#### UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

+ + + + +

# 39th COMMERCIAL FISHING SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + +

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2018

+ + + + +

The Committee met at the United States Federal Center South, 4735 East Marginal Way South, Seattle, Washington, at 10:00 a.m., Chairman Erling "Jake" Jacobsen presiding.

### PRESENT:

ERLING "JAKE" JACOBSEN, Chair
KRISTIAN BOEHMER, Member
KAREN CONRAD, Member
THOMAS DAMERON, Member
EDWARD DENNEHY, Member
JOSEPH DERIE, Member
GLENN HEWLETT, Member
HAL HOCKEMA, Member
MICHAEL KAMPNICH, Member
GREG LONDRIE, Member
ERIC ROSVOLD, Member

## STAFF PRESENT:

- CAPT. MATT EDWARDS, Chief, Commercial Vessel Compliance, Designated Federal Officer of the Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory Committee
- JOSEPH D. MYERS, Chief, Fishing Vessel Safety Division, Alternate Designated Federal Officer of the Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory Committee

## CONTENTS

Introductions, swearing-in of new members, election of Chair and Vice-Chair
Status of Commercial Fishing Vessel Safety Rulemaking projects resulting from requirements set forth in the U.S. Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 and the U.S. Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 20124
U.S. Coast Guard District Commercial Fishing Vessel Safety Coordinator reports on activities and initiatives
Industry Updates
Discussion on Fire Extinguishers and Survival Craft91
U.S. Coast Guard/National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service, Memorandum of Agreement Charter update 94
Presentation and discussion on casualties, by regions and fisheries, and an update on safety and risk-reduction-related projects by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Public Comment Period
Adjourn 237

# P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 [Transcript produced from improvised 2 3 audio recording until 1:16 p.m.] right, 4 PARTICIPANT: All thanks, everybody. I'll give you another reminder. 5 you speak, please state your name for the reporter 6 7 because we're recording it on the conference line. So we were on old business and we're 8 9 continuing on old business, and just general status 10 and updates on the recommendations the Committee has made. 11 12 PARTICIPANT: Yes. Chair? 13 PARTICIPANT: New business. I wanted to provide a status update. Currently there are 14 11 FISHSAC members. And I believe on the back 15 16 table, and if not on the back table, if they've 17 already been picked up, we do have available the 18 current roster of members and their expiration, 19 the dates that their membership expired. But right now, we're at 11 members. 20 21 That being said, traditionally this charter has

Seven of the 18 right now are in status

18 members.

where they're -- we're waiting for letters to be signed by the Secretary, that's at the DHS level.

We anticipate that to come about pretty soon, but again, we --- until the staff, it hasn't happened.

So that is the status of those seven members that we're waiting for. Certain members have been already approved by -- at the White House level, and now it goes to the Secretary for signature. And so that is just a quick update on that.

That being said, with the current status of the FISHSAC membership, there will be six vacancies in 2019. We are, we're right now actively working on a -- to launch a broadcast on those vacancies. It will probably come out after January, I'm speculating.

These positions are not up until June of '19. So what we are putting out is if you know anyone or yourselves in the public are interested in being or putting an application in to be considered as part of the Advisory Committee,

you're encouraged to do so, and we're going to ge
an announcement out on that. One of the
things we've seen in the past is that sometimes
certain informations or certain elements of the
resume are not as detailed as we'd like. And so
what we and we're going to try to convey this
in our announcement so what we're trying to
the word we're trying to get out right now is please
follow that announcement. Or if you know people
that may want to put in for it, hopefully they'l
follow that announcement. And again, we're
anticipating first part of the year.
That being said, Mr. Chair, let's see
PARTICIPANT: Are we going to review
this document?
PARTICIPANT: That was being, that was
just simply presented to the Committee that we can
hand that out for public view. But the inten-
wasn't to go through every line item. Unless, o
course, you'd like to do so, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, and thanks
Karen. I was referring to the 2011-2018 tasks and

recommendations in these items that I received, 1 2 that you sent out. By all means, 3 PARTICIPANT: prepared to kind of move ahead, if there are any 4 questions on that, and if, and I'm just throwing 5 this out there, Mr. Chair, if the Panel wishes to 6 7 review it and, you know, we still have tomorrow. If they have important questions, maybe we could 8 9 stand by to comment on that also. I'm just throwing 10 that out there. 11 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yeah, okay, Yeah, appreciate it. This is kind of the 12 thanks. 13 nature of what we've done in the past and what action has been taken. So you might want to look through 14 this this evening if you haven't done it already 15 16 and see if you have any questions. 17 Certainly. PARTICIPANT: 18 All right. CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: 19 Chair, PARTICIPANT: Mr. Ι think that's what I have on the vacancies. And then if 20 21 it's your will to roll into the district coordinator 22 reports?

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Let's go into district coordinator reports.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, sir. By the way, for the public, one of the things, and maybe I'll wait until the district coordinators are done with their reports. But what I'd like to do, and I may solicit Mr. Rob Craighead for his assistance on this, I want to, not everyone knows where this district coordinator hit list is at.

And what this does is it shows a list of district coordinators and examiners within a specific AOR, or area of responsibility, a district. And there's emails and phone numbers, point of contacts. And so what, after they are done talking, what I'd like to do is go to our headquarters website that we're trying to promote, and I want to show you where we pulled this up at so you know where it's at, amongst other things.

So, that being said, do we, district coordinators, let's see, do we -- we'd like to start off with First District, First Coast Guard District.

