collect trash from multiple areas, etc., which could be used for cleaning up derelict barges. The group discussed the limitations under current state statutes, and how they're not as straightforward as some municipal codes. Wyn - ultimately, DNR is going to have to go through legal steps to resolve. Understanding what type of cost to get the barges out will help, and putting money on the ground to take vessels out will need some base money put down on the table. Having multiple agencies on board with putting skin in the game will be very useful for any funding requests. City of Bethel boundaries - Steamboat Slough is not in the city limits, but in the 'sphere of influence' clarified from Peter. Rachel asked folks to continue getting information to her on Steamboat Slough information. As a Task Force effort, she will continue to pull together a broad package of information on Steamboat Slough. At that point, funding will need to be procured by a more appropriate entity (i.e. Cook Inletkeeper is not the appropriate entity for managing a project for acquiring cost estimate for salvage of vessels in Steamboat Slough).

ADV State Statute (30.30) Revision

Rachel gave an overview of the statutes and where we currently stand. The group discussed the need for 'stopping the bleeding' and preventing continued accumulation of ADV.

Holly then stepped everyone through the 30.30 statute revision as presented in the meeting packet. Feedback is critically important from Task Force members.

General notes from the current draft of 30.30 revisions:

- We are not focusing on order at this point.
- This document starts with the bare bones provision.
- Derelict vessel unlawful was wrapped back in (30.30.095). Holly did revise for the definition changes. Greg noted that 'upon waters' should maybe wrap further to include under/on/etc. Rachel reviewed previous discussions regarding pulling out of the 'abandoned' term and process and put under 'derelict' to maintain consistent language and process throughout statute.

The group then discussed the current Article 3 at length. Not sure why there's a statute section for private businesses. HB131 just added municipalities, didn't change anything. Mike surmised that private businesses were established on DOT leased properties, and wanted to have some inclusion under statute when it was originally drafted. DNR gives leasees (i.e. Burkesboro Marina on Big Lake) authority to operate a marina on state land, and probably does need to keep some protection for those businesses. Similar to WA - if you are a marina operating on state waters, you will be held to these standards dealing with ADV. As a private landowner they have action & enforcement opportunities that don't exist for the state in their privately owned uplands. Holly would like to take a stab at Article 3 to reframe in an obligation approach on state/muni lands where there's a lease (insurance requirements, etc). What about privately owned boatyards? Holly - any vessel operating in the state that may hit the water should be considered as to what we can reasonably expect a business owner to enforce/require, even just for ownership information. Haul-out operation (i.e. Northern Enterprise) is a contract between two private parties. Northern is allowing a vessel to come up into their yard.

The group then discussed making Article 3 more general and make specific to state/muni tidelands leases. **Rachel will go and check with private industries to see what their thoughts are on the Article as it currently stands (Holly will get Rachel the legislative history on Article 3).** Bryan thinks they protect themselves pretty well. Pete - there are a lot of private property owners in the Slough, may be helpful for them if it were broadened to include private property that isn't a business. The definition in 30.30.090 includes private property. Private property owners don't need anything under this statute as there are other avenues available. However the Task Force might consider maintaining some interest in derelicts on private property as there's some strange examples out there of areas ceded to private interests in the state. Holly noted that private landowners aren't bound to the same federal admiralty law, except when the boat isn't fully destroyed there are still liens held against it. Rachel noted FEMA and private property access to ADV funds as places where private landowners are engaged in the state statutes in other states. **Holly will confirm riparian right laws regarding private land owners (rivers etc).** Wyn - in state statutes DNR definitions include tidelands, submerged lands and shorelands (inland navigable waters). Federal law has different definitions. The group discussed the concept of "Navigability", which is a messy term with a lot of different definitions. May be a better idea to just say under state/muni ownership. USCG there are different definitions of "navigable" for pollution vs waterways management. Currently the definition of "waters of the state" is maintained from the previous legislation to maintain DOT jurisdiction (AS 44.03). Wyn - if you want the most global definition, the state's "rubber ducky rule" means waters for any recreational purpose = navigable waters. Covers lakes, rivers, streams, etc. The state 38.05.965 is the state definition that is probably the most broad you'll find. Tony - waterways management goes

more with what the Corps says which is very specific and limiting. USCG pollution side is basically the 'rubber ducky rule', but obstructions to navigation etc. is within the Corps definitions. Wyn - who are you writing the legislation for? Corps and USCG don't need it - state and munis do, and so that's really all that matters, but want to have some feedback from the feds to understand/avoid boxing in.

