DATE, 2024

South Carolina Department of Natural Resources

 Environmental Program, Emergency Oil Response

Attn: Lorraine Riggin, Director

EMAIL: environmental@dnr.sc.gov

Request adoption of three measures during the current revisions to the Area Contingency Plans (ACPs) and Regional Contingency Plans (RCPs) to update Plans, specifically:

1. Worker health monitoring units to minimize harm to emergency responders;
2. Public health assessment units to integrate public health into the National Contingency Plan (NCP); and
3. Regional Citizens’ Advisory Councils to strengthen local involvement.

Dear Director Riggin,

 We are writing you, as the lead agency for South Carolina on oil spill prevention, preparation and response, regarding the current U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)-driven reorganization of the Area Contingency Plans (ACPs) into USCG sector ACPs and the new Regional Contingency Plans (RCPs) that will result from this reorganization. You and your teams are responsible for developing, implementing, and updating ACPs in collaboration with federal partners in EPA Region IV, which includes the State of South Carolina.

 Our South Carolina-based organizations represent residents who depend on a healthy ocean for environmental, economic, and personal reasons. During a large oil spill, some of our members would serve—or have served—as citizen responders or volunteers to assist with spill response. We live with the toxic consequences of products used during oil spill response. We ask for accountability.

 Under federal direction, the ongoing reorganization of ACPs is being treated as a simple rearrangement of existing plans into separate ACPs for each sector and new RCPs for each region. This treatment replicates past practices and omissions into multiple new plans, and it ignores new scientific information and revised regulations that should be used to update plans during the reorganization process. All the pieces are in place to update area and regional contingency plans (“Plans”) to better protect first responder health, public health and welfare, and the environment.

 We ask you—and lead agencies in other coastal states in Region IV and nationwide—to carefully review the entirety of Chapter 4: Area Contingency Planning Policy of the USCG Commandant Change Notice 16000 to understand the full implications *to states* of this USCG-driven reorganization.[[1]](#footnote-1) Further, we ask you to coordinate with the federal agencies to update the Plans to include the following three state-driven measures, as part of the ongoing reorganization process to be completed by October 2026.

*Symptom-Based Exposure Assessment and Health Monitoring Units*

 After the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster, it was widely recognized that people from professional responders to the exposed public were getting sick at levels of exposure to toxic chemicals that were previously thought to be “safe” (i.e., of a low health hazard risk). Consequently, federal agencies took steps to minimize harm to professional emergency responders in future all-hazard disasters.

However, to address worker and public health during a Spill of National Significance, as recommended by the National Commission on the Deepwater Horizon,[[2]](#footnote-2) ACPs and RCPs must also address human health impacts at the state/local and regional levels since spill preparation and response cascades outward from ACPs. The U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and states with OSHA-approved plans have jurisdiction for worker health, while states have jurisdiction for the public health of their residents. Therefore, it falls to the state lead agencies, OSHA, and agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to make sure human health protections are integrated into the current reorganization process as actionable health monitoring units.

These health monitoring units would build on existing health protection regulations and programs already recommended or established by federal or state agencies or academic institutions. For example:

* Concentration-based exposure assessment (using Permissible Exposure Limits) is unreliable: OSHA revised the Hazard Communication standard [§ 1910.1200] in 2012 to recognize certain categories of health hazards as chemicals or mixtures that include these chemicals as exceptions to the rule of concentration-based risk assessment and to require the more reliable and critical symptom-based exposure assessment and health monitoring when such chemicals or mixtures are known or anticipated to be present.
* Symptom-based exposure assessment is reliable: In 2012, the National Institute of Occupational Health and Safety (NIOSH) developed a detailed protocol for all emergency responders and post-emergency workers, using symptom-based exposure assessment for monitoring and surveillance.[[3]](#footnote-3) NIOSH maintains a training program to support use. The National Response Team (NRT), comprised of 15 federal agencies, including the USCG, OSHA, and DHHS recommends its use.
* Some States and RRTs have cooperatively developed or are developing worker and public health assessment units:
* RRT 10 and the Northwest Area Committee (Washington, Oregon, and Idaho) chartered a 2023 Health and Safety Task Force to determine what, if anything, could be done to improve health protection for emergency responders, post-emergency workers, and the public. In its final report,[[4]](#footnote-4) the Task Force recommended developing and implementing a Worker Health Monitoring Unit and a Public Health Assessment Unit within the NCP as part of the Incident Command System and, also, rewriting all the health and safety messaging for workers and the public regarding exposure to dispersants and oil spills to reflect known human health impacts.[[5]](#footnote-5) The Task Force also recommended where to fit the health monitoring units, symptom-based health surveys, and safety messaging into various sections of the Northwest ACP (Appendix D).[[6]](#footnote-6)
* RRT IX (9) and California state and local officials developed and piloted a Public Health Assessment Unit in 2015–2021 that retains state control of public health and is integrated into the disaster response framework to allow expenses to be reimbursed. The unit does not yet include symptom-based exposure assessment or health monitoring.[[7]](#footnote-7)
* There are validated surveys to support symptom-based health assessment and monitoring: In 2021, teams of scientists found the immunology-based biomechanism that triggers symptoms at very low levels of exposure to health hazards and can lead to respiratory and/or skin sensitization and/or neurological sensitivity to light, sound, touch, and chemical odors.[[8]](#footnote-8) They developed and validated nonintrusive symptom-based survey tools that provide rapid results critical for real-time health monitoring and long-term tracking.[[9]](#footnote-9)
* The need to update health and safety messaging for workers and the public is urgent: Post-BP Deepwater Horizon disaster studies found that the widely used Corexit dispersants are potent respiratory and skin sensitizers, carcinogens that trigger multiple cancer pathways, and teratogens that disrupt development of fetuses, and can cause specific target organ toxicity to the blood, respiratory, cardiovascular, and peripheral and central nervous systems.[[10]](#footnote-10) None of this is reflected in current government and industry safety messaging, which still claims (falsely) that these products are as safe as common household cleaning products and exposure risk is minimal.[[11]](#footnote-11)