They're not in. 1 PARTICIPANT: Okay, they're not. 2 PARTICIPANT: 3 didn't think I saw anyone here. Okay. Fifth Coast 4 Guard District, Mr. Luna. MR. LUNA: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair 5 My name is Troy Luna, I'm a and Panel members. 6 7 Fifth District Commercial Fishing Vessel State Coordinator stationed out of Virginia. We have 8 four sectors and two MSDs under our command. 9 10 now we currently have a fishing vessel fleet size 11 of about 5,845. 12 We have ten civilian examiners, 56 13 Auxiliarists, and three active duty members conducting exams for us. 14 Annually, we conduct about 580 exams, issuing about 465 decals each year. 15 16 We have about 700-plus warnings, and they only 17 result in about five terminations a year, so we're 18 they're doing pretty good. And all 19 safety-related. 20 A couple initiatives that we've had 21 going for the last year is we developed a system 22 to try to better understand our fleet size in the

district, and we started that in January. We use it in all vessels that operate in our waters through the years, last four or five years. Through exams, casualty citings, warnings, counting state numbers plus NOA permit numbers.

We kind of consolidate all that, and that's kind of how we got our list of our 5800. And we're kind of updating it every, whenever they do examiner boardings and stuff, we're adding to that to make sure we get an accurate as possible count as we can have. We know that there's other vessels out there, but we have to start with somewhere and that's where we started at.

issue Another we have is highly migratory species permits and the vessels. They're out there catching fish that are, can be rec vessels or other vessels, or selling their they're not complying catch, but with the regulations.

So working with NOAA to get the permit data plus the landing data, we can consolidate that information, go to the vessel, find out which

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	vessels have not had the decals and provide outreach
2	to them and tell that, you know, because you're
3	selling your catch, you're considered personal
4	fishing vessels, and try to alleviate that gap.
5	And so far we've only got about 80
6	vessels, 65-80 vessels, that fall into that
7	category, but we're still compiling the data on
8	that.
9	And finally, I was tasked to provide
10	some data, some casualty data, to assist NIOSH with
11	the report that Stan's working on to the surf clam
12	and ocean quahog casualty data for those vessels.
13	Initially they wanted just fatalities and vessel
14	sinkings. And I went back to 1990 until today and
15	provided all that data, I'm sure we'll see that
16	information soon. And that's all I have. Any
17	questions?
18	PARTICIPANT: Questions for Mr. Luna?
19	MR. LUNA: Thank you.
20	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
21	MR. HOPPE: Good afternoon, my name's
22	Walter Hoppe, I'm with the 7th Coast Guard District

in Miami. We have six sectors and one MSU, seven examiners besides myself, one of which is new within the last two months, that sector of Miami.

He was our original examiner, got the program started. He just retired this year, Rafael Arizmendi. And so his replacement just came on board within the last couple months.

So at every unit, you have a civilian full-time examiner. We had about 400, roughly, inspections over the last year. About 50 percent of them resulted in decal and license renewals. Also, we've done, I want to say three, but I could be wrong, approximately three examiner courses within our district, where we've been able to supply the trainer and the examiner who is examined by the trainer.

I mean, we have like damage control trainer has for patching, repairing leaks, providing --- seems to be pretty popular. We've also had a course, this year our auxiliarist put together a course to train the other auxiliarists within our unit. Basically, we tried to replicate

the courses provided at Yorktown to get a basic 1 level knowledge, at least the auxiliarists and the 2 3 examiners. I've also attended the South Atlantic 4 Management Committee and the Gulf 5 Fisheries Fisheries Management Committee that meets within 6 7 our district during the last year. Yeah, we were, as Troy mentioned, also provided guidance on 8 permitting, how to bypass issues. So this is about 9 10 it. Any questions? PARTICIPANT: Questions for Mr. Hoppe? 11 12 Tom? 13 PARTICIPANT: Do you have an estimate of how many vessels in your district, commercial 14 fishing? 15 16 PARTICIPANT: Yeah, we're right in 17 around the six to eight hundred. But it's hard 18 to say for sure on some of the state-registered 19 vessels, because unless the Coast Guard has 20 interacted with them, we don't really have a record. 21 But we have been working with the state with either 22 their DNR inspector to see or, well, within Florida,

we break it down, because we had such a small section 1 of Florida. 2 3 But we've been working with them to get 4 the number of landings as we get them, and permits But that doesn't necessarily equate to 5 issued. one for one. Sometimes an operator has multiple 6 7 vessels, sometimes he has one vessel with multiple This is ongoing, but that's our best 8 permits. number. 9 10 PARTICIPANT: Thank you. 11 PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman. 12 PARTICIPANT: Go ahead, Mr. Rosveld. 13 MR. ROSVOLD: So 6800 vessels total, and you do 400 inspections, and only 200 of them 14 pass, what happens to the other 200, what's the 15 16 major failure? A lot of times they'll, 17 MR. HOPPE: 18 when we go to do the exam, we find out, you know, 19 this is what you need, this and this. You have to correct it and call us back. So we're waiting. 20 21 After 30-60 days, if we don't hear back from them, 22 then we try to follow up.