Holly is pretty sure that 'waterways' under 30.30 right now includes the definition of navigable and will look into that further, as well as the DNR definitions of tidelands, submerged and shorelands, and the other items discussed above with an overall aim of keeping 30.30 broad.

Holly then noted that the hearing process must be addressed in revised statute. Page 7 - Right to Impoundment Hearing – she attempted to keep this as simple as possible, trying to create an overarching umbrella that specifies there's a right to a hearing. Municipalities would likely to best maintain their administrative hearing process, as would individual state agencies. You have to have a pre-impoundment hearing unless you have a clear and present danger at which point you have to have a post-impoundment hearing. One of the purposes of making 30.30 apply to municipalities is that many small ones need coverage under the statutes, but don't want to tie the hands proceeding-wise for agencies. Need flexibility for agencies and larger municipalities. Holly's question - can we do the minimum in statute, or do we need more detail to help those without administrative process in place? Wyn - the broader approach allows the municipalities to do their own way, and the state can adopt regulation to do their approaches. Marrying that all in the statute will be messy, but at the same time we don't want to lose sight of the basic requirements. Keep in the legislative record as to the 'why' - maintain the admiralty law requirements. Make as flexible as possible given case precedent etc and move forward with the outer threshold. Post-impoundment hearing timing – Holly will look further into what the options may be (more than 48hrs).

Mike suggests adding a definition of "Commissioner". An agency can enact regulations if you have a specific state agency named as the authority to further interpret without going back to the legislature. Holly noted there should be an enabling statute to enable commissioner/agency to enact regulations etc. and to expand upon for municipalities to deviate (i.e. go above & beyond) – this was noted to be understood under all state law. Steve - careful narrowing down to DNR too specifically as the authority, because it takes away imperative for other agencies to share the burden. Mike noted that all agencies should have statutory authority, but the ability to create regulations must be granted. Not sure if that has to be a single agency or if it can be multiple agencies. Mike will ask the question and report back as to if you can have a single agency to write regs or multiple agencies with enabling authority. Once we have the answer, then we can get further down into enforcement and authority for implementation of statute.

Steve noted that the new 14 day haz mat statute (HB131) was taken out in the most recent revision under the definition of 'abandoned'. Careful to not reduce the ability of multiple agencies to work together (i.e. that helps DEC and ADF&G work together on permitting).

The group then began looking over the memo provided by Holly and Katie that included an overview and responses to concerns raised in the Juneau Empire regarding the sinking of the M/V Challenger in Gastineau Channel. The memo looked at the overall challenges and the tone in the articles/letters from the Juneau Empire

Insurance challenge. If we provide insurance requirements for our vehicles, why is it that vessel owners can avoid such requirements?

The group had a lengthy discussion regarding vessel insurance which is recorded at length below, with the goal of preserving the thoughts and discussions had to-date as this is an ongoing topic for consideration.

Insurance Summary:

- Because of the remoteness of the coastline/rivers, lack of roads/infrastructure, and other challenges, a vessel doesn't have to be particularly large or old to be a "high risk" or potentially very expensive ADV.
- Multiple agencies/municipalities may connect with a vessel owner for various reasons (moorage in a harbor, ADF&G fishing permit, ADNR permit for mooring on state tidelands, etc).
- There are no title requirements for boats in Alaska.
- Only three states in the country require boat insurance (one of which is WA).
- Not all vessels would comply with insurance requirements (i.e. small skiffs in rural AK). Where to set a bar for requiring insurance is a big question. Right now put a place holder of 35', but do more homework to figure out what makes the most sense.
- No insurance policy is likely going to cover everything, but some insurance requirements may raise the bar for vessel ownership and transfer to help reduce ADV creation.
- AK could require vessel registration, and at that point require insurance, however there's no state in the country that requires USCG documented vessels to also be registered with the state. That will remove a fairly large portion of vessels from the potential pool.
- We don't currently have any transfer of ownership laws in place for vessels.
- For enforcement, although there may not be one place where someone has to show proof of insurance there would be many opportunities spread out among various agencies/entities.
- What would be a penalty for failure to have insurance?
- Insurance isn't going to solve all problems, and still have a serious issue to face in the 'cradle to grave' appreciation of a vessel's life. Many states are turning to Voluntary Vessel Turn-In Programs (VTIPs).
- Hull and pollution policies are likely more important to the issue of ADV than liability.
- Need to have a better understanding of where a cutoff might exist for larger/higher risk/more expensive problems. Look at current ADV database, Northern Economics study, talk with the Marine Adjusters of Alaska.
- This is very much an ongoing topic for consideration.