As previously stated, the logistics for conducting human health assessment falls to states for public health and to federal OSHA for workers and states that have OSHA-approved plans. Therefore, it falls to the state lead agencies for oil spill response, OSHA, and DHHS to take the lead on human health issues during the current reorganization process.

*Regional Citizens’ Advisory Councils*

In its final report, the National Commission on the Deepwater Horizon found that the Coast Guard’s failure to actively engage state and local officials in the development of ACPs undercut the efficacy of the overall response during the disaster response.[[12]](#footnote-12) To close this critical gap in the government’s existing response capacity, the Commission recommended “C3: EPA and the Coast Guard should bolster state and local involvement in spill planning and response similar to the Regional Citizens’ Advisory Councils mandated by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

ACPs are not Regional Citizens’ Advisory Councils (RCACs or “Citizens’ Councils”). The Oil Pollution Act specifically established ACPs and RCACs, because both are needed for efficient and effective ACPs that work as intended and do no more harm. The current reorganization of ACPs does not address the National Commission’s Recommendation C3, but it provides an opportunity to do so.

RCACs serve a different function than ACPs.[[14]](#footnote-14) They provide science and technical support for the Area Committees. They conduct the research, environmental monitoring, and thorough contingency plan reviews needed to demonstrate safe environmental practices.[[15]](#footnote-15) They generate quality, area-specific information for Area Committees and RRTs to make informed decisions in developing and updating ACPs and RCPs, and they provide a critical feedback loop to determine if the Plans work as intended.

 We are asking you and your teams to coordinate with other coastal states in EPA Region IV and nationwide to adapt and apply this model citizens’ council to serve the Region’s States, Area Committees, and RRT via its state representatives. The next generation RCACs should be tasked with, at a minimum:

* supplemental testing for use of dispersants and other products to determine what products can be used safely in state and adjacent federal waters with species of concern [§ 300.910(g)];
* conducting baseline and post-event surveys for public health monitoring to determine location and needs of vulnerable populations during and after an oil spill to support the public health assessment units; and
* thorough reviews of industry and government contingency plans in the regions under their associated RRT’s jurisdiction.[[16]](#footnote-16)

 To perform these critical functions, the RCACs must be autonomous, able to act free of outside control. The Oil Pollution Act recognized this when it made the original RCACs self-governing,[[17]](#footnote-17) restricted federal and state agencies to nonvoting membership,[[18]](#footnote-18) and prohibited industry participation.[[19]](#footnote-19)

 In contrast and of grave concern to us, the USCG Commandant Instruction created a workaround of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which prohibits industry representatives from holding Area Committee membership. The Commandant Instruction notes, “however, industry participation in Area Committee meetings is invaluable.”[[20]](#footnote-20) The workaround allows Area Committees to establish subcommittees that specifically include industry participation:

“Subcommittee participants include individuals such as facility and vessel owners/operators, spill cleanup contractors, emergency response officials, marine pilots, local chemical manufacturers, salvage and marine fire-fighting entities, and members of other qualified organizations from the local community, such as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).[[21]](#footnote-21)

 To be clear, RCACs are not meant to be a function of subcommittees or special Task Forces that serve Area Committees. To close a critical gap in national preparedness and fulfill the National Commission’s Recommendation C3, the States must create RCACs as stand-alone, autonomous entities *accountable to states*. For example, the Oil Pollution Act required funding for each RCAC to be provided by owners and operators of oil facilities and tankers in the region of operation.[[22]](#footnote-22) The same opportunity should be afforded states, as part of their *required* oil spill response preparation and planning.

 Our requests are urgent. As concerned citizens who must live with the toxic consequences of oil spills and products used during a response, we ask our State to tap into the networks of non-governmental, non-industry affiliated organizations in coastal states, inviting us to be part of preparing effective, efficient oil spill response plans that work as intended and do no more harm. This is what community resiliency looks like. It is the missing core of national preparedness. Anything less will fall short of the mark.

Sincerely,

NAME of ORGANIZATION(S)

Staff name

Staff title

Email

cc:

RRT IV EPA Co-chair RRT IV US Coast Guard Co-chair

James Webster Richard Lavigne

Webster.James@epa.gov Richard.J.Lavigne@uscg.mil

RRT IV EPA Coordinator RRT IV US Coast Guard Coordinator

Jed Hewitt Simon Juul-Hindsgaul

hewitt.jed@epa.gov Simon.Juul-Hindsgaul2@uscg.mil

The ALERT Project

Dr. Riki Ott, Director

riki@alertprooject.org
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