1	If they don't respond, then we close
2	out the activity. Again, we're waiting on them.
3	We don't know if they stopped fishing because they
4	didn't want to spend the money, or you know, if
5	they decided to get a newer vessel. Multiple
6	reasons why they didn't follow it up. Otherwise,
7	it's, we just wanted to catch them operating without
8	a valid decal or the appropriate documentation.
9	PARTICIPANT: Just a point of
10	clarification. Did you say in six to eight hundred
11	or 6800?
12	PARTICIPANT: No, sixty.
13	PARTICIPANT: Sixty.
14	PARTICIPANT: So I assume you have, you
15	don't have a lot of fisheries that require observers
16	on the boat with you?
17	PARTICIPANT: Correct.
18	PARTICIPANT: Any other questions for
19	Mr. Hoppe? Yes, Mr. Meyers.
20	MR. HOPPE: I just have one point of
21	clarification on that. Okay, when I say decals
22	issued, technically, under the new regulations

1	since 2013, you have to have an exam within the
2	last five years. So even though they don't have
3	a decal because it's only good for two years, when
4	you take into account four years, five years, it's
5	a little
6	PARTICIPANT: I was just curious, with
7	your DC trainer, and I assume, D-7, you probably
8	have two of them?
9	PARTICIPANT: We actually, yes. We
10	have one in St. Petersburg and one in Jacksonville.
11	PARTICIPANT: Okay, and I'm just
12	curious. Do you use the stability model that the
13	boat, in conjunction with those DC trainers?
14	MR. HOPPE: Yes, they also have one
15	that is a small, it looks like a fishing boat, but.
16	PARTICIPANT: Okay. And I guess the
17	follow-on with that one is are you seeing a lot
18	of interest with the model, with the stability in
19	the different I'm trying to think of a way to
20	put it. The different experiments that you can
21	do with that model itself. And I imagine you take
22	with the industry forms?

Well, we're bringing them MR. HOPPE: 1 to the training. And basically, when they come 2 3 through, it allows them to see it. When you see it with your own eyes, how a small movement on a 4 vessel creates a big -- I think it opens your eyes. 5 PARTICIPANT: Thanks. 6 7 PARTICIPANT: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Hoppe. 8 Good afternoon, my name 9 MR. PERKINS: Perkins, 10 is Bob I'm the Uninspected Vessel Coordinator for the 8th District out of New Orleans. 11 12 I presently have four sectors, two MSUs, two MSDs, 13 and I'll have examiners. I have ten billets for examiners which stretch from Brownsville, Texas 14 to Panama City, Florida. 15 16 Of those ten billets, I have one that 17 is empty presently, one that will be empty in a 18 couple of weeks. Two that are empty now, one 19 that'll be empty in a couple weeks, and a fourth one that is possibly going to go MTU before the 20 21 end of the year. And my position will be vacated

at the end of year.

So we're down, we're going to be down 1 five people. We've hired one to replace one of 2 3 the five, and we're working on vessels. A very interesting question. 4 1072 federal permits. Of that, we estimate that 5 965 of those are actually actively being fished. 6 7 So we have 1000 boats that basically fit into that But then we have 30,000 inside boats. 8 category. 9 And not, all of you can go, all of these are 10 commercial boats. They're not really commercial 11 boats. 12 A lot of these guys are, like 13 Louisiana, they'll get a commercial permit so they can haul a bigger net. When they're shrimping, 14 they're actually recreational shrimpers, they're 15 16 keeping their catch, they're not selling anything. 17 But they have to get a commercial permit in order 18 to haul a certain size net, and they'll do that 19 just to facilitate the process. 20 So how many boats I really have, it's 21 kind of a quess. But we know it's nowhere that

actual 30,000 number. Because there's a lot of

recreational boats that are just kind of falling 1 2 into that category. 3 We do just north of a thousand exams, between the ten examiners we do a thousand exams 4 We issue somewhere just south of 600 decals 5 per year for those thousand boats. A lot of oyster 6 7 boats, a lot of bay shrimpers. We do have long liners and reef fishing vessels. 8 We also have highly migratory species 9 10 boats, which are actually the worst part of our 11 Those are the guys that we have the most 12 problems with. The oldest boats in the worst 13 condition. The fatality rate within the Eighth 14 District has stayed fairly steady. We generally 15 16 tend to lose between two and four fishermen a year. 17 Falls overboard, number one lead cause. 18 over the side, no life jacket on. Most of the time, 19 they're single-handed on the boat. We have no idea why they went over 20

unless we recover the body and find out the

individual had a heart attack or had some type of

21

injury. If we get the body back, sometimes we can figure out why they went over the side. But my colleague will talk to you about that, I think, in much more depth.

The second leading cause of fatalities in the Gulf of Mexico is winch entanglement. NIOSH is also working on that. They are developing a guard system for the winches. There's not going to be, there is no mandatory, it's not going to be a regulation, it's not going to be something to ram down anybody's throat.

What they're doing is coming up with a very simple design for these. It's not simple, it's actually kind of complicated, but they're dumbing it down to the lowest level, and then they're going to give the plans to the fisherman so that they can make them themselves or have them fabricated in a shop and out among their other winches.

They've gone out, done a lot of work with a lot of different boats throughout the Gulf,

I'm not sure --- they've been at Brownsville,

they've been in Galveston, they've been in south 1 Louisiana. They went through as many different 2 3 types of winches as they can to kind of facilitate 4 this process. So we're trying to help NIOSH come up 5 with an answer to the problem. That's the second 6 the Gulf, winch 7 leading cause of death in entanglements. 8 That's about all I have for you. 9 10 questions? Yes, sir. How many of the boats 11 PARTICIPANT: will use the winch handle when they're dealing with 12 13 the -- they have to steer and everything around themselves, with a self-quide? 14 PERKINS: 15 MR. Almost none of 16 anymore have self-quides, but a lot of them have a mechanical guide, depending on how they set those 17 up, where sometimes they're pushing, sometimes 18 19 they're pulling. They depend on the boat, the owner, the setup, what they feel is the right way 20 21 for their guys to do it.