It may be possible to craft some real requirements here without offending Alaskan 'freedoms' of vessel ownership, as we already pay insurance on a lot of our other things. With that being said, only three states require boater insurance. Many states have very lengthy educational documents, but don't require insurance. Tone is a big deal - paying attention to WA is important as they are our closest neighbor. They had a very strong public education campaign that followed in tandem with the House Bill on the floor. We can take their public documents and rifle through that for where we like/don't like etc.

Start with looking at WA statutes - 79.100.170 which requires insurance for vessels of a certain age/size class, considered to be a higher risk. Tony noted that from a pollution response perspective, the costs are exponentially higher up here for all vessels because of their remoteness. You could have a 30' vessel with a larger price tag than a 65' vessel. Steve agreed, and most of the ADV in Southeast are smaller and younger vessels. Seiners generally have insurance (they have an insurance pool), pleasure boats with a loan from the bank have insurance, etc.

How do you get to vessel owners who have USCG documented vessels? Wyn - ownership question. Make everyone (incl. USCG documented vessels) register with the state, or have either/or. You could say 'at this point that you do something with your vessel', you have to prove insurance. Steve - the state steps in when the boat isn't mobile. Opportunity with the 14 day permit requirement - using the Leading Lady/Kupreanof, if you're going to anchor in CHA or in state lands for over 14 days you need a permit and to get that permit you should need insurance. Doug - the intent of the WA law that requires vessels to have insurance at point of transfer was

probably to catch those vessels that are uninsurable and stop them from being sold. Fishing in Alaska waters have ADF&G sticker.

In WA, they rely heavily on the private marinas and the counties etc. to do a lot of insurance enforcement. Wyn - we should be exploring what we really want to do, but there is some serious groundtruthing that needs to be done regarding actual costs and reality for Alaska. DNR wrestles with this with bonding because bonding companies are saying they can't do business in Alaska because of the costs, and then companies can't do work here because they can't get bonded. But focus first on the 'right' thing to do, and then follow-up with the reality check.

Bryan - insured vessels are not abandoned vessels (although they can be derelict). Always have an RP - the insurance companies. He believes the goal should be 100% insurance, and there will be vessels that are uninsurable. Tracking insurance, etc. is easier if you're added as 'additionally insured' but it all includes staff time. To keep it legal in Bryan's mind, must apply to everyone. There's some consideration in Homer of having a tiered system in the moorage - if you have no proof of insurance, you pay a much higher rate than if you have proof of insurance. Doug could see that a minimum size vessel that wouldn't require insurance as they wouldn't be too expensive to pull it out.

If transfer of vessel ownership insurance requirement were in place, wouldn't be able to transfer problem/derelict vessels down the line.

Types of insurance: hull, liability, pollution. From a DNR perspective the highest priority is what's it going to take to get the vessel out of the water/off state lands. The feds have a pollution response fund, as does DEC but there's no fund for removing a vessel, so seen as the biggest weakness (i.e. hull insurance may be the most important for ADV disposal).

Estimate for the Challenger was \$925k to raise/dispose of. Wyn - you're not going to be able to cover everything, but having some kind of an insurance policy may be helpful. Potentially could just say at a legal minimum you have to have the coverage to remove everything, and then individuals can work with their broker's to figure out what that is. Greg noted that not every vessel (esp in remote) that river skiffs aren't going to go get insurance. Tony noted that once limit of liability is reached, the insurance company walks away & the money is gone. Will likely not get you cradle to grave.

Rachel/Steve - insurance as a preventative measure is probably more compelling than as a response measure. Bryan - vessels in the harbor vs vessels at anchor. Vessels in the harbor are attended in some capacity. A questionable vessel in the harbor (VOC) is required in Homer to have a watchkeeper and they have to keep a log etc. A permit from DNR at this point wouldn't require insurance or a responsible party to attend that vessel. Doug noted that the Challenger was in the CBJ harbor until the harbormaster asked him to leave, at which time DNR was encouraging him to apply for a permit but it wasn't happening.

