

Greater St. Louis Area Spill Response Strategies for the Mississippi River

2009 Freshwater Spills Symposium St. Louis, Missouri





Dave Hokanson & Mark Ellis Upper Mississippi River Basin Association

Aleshia Kenney US Fish and Wildlife Service

Jim Silver US EPA Region 7

Overview

- Response strategies background
- Setting: Upper Mississippi River in the Greater St. Louis Area
- Motivation for updating response strategies
- Process of response strategy development & updating
- Findings and conclusions
- Demonstration of response strategies CD
- Next steps, considerations, and questions

Response Strategies Background

- Identify and field-assess locations
 where spill response/protection
 strategies could be employed to protect
 sensitive resources
- Strategies jointly identified by federal, state, regional agencies and private sector
- Incorporate into Inland Sensitivity Atlas (EPA Region 5)
- Tie to sub area contingency plan
- Provide for use by responders & planners
- NOT a substitute for consultation, but rather a starting point for action





Response Strategies Background

On the Upper Mississippi River (UMR), Area Response Strategies Have Been Created For:

- Twin Cities
- Quad Cities
- Greater St. Louis
 - Initial in 2006 (pre-SONS)
 - Revised 2008 (this presentation)

St. Louis Response Strategies Study Area

Mississippi River:

Mile 201 (Mel Price Lock and Dam) to Mile 140 (Jefferson County line)

Focus on: Chain of Rocks/Chain of Rocks Canal Area



St. Louis Setting Part 1: Sensitive Resources

Sensitive Species

 Sturgeon (Pallid Sturgeon), others (fish, birds)

Water intakes

 Drinking Water: St. Louis, East St. Louis, Granite City, industrial/process water intakes

Sensitive Areas

 Side channels, managed areas, bird nesting areas, fish spawning and congregation areas

Recreational Areas

Parks, historic sites, recreational fishing areas











St. Louis Setting Part 2: Potential Spill Sources

Oil Pipelines and Oil Storage

Vessels & Fleeting Areas

Hazardous Materials

Other Urban/ Industrial Sources











St. Louis Setting Part 3: River Dynamics/Considerations

Swift current, large volume

Confluence with Missouri River

Navigation •Lock 27 •Chain of Rocks Canal •Vessel traffic

Seasonal conditions



Motivation For Revisiting St. Louis Strategies

New data on sturgeon and other data sets

SONS 2007 experience

Look at areas downstream/ expand scope

Increase participation by resource managers and industry

Make more precise and descriptive

- Better identify areas to protect
 Find out what works, what doesn't in response
- Focus on Chain of Rocks/Chain of Rocks Canal area



St. Louis Response Strategies Development Process

Notified & recruited potential participants (May 2008) Illinois DNR, Illinois EPA, Missouri DNR, Missouri DOC, US EPA Region 5, US EPA Region 7, USACE, US FWS, USCG-Sector UMR, USGS, St. Louis Water, American Water Company, Conoco-Phillips, Environmental Restoration, Greater St. Louis Sub Area Planning Committee, Others

Assembled data sets and preliminary maps (June 2008)
Sensitive Resources Meeting –Alton, IL (July 2008)
Conference Calls and Field Prep (August-September 2008)
Field Assessment (September 30-October 1, 2008)
Development of CD (October-December 2008)
CD Distribution (Began January 2009)

Field Work September 30, 2008





Participants:

- IL EPA
- MO DNR
- US FWS
- US EPA
- USACE
- USGS
- Environmental Restoration
- American Water Company
- McKinzie Environmental
- UMRBA





TEAMS: North Boat, South Boat, Ground Crew

Outcomes and Observations

Seasonal and flow condition important

River source (MS vs. MO) is critical determinant for action

Side channels/slack water: may need to use upper portions for collection (not just exclusion) in order to protect downstream

Difficult to prevent materials from entering Chain of Rocks (to protect sturgeon/intakes), but:

- 1) There are some actionable areas that could be used (side channels, National Maintenance, Lewis & Clark/Cahokia Diversion Canal, Chain of Rocks Canal).
- 2) Manipulation of Lock 27 may only increase success somewhat, but may be worth doing & communication with USACE important.
- **3**) **Barges and other innovative approaches may be needed.**

Access points: many available, but some not! Notification is key for water intakes, they can adjust processes

Demonstration St. Louis Response Strategies CD

- Contents of CD
 - Overview maps
 - Strategy tables & photos
 - Supporting data
 - Tactics manual
 - User guide
 - **DEMO**



GOAL: Protect drinking water intake (Notify



Next Steps

- Further distribution of CD (interim product)
- Revise if needed
- Incorporate into Inland Sensitivity Atlas (Illinois statewide update) and reference in St. Louis Sub Area Contingency Plan
- Use in planning, training, and response

Questions and Considerations

Success of conventional mechanical techniques is probably limited, are there other approaches that need to be considered/tested/implemented? Innovative on-water techniques? Other ideas?

How can the strategies be improved? Do they need to be further revised?

How to successfully distribute and get feedback from potential users?

What does this effort tell us about the development and documentation of response strategies?

Your Questions?



5

Contact Information

Dave Hokanson UMRBA 651-224-2880 dhokanson@umrba.org

Jim Silver US EPA Region 7 636-326-4724 <u>silver.jim@epa.gov</u>

Mark Ellis UMRBA 651-224-2880 <u>mellis@umrba.org</u> Aleshia Kenney USFWS 309-757-5800 x218 aleshia_kenney@fws.gov