Most of the guys, the one that makes

the most sense to me is when they're actually pulling to guide it towards the aft side of the drum. And then they just release it and let it go to the front side, where they're not pushing themselves into the drum, seems to be the best answer.

A lot of guys don't use those guides, and unfortunately they use their foot to guide that cable. And it takes a leg, pulls it right into the drum. And when the leg goes, there's nothing left to --- if they got the drum locked down, there's a handle on the drum that they have to pull to engage the clutch to make the drums wrap up the cable.

And they're not really, well, they make their own modifications where they can basically put a chain or a line over this handle to hold it engaged, so they're not having to hold it, especially if it's a deep trawl and there's a lot of cable out. And they use their foot to guide these things in and a foot snags on a bar, it sucks them into the winch. The handle's tied down. They go around once or twice before it kills them.

1	PARTICIPANT: Do, would you say that
2	
3	PARTICIPANT: Yes thanks to Mr. Perkins,
4	appreciate the response. Just a reminder, if you
5	could direct questions to the Chair and state your
6	name so, for the record we can, because there's
7	a recorder on the other end of that microphone.
8	MR. BOEHMER: Can I ask one more
9	question?
10	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
11	MR. BOEHMER: The entanglements that
12	you've seen Kris Boehmer, I'm sorry. Were they
13	usually a result of steering the wire arm?
14	MR. PERKINS: The ones that we've seen,
15	it kind of varies. A lot of time, it's clothing
16	getting caught on a piece of wire and it pulls them
17	in, or they're trying to use their foot for
18	something. I mean, it kind of varies.
19	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
20	PARTICIPANT: Thank you, any other
21	questions for Mr. Perkins? Oh, go ahead, Tom.
22	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

1	Thomas Dameron. So I hadn't heard that before,
2	that you have now are these inside boats that
3	are state-permitted, and then they're getting a
4	commercial fishing permit to pull bigger nets?
5	Are they going outside and pulling bigger nets?
6	MR. PERKINS: Yeah, most of these are
7	inside boats. They're bay shrimping. These are
8	actually what they are, are recreational shrimpers
9	that get this permit just so they can haul a
10	twelve-foot net. Because with a recreational
11	permit for shrimping, you're limited in net size.
12	They'll only, I forget what it is, I
13	think it's a six-foot net or something, and it's
14	not big enough for them. They want a bigger net,
15	and in order to pull that bigger net, they have
16	to get a commercial permit to do that.
17	MR. DAMERON: But they're not
18	considered commercial vessels.
19	MR. PERKINS: They're not selling the
19 20	MR. PERKINS: They're not selling the catch. There is no
	MR. PERKINS: They're not selling the catch. There is no  MR. DAMERON: They're not selling the

1	MR. PERKINS: They're not. But they,
2	if you look at the state numbers, it reflects in
3	their numbers of commercial fishing vessels. And
4	where we kind of get into this whole thing is when
5	they started getting calls from observers, and
6	they'll call us and go, wait a minute, we're just
7	a rec boat, you know, why are you number one,
8	talk to NOAA, it has nothing to do with us. And
9	number two, it's because you have a commercial
10	permit and they're looking at that.
11	MR. DAMERON: Thanks, Bob.
12	MR. PERKINS: Certainly.
13	PARTICIPANT: Yes, thank you. Any
14	other questions? All right, thank you very much,
15	appreciate it.
16	MR. PERKINS: Sure.
17	PARTICIPANT: District Nine. Let's
18	see, District Eleven. No, Ms. Peg Murphy was not
19	able to come. But we have a yes, sir.
20	MR. NGUYEN: Good afternoon. My name
21	is Marc Nguyen, and I am a commercial fishing vessel
22	safety examiner at Sector Los Angeles/Long Beach.

Peg Murphy, our D-11 program manager, was not able 1 to make it here today, and she sends her regrets. 2 3 In way of background, D-11 California fishery consisted of shrimp, lobster, urchin, 4 squid, black cod, halibut, sword, albacore, and 5 So it's very diverse. crabs. 6 7 In 2017 the fishing fleet, made up of 3012 commercial fishing vessels. Half of them are 8 documented with the Coast Guard, and half of them 9 10 are registered with various states. We conducted 711 commercial fishing vessel safety exams and 11 issued 367 decals. We did this with six examiners 12 13 and with the help of our Coast Guard Auxiliarists. Our Coast Guard active folks conducted 14 205 commercial fishing vessel boardings 15 16 responded to 18 major casualties resulting in the loss of four lives and nine vessels. 17 They also 18 responded to 75 minor casualties, with 61 being 19 disabled and were tow-in by the Coast Guard. Each major casualty is summarized in 20 our D-11 newsletter with the detailed accounts from 21

the captain of fishing vessel (inaudible).