Katie clarified that folks were discussing having no dollar amount on the coverage, but put minimum requirements for coverage for sinking/pollution and let the insurance company decide. **Bryan noted that the marine adjusters of Alaska would be good folks to touch base with on this - Bryan will follow up with them to get some ideas of cost, etc. for different types of insurance - pollution/hull/liability, with generally hull & pollution higher priorities.**

What vessels should an insurance requirement apply to? "Skiffs" generally 25' or less. Maybe based on the amount of fuel a vessel can carry? 30' and above are the big problems. What's the threshold and why? Are there statistics on the number of vessels sunk in AK/database/where are the problems? **Rachel will re-send the**

Northern Economics ADV cost survey. Wyn - 35' is out there, let's leave it in as a place holder and then do our homework. Age question - nice looking older boats but a lot of older ones in the state as well, but depends on if it's maintained. USCG generally breaks down on tonnage. Documented, inspected/uninspected. Jade noted that there might be good to have similar standards.

Amy – USCG documentation starts at 5 net tons. ~ 30' vessel gets into the 5net ton range. Wyn - could potentially do it on tonnage or amount of fuel, but leave out the age component.

How do we address the cradle to grave question? Around the country a lot of move to a Voluntary Turn In Program. Note that other states generally have bigger problems with smaller, recreational vessels. We're doing this based on risk, which is a much more solid sell.

Katie asked about an obligation to show proof of insurance, when does that happen? Right now we don't have any transfer of ownership requirements in Alaska generally....there are multiple agencies who for different reasons ask for documentation. Bryan - paper napkin bill of sale is a concern – can we have a legal backup to say what an acceptable transfer bill of sale looks like? If you're going to sell your vessel in the state of Alaska, you have to do x/y/z. Wyn - likes it, but noted that Alaska is a non-mandatory reporting state. If that's the way the state operates for houses, etc. then there's no way to to likely get there for vessels. However you could possibly have an overriding registration process. Pete – noted that Bethel uses an affidavit of boat ownership with Alaska DMV. But with that being said, just because you've registered it doesn't mean you own it – we have no title requirements. They've had problems in court holding vessel owners accountable. Need to craft statute or ordinance to declare how you hold ownership accountable.

Enforcement - treat like car insurance, you have to show it to police when you're pulled over. Every agency has the opportunity to enforce. You might not have insurance, but if everyone's looking for it then it's making it very hard. Many people can enforce it through different means. What's the penalty - criminal or civil? Move that into enforcement.

Bryan - documented vessels every year, there's no requirement for insurance. Any chance on a federal level there could be some requirement? Tony - out of the USCG jurisdiction, they don't tend to propagate new regulations.

Ownership challenge.

Language in "ownership" definition may be the place to be explicit. Municipalities have been able to amend their code to be explicit. Education is really important, and helps with enforcement.

“OWNER”. Currently not defined in our statute. Wyn - Need is to shift the owner to a mandatory registration or USCG documentation. BUT if you're not registered, there's no holding to liability. So that might not be the best. Oregon has a simple definition, but they leave themselves open to lessees. DNR doesn't hold lessee accountable as an 'owner' because DNR is the landowner. This is dealing with property. We don't care about the lease, we care about the owner. Steve – from a pollution perspective it's owner or operator = the person having control over the substance at the time of release. i.e. when fuel is spilled in transit on land, the transporter is liable. But on the vessel front, always goes back to the owner because of the insurance. Would it be possible to go after either owner or operator? 46.03.822 (2) owner and operator of a vessel or facility from which there is a release or threatened release takes on the cost. Tony - USCG doesn't really care who initiates the clean-up, someone has to or else it will be federalized and then the folks in DC will go after either the owner or the operator, both are potentially on the table. Mike - is there a threshold for what DEC considers substantial pollution threat?

USCG and DEC have similar "substantial" vague definitions of what's justifiable - deliberately written gray. Steve - not a quantity per say, but what can you consider a significant threat.

Wyn - can we say that we go after the owner or operator, and then have two definitions and go either/or. Steve - if we have an owner and operator identifiable, may be stretching the definition of ADV (probably not abandoned, but can still be derelict for a number of reasons).

Katie would like to have the operator definition to see how broad/who it would include. Need to have this discussion taken as homework to think about definitions of ownership and accompanying liability more completely.

Enforcement challenge.

Have to change the language of 30.30 to give every agency at the table to say 'yes' for enforcement, aggressive action and collection. Doesn't address funding, staffing, DOL support, etc. Recommend to make the law as strongly as possible everyone gets to 'yes' - this is strong law that I can enforce. We will wrap back to this discussion at a future meeting.