22

From

the deck plate, the examiner encounters numerous non-approved Coast Guard safety equipment, such as fire extinguishers and survival suits. noticed numerous vessels switching from Coast Guard documented to state-registered due to lesser safety requirements. From Sector Los Angeles-Long Beach, where I'm from, we saw numerous fishing vessels went down to Mexico to conduct repairs and have major modifications that, as a result of this, several vessels suffered serious casualties or unable to maintain the documentation with the Coast Guard due to major replacement of vessel hull or superstructure, which rendered the vessel to be foreign built. In summary, D-11 commercial fishing vessel safety program will continue to pursue our mission of bringing each and every fisherman home safe. I'm open for questions. Ouestions PARTICIPANT: for Mr. Nguyen. MR. ROSVELD: Mr. Chairman, Mr.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Rosveld, Eric Rosveld. These folks that switched 1 to state registration, they were able to bring their 2 tonnage under the five net tons, is that what you're 3 4 suggesting? No, these are typical, 5 MR. NGUYEN: typically small boat, less than 30 feet, that are 6 7 documented with the Coast Guard. And once they found out that they can register with the state 8 9 and have a less cumbersome requirement, they do 10 that. 11 MR. ROSVOLD: So you don't have any 12 record as to how many larger boats that are under 13 five net tons that you do inspect? That was a big issue on 14 MR. NGUYEN: the Gulf, being especially boats that were built 15 16 in Canada and moved out to California and registered 17 with the state. And we saw --- Sector LA/LB, any 18 boat that is over 30 feet and claiming to be less 19 than five net tons would require a survey report 20 to verify that indeed it is less than five tons. 21 We have, I know Peg Murphy has worked

with headquarters and also with the state regarding

state permit for boats that are seem way too big 1 for five net tons. But the calculation can be, 2 3 the number can be misleading. 4 MR. ROSVOLD: Right, so when you do your inspections, you know, since it's a Coast Guard 5 documented rule, when you look at the document, 6 7 you're looking at the document for accuracy, not just for being present? 8 9 MR. NGUYEN: Yeah, we, several things 10 we're looking for. Obviously, we look for the valid --- the validity of the document, the length 11 12 of the vessel. And if it doesn't match what the 13 items say, we begin to dig. Also, when we do exams, the cargo hold, we look at the cargo hold, and if 14 the vessel claims to be five net tons and it's at 15 16 a full, humongous cargo, suddenly all kinds of flags 17 go up. 18 MR. ROSVOLD: One more question. Do 19 you know if there is a regulation that requires the vessel owner to have his exact measurement on 20 21 board for less than five net tons? 22 No, I do not know any MR. NGUYEN:

1	requirement.
2	PARTICIPANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3	Mr. Hockema. Yeah, Mr. Hockema.
4	MR. HOCKEMA: Mr. Rosvold, your
5	question, I'm pretty sure you know the answer, the
6	answer is no. For documented vessels, it goes with
7	documentation of course, and that's on the vessel.
8	But for state-registered vessels, I think there's
9	just a gap there in the regulation that doesn't
10	show up.
11	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, thanks for the
12	clarification. Any other questions for Mr.
13	Nguyen? Tom.
14	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
15	Tom Dameron. And thank you, Marc. So I've heard
16	here that about 50 percent of Coast Guard exams
17	are getting passed. Are you finding that very many
18	of these are using the safety checklist generator?
19	MR. NGUYEN: Yes, we, when we get the
20	phone call, we refer them to the website. And
21	approximately half of them use it. The other half,
22	they have a challenge with technology in general.

1	MR. DAMERON: Thank you.
2	PARTICIPANT: Okay, any others?
3	Thank you very much, Mr. Nguyen, for your comments.
4	Mr. Hardin.
5	MR. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6	My name is Dan Hardin, and I'm with the 13th
7	District, that's Oregon and Washington. And I've
8	prepared a PowerPoint, so if I can have just a couple
9	minutes and I'm ready to go.
10	I'm an old instructor, so I hope the
11	technology works for me.
12	PARTICIPANT: We can take a break if you
13	need a little bit of time.
14	MR. HARDIN: Yes, my friend from D-17
15	will also be using this, so can we get like five
16	minutes?
17	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, let's stand down
18	for five minutes. Thank you.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
20	went off the record and resumed following a brief
21	recess.)
22	MR. MYERS: And they did not say that that

was 2018. So, but these are just -- I think these are numbers and -- so plus or minus I'm sure. We're not sure what the accuracy is on the numbers, but it's significant. That's the key point.

The IMO recognizes that -- the IMO recognizes the need for a response to the safety crisis in the fishing industry and has a number of instruments addressing this issue.

instruments One of these is the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel, STCW-F, which was adopted by the IMO in 1995 and is expected to bring considerable benefits and advantages to the fishing industry, approving quality of education, training provided to personnel employed in the fishing vessels, and enhancing the standards of training and safety in the fishing industry and fishing vessel fleets.

Previously, efforts to improve training, certification, watchkeeping standards, fishing vessel personnel have been adopted and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

recommended in assembling resolutions at the IMO 1 level. 2 3 STCW-F Convention the STCW-F Convention is intended to contribute to 4 the reduction of casualties and will go a long way to 5 improve the present poor safety record of the global 6 7 fishing industry. The STCW-F Convention applies 8 to 9 serving board seagoing vessels personnel on 10 entitled to fly the flag of a party, i.e., the flag state, for us the U.S. flag, in the sense of 11 12 regulatory framework for the training 13 certification of personnel employed on board fishing vessels, with the review of improving 14 safety of life and property at sea in the fishing 15 16 industry. International 17 The Convention of 18 Standards Certification and Training, and 19 Watchkeeping for the fishing vessel personnel, 1995 STCW-F entered in force 29 September 2012. 20 The 1995 STCW-F Convention sets the 21

certification and minimum training requirements

for crew of seagoing vessels of 24 meters in length and above. The Convention consists of 15 articles and annexes containing technical regulations, and I actually have a copy of this here if later on you want to take a look at it.

The STCW-F Convention is the first to establish basic requirements for the training and certification and watchkeeping on an international level, and the Convention is currently being reviewed by the Subcommittee on Human Element Training and Watchkeeping in order to align with the standards of the Convention, which is the current -- with the current state of the industry.

It should be noted that the U.S. is not signatory to the STCW-F, or we haven't ratified it yet. That being said, as stakeholders, we do recognize that we play an active role, and should play an active role, in these IMO discussions and feel that it's important to our position as representatives in these matters, because, you know, we have initiatives like, for example, the Polar Code that has started to rise.

And, again, that impacts areas of the Bering Sea. And if we're not coming at the table to these discussions and making recommendations and conveying our stance, we miss -- we miss our chance many times. So we have to recognize that it is important.

This past summer, 16 through 20 July of '18, at IMO London in the U.K., a comprehensive review of the STCW-F Convention with subcommittees on human element training and watchkeeping, HTW-5, was conducted. The aim was to review the minimum standards of compliance set out in the treaty in order to bring them up to date to reflect realities within the commercial fishing industry globally.

The U.S. delegation to STCW-F was comprised of two members this year, one representative by the Fishing and Vessel Safety Division at Coast Guard Headquarters, myself, and one member of the fishing industry, which was represented by Mr. Jerry Dzugan in the audience.

The session was attended by a delegation from member states, associated members

of IMO, by representatives from the United Nations specialized agencies, and by the intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations on a global spectrum.

The task at hand was for state delegates representing international fishing industry interests to conduct a comprehensive review of STCW 1995 Convention with subcommittees on, again, HTW-5.

The outcome included a draft amended version of the subcommittee recommendations to the STCW-F text, which has been ongoing for several years because the Convention may meet not necessarily every year, but they may meet every several years.

Further detailed discussions was detail needed on areas such as annex table format, definitions, and context. Thus, a correspondence group has been established to continue these efforts and concentrate on remedies for these topic items. And I'll just give you an example of some of the items that we are actively working on now.

The harmonization with the STCW language, with the model templates, so you have STCW, and then you have STCW-F, which concentrates, again, on fishing vessels, and we want to harmonize efforts in how this is presented in the text.

So, for example, there are definitions, and we don't want them to conflict with each other, or even simple tables that we don't want conflict because then it sends the wrong message when you're reading certain IMO documents.

And so -- but that takes a committee meeting and hashing out the details many times, which gets into omissions of redundancies, again, for example, with fishing industry vessel definitions. You know, what is a fishing training vessel? That was a big topic with the Japanese delegation. For example, would they have a real robust program on fishing training industry vessels?

And the -- folks or folks going through these schools, I should say students, they may spend several years on this -- these vessels. But if

we don't have a defined, detailed layout of what that actually is, other countries may raise some hands and say what are you talking about? So we want to make sure that's detailed in the definitions.

Also, duration of seagoing service for certain deck department, new competencies. That has to be well laid out, and I would also argue that even -- and not just deck, but what about the engineering aspect of that. This has yet to take shape, take form.

Also, these detailed various competencies have to be flushed out and defined as relates to knowledge and proficiency categories, methods, and demonstrating those competencies. So you have the topic, but how do you -- how do you demonstrate that topic, and by what governing source?

And this goes all the way back to our Coast Guard accepted course where we have to flush out the details of the curriculum and the syllabus and instructor contact hours and what is the

criteria in the first place. And if -- if these are not laid out, if you can imagine, you know, 10 or 15 countries arguing over how we do that and define it, it's pretty challenging.

And so you don't want to just meet once every one -- you know, once every -- once or twice a year, or every two or three years, because then it will take 20 years to flush all this out. That is why there is an ongoing panel of flag state delegations meeting with multiple, multiple topic discussion emails every month, and we are -- and they are just starting to take shape and form, because what we're trying to do is have things ready to go in the spring of '19 to go to the next stage.

Now, by the way, as this takes shape, these discussions and these amendments, one can go to IMO.org, and as you drill down to different layers, there is a placeholder for these ongoing committee discussions. They are not as detailed as what you'd like to see, but they do have a dedicated placeholder right now. And as things get flushed out, they are going to be populated.

So, for example, the HTW-5 meeting that happened this past July, there are minutes that have been posted, at least they were when I looked at them a month ago, that -- they were reflected.

And with that said, I want to be sure I didn't miss anything because that's a lot of explanation. But as I said before, we feel that the U.S. position is that we, if anything, have to come to the table and contribute to these discussions as they take shape, and what this is going to -- you know, I think things are coming along, but at the same time, if we are not at the table, we miss the train, and that's why, one, we've included Mr. Dzugan. And we also opened it up to the public and this committee, where if you are interested in simply reviewing some of the discussions that are going on and contributing comments, we welcome that.

And I think there has only been one opportunity this -- I think last month, and I think -- I believe I shared with Mr. Dzugan nothing significant transpired from that language. But,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

again, we offered the opportunity up. 1 So I think over the next couple of 2 3 months things are going to start growing a little quicker. And we'll probably pass around a sign-in 4 sheet where if you say, hey, I'd like to jump on 5 board with this, you know, we can offer you for 6 7 the team. And, by the way, the rules of engagement 8 here are we offer up the comments from industry 9 10 and, again, the panel here, and then look to our 11 office the representatives to the U.S. as 12 delegation. And if we see merit to the 13 conversation, then we officially bring that to 14 comment. And, Mr. Dzugan, do you have any comment 15 16 with your experience or any thoughts on this topic? 17 MR. DZUGAN: I may. 18 Please. And, again, PARTICIPANT: 19 mic. I'm Jerry Dzugan, Alaska 20 MR. DZUGAN: 21 Marine Safety Education Association. It feels 22 funny being on this side of the table --

## (Laughter.)

MR. DZUGAN: -- so long. Thanks to Mr. Myers for allowing me to attend that meeting and the chairman for allowing me to be on the agenda for a bit.