Definitions.

In addition to the above topics, the group discussed the definition of 'Abandoned' as it is presented.

ABANDONED. Bryan - unattended vessels. Alaska needs to define both abandoned & derelict vessels, and under abandoned should include 'unattended' vessels. A nice vessel can still be a problem if no one is paying attention to it. Gives authority for an agency to say ok - if you want to moor on my lands, what are you going to do to ensure that it's attended to? i.e. hire someone as an 'attendant' to go in and check on the vessel regularly.

Wyn - before was 'left unattended' 'without consent of the landowner' etc. all need more clarification. All of these things are very difficult to prove - the 14 day rule generally doesn't really work to enforce. Not keen on setting another day limit. Keep language to say, "without the consent of" and then the authority lies with the agency/muni to establish what the consent consists of. Bryan's taking it a step further to say that you have to maintain a vessel a certain way which is good, but difficult to define. May not have a place in state statute, but more in practice with each entity. In current drafted language, drop #7. Use common language. Katie is not sure about the "otherwise left" language - maybe add in moored or anchored etc. Common consensus to remove the 'abandoned' terminology and just roll with derelict. Wyn asked if this would adversely affect municipalities. Bryan said he doesn't think so - Homer has derelict or nuisance vessels. Nuisance vessels can include bad behavior of the crew, etc. Mike - should 'nuisance' be included in a definition? Not sure it's feasible. Wyn - need to have citable offenses on the enforcement end of statutes. Later we should have a derelict vessels be a 'citable offense' - don't really need to get into the details of nuisance. Mike would still like to see the 'nuisance' definition to address the piling of garbage, crazy behavior, etc. Katie will take a look at that and will bring some feedback to the group.

End Notes

Wyn - Rep Seaton would like a briefing, as would Kreiss-Tomkins. Wyn thinks that once the session begins and after we meet again would be a good time to brief them.

Pete - include Steamboat Slough information with their briefings and include the regional reps/senators

Planning our next meeting: Last week of January is the Seattle Boat Show (Jan 29) & RRT meeting in Anchorage. 2nd week in Feb is AFE in Anchorage. 1st week of February might be the best time.

Rachel will add Katie to the Task Force email list.

Wyn - got the email information to send out for getting into the database to play around and give feedback. He'll check in with Kyle and get an email out to folks probably tomorrow to get feedback.

Meeting adjourned just after 4PM.

Alaska Ad-hoc Abandoned & Derelict Vessel Task Force

October 27, 2015

Anchorage

Meeting

Participant List

Name	Agency	Email	Phone
Alissa Joseph	Orusararmiut Native Council	ajoseph@nativecouncil.org	543-2608
Amy McElroy	Senator Murkowski's office	amy_mcelroy@murkowski.senate.gov	202-224-6665
Bryan Hawkins	AAHPA/Port of Homer	bhawkins@ci.homer.ak.us	235-3160
Chief James Berna	USCG Div. of Waterways Management	james.e.berna@uscg.mil	428-4197
Doug Sanvik	ADNR Div of Mining Land & Water	doug.sanvik@alaska.gov	465-3513
Greg Roczicka	Orusararmiut Native Council	groczicka@nativecouncil.org	543-2608
Holly Wells	Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot	hwells@bhb.com	263-7229
Jade Gamble	ADEC Spill Prevention & Response	jade.gamble@alaska.gov	262-3421
Jeff Green	ADNR Div of Mining Land & Water	jeffrey.green@alaska.gov	269-8568
Jusdi McDonald	ADNR Div of Mining Land & Water	jusdi.mcdonald@alaska.gov	269-8565
Katie Davies	Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot	kdavies@bhb.com	263-7247
Mike Lukshin	ADOT Ports & Harbors	michael.lukshin@alaska.gov	465-3979
Pete Williams	City of Bethel, Harbormaster	pwilliams@cityofbethel.net	543-2311
Rachel Lord	Cook Inletkeeper/Alaska Clean Harbors	rachel@inletkeeper.org	235-4068 x29
Rose Kalistook	Orusararmiut Native Council	rkalistook@nativecouncil.org	543-2608
Senior Chief Tony McDade	USCG Sector Anchorage	anthony.m.mcdade@uscg.mil	382-1148
Steve Russell	ADEC Spill Prevention & Response	steven.russell@alaska.gov	262-3401
Wyn Menefee	ADNR Div of Mining Land & Water	wyn.menefee@alaska.gov	269-8501