A little bit of my background is we first started training fishermen in 1886, '85/'86. One of the first things we did was we looked to the IMO model course, 6.09, to design our instructor training course, our train the trainer course. And we found those model courses really interesting and is a good template to use and gave me a good head start, a good skeleton to hang things on.

In 1995, the International Maritime Organization, IMO, did an update to STCW for other mariners, not fishing, but to other mariners on international voyages. It's called STCW-95. I was interested in that, and then I learned that they were giving a workshop on it at World Maritime University in Malmo, Sweden, and I went to that workshop.

And then I found out that they offered

graduate courses, and one of them, one of the graduate trainings was in marine education and training, and I took that. I actually went to the school. I took a year sabbatical. I went to the school, and basically my main professor was the man -- one of the people -- one of the men who wrote STCW and STCW-95.

So I got a lot of background on STCW, and I was disappointed that there wasn't much emphasis on the STCW-F then, fishing, because I was -- I had one step in the world of education the last 40 years, and my other foot is in commercial fishing. So I was interested in more on that.

But STCW-F was not in force at that time. Not enough nations had signed up, so it was kind of deescalated. The reason why it wasn't signed and in force was because the majority of tonnage in the world is held by Asia nations, and Asia nations didn't get back on -- get on board with it until about four years ago, I think, when it came into force. I think that's right, Mr. Myers, four or five years ago.

1	And to give some a little bit more
2	background, STCW applies to vessels 24 meters, 79
3	feet and above, or 300 gross tons. Correct me on
4	anything if I'm wrong, because my STCW is a little
5	bit rusty. But STCW and the Asia nations signed
6	on when they compromised with the Europeans and
7	increased the tonnage to 300 tons because that meant
8	a lot of the vessels were exempt, and tonnage is
9	different from Mr. Hockema addressed this. Even
10	within our own nation, but certainly between
11	nations, and how this how it's measured, although
12	it's supposed to be a standard.
13	So the Asian nations got a bit of an
14	out, and they signed on to it, and then the STCW-F
15	came in to came into effect.
16	PARTICIPANT: Jerry?
17	MR. DZUGAN: Yes.
18	PARTICIPANT: Are you talking about
19	ITC tonnage?
20	MR. DZUGAN: That's a good question.
21	
22	PARTICIPANT: Or regulatory tonnage?

PARTICIPANT: You know, and I think -I think -- one of our comments this past summer
was it depends, and so it depends on the topic and
the applicability where I think -- and I think in
some areas that was unanswered on applicability
and how it is defined.

So one would assume ITC, but again, we didn't want to assume, so there were voids within the language of certain areas of STCW-F where we said, you know what, if this is what you want, you have to state it. We can't assume it. I'm not sure if that helps, but that -- but that is -- I think that's why there is more discussion to be flushed out here.

PARTICIPANT: Okay. Sorry to --

MR. DZUGAN: No, that's -- that's excellent. I was going to get into more granular things, just to give you some examples of why this committee should be involved. And the Coast Guard, I am happy to say, is involved now. They have been -- because it wasn't in force, is being put as a low priority. But I appreciate, again, Mr. Myers,

your raising the priority of this.

Let me also say that how this is enforced, SCTW-F is enforced, first of all, as our vessels mostly visiting other ports. That's where the enforcement comes in. The United Nations does not have their own navy out there doing enforcement. They depend on signatory(s) to these Conventions to do home-based -- home port enforcement. All right?

I've talked to the Coast Guard about this in the past, and others, it has been a low priority because it just hasn't seemed to have been a concern. But, in fact, for the South Pacific tuna fleet it's a concern for vessels in Seattle that are transiting to Alaska, it could be a concern. Canada is a signatory of STCW-F.

And because we have a political battles sometimes over fish, over salmon, for example, with Canada, you can see that it is being used as, oh, all of a sudden we're going to enforce this, and if you're transiting Canadian waters, we're going

to -- and if you stop, especially if you stop in any of our ports, we're going to not allow you into the port unless you have the STCW-F credentials on your crew.

This hasn't happened, but there is that potentiality there. I have -- because I have feet in kind of both worlds, of education and fishing vessels, one, as a professional educator, I see a need for professionally trained operators, especially of larger fishing vessels. There is a need for that.

On my other foot, in the fishing industry, on every coast I have visited, I hear complaints from masters and captains that they can't get professionally trained, or sometimes even sober, crew members to work on their vessels. And that's a big handicap for that.

STCW training and STCW -- or STCW training is -- takes a lot of time, and it's expensive. STCW -- most people when we think STCW think of basic safety training, EST, five days and you're done. Full STCW pallet is many courses that

take weeks and months' worth of time and are taught in maritime academies and a few places around the country. That's a heavy lift for an industry that is having a problem finding qualified people as it is just to -- just to work on a vessel.

The other risk -- the other thing that balances all this is, I think I already mentioned it, is the need for the U.S. not -- fishing industry not to be handicapped by this by not being able to transit international waters or go into foreign ports. That could be a big handicap also, and talked to the -- I don't know if anybody from the subcommittee is here. You can correct me.

PARTICIPANT: Well, I know a little bit about it. But a lot of the foreign officers that are used on the -- tuna fleet boats have STCW regular certificates.

MR. DZUGAN: Exactly. And I talked to them about that a couple of months ago. Where are you getting your STCW-F-trained people? Because in the survey I did on U.S. maritime academies, nobody is teaching it because we don't have a Coast

Guard F approved -- STCW Coast Guard-approved F 1 And they said, well, we're using people 2 course. 3 with STCW-F certificates mostly from Asia to crew our U.S. fishing vessels to meet that requirement. 4 And that's -- that conflicts with other 5 standing regulations about crewing and them being 6 U.S. citizens. So it's a conflict there. 7 And then there's a bigger issue of the 8 U.S. not being signatories to, like you said, Polar 9 10 Code, Law of the Sea. The U.S. is a maritime We started as a maritime nation. 11 nation. 12 located between Europe and Asia. The maritime 13 history is really important to us. Fishing is really important to us. We need to be engaged. 14 So, again, I'll thank the Coast Guard for being 15 16 more engaged with this now. I want to just give you some examples, 17 18 so I'm going to kind of go a little granular here. 19 But I'm not going to go too far, so don't worry, 20 Mr. Chairman. Some of the issues we have talked about 21

are celestial navigation. Is that needed anymore?

There is an argument that it's not needed because of all of the electronics we have. There is an argument that it is needed because when they go down, what do you do? If there is an international conflict, and it goes down, what do you do? New Zealand has been a big supporter of thorough celestial navigation under STCW-F. They said their course takes a year. In the survey that I did in the U.S., I noticed this one school that offers a ten day course, and it's \$2,750. That's just one piece of a granular beach we are talking about here. Is it a good idea? Is it good for mariners to have it? Sure. Everything goes down. I've had mine go down, but it's -- is it going 16 to be difficult? You bet. Should OMI have advanced an certification for deckhands on these vessels? 19 Right now, STCW-F mostly just applies on skippers, officers, engineers, watchkeepers. You voluntarily, they are proposing this now. It's

not a requirement of it yet -- things to be thinking

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

about.

And there is -- that guy in New Zealand says yes, France says no, and most of the -- most of Asia says yes. So there is these -- you know, there are some disconnects here between other nations about this.

How much experience at sea for a watchkeeper under STCW-F? Three months? Six months? You know, those kind of decisions. I think the U.S. position was six months, and that's one that was seen to be -- had the most support. These things are -- these discussions, by the way, that take place in these meetings are done not by up and down, majority votes, they're done by consensus -- the IMO votes.

Is an STCW certification equivalent to an STCW-F certification? If you already had STCW, you had celestial nav, you've had navigation, and everything else, is it -- is there going to be an equivalency? Except for the fact that STCW also includes fish handling and maneuvering and the fisherman's code, safety code, and some other

things, do you just take those extra things and 1 then you have an equivalency or not. 2 Allowing 12 months of fishing vessel 3 experience in unlimited waters, for vessels over 4 24 meters to substitute for one year of the two 5 years of seagoing experience. You know, what's 6 7 the tradeoff for at-sea experience and training in a classroom? What is the tradeoff for 8 9 experience in a simulator? 10 A lot of the STCW-F is going to probably have to be done in simulators that maritime 11 12 academies use. How much of that do you substitute 13 for seagoing experience? The definition of limited and unlimited 14 15 waters has really not been decided. I thought that 16 was pretty clear-cut. It would be 200 miles. Like the EEZ, that was an assumption on my part. 17 18 kinds of numbers, 3 miles, 12 miles, 20 miles, all 19 being thrown out there. So there's no agreement 20 on that.

one of the courses that is proposed, basic knowledge

Retaining basic knowledge. This is

21

of responsible conservation and fighting illegal fishing, you know, do those things get included.

Aligning STCW-95 with these other amendments like Manilla -- 2010 Manilla amendments, Cape Town amendments, all -- you know, every few years there's a meeting wanting to add more amendments onto this training, either voluntary, it's just a good idea, or required.

So I just want to end by saying there's a lot that this committee could contribute to this discussion through Mr. Myers, who is the designated delegation for this. And I think that when you are making your argument about whether -- which will be coming up.

I heard a little bit this morning about whether this committee should exist even. This is one of your most important arguments. The U.S. needs to be involved internationally in these topics. And as fishermen, we should be engaged in that conversation to provide input and guidance to the Coast Guard. So that's all I have.

Thank you.

Thank you. 1 PARTICIPANT: Do you have anything further on the topic, Mr. Myers? 2 3 MR. MYERS: Nothing further. I think 4 -- I think -- detailed out, and I -- I think the -- I think it would be in our -- it's an important 5 agenda that is just going to keep taking shape as 6 7 we move forward. And it looks like a couple of hands are going up, but I have nothing further, 8 unless there is a comment to be fielded. 9 10 PARTICIPANT: Yeah. I'd like to --11 some remarks, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Jerry, Mr. 12 Hockema. I have some comments there. They are 13 around where -- what Mr. Dzugan was talking about. We realized after his discussion that there are 14 a lot of things going on internationally that are 15 16 relatively burdensome if we were to put them into effect here. 17 18 We're not a signatory to this, at this 19 point at least. But it does illustrate how sometimes 20 the United States, as a leading nation economically 2.1 in the world, is sometimes left behind in matters

STCW and STCW-F have been around a long

like this.

time, well over 20 years, as we have talked about.

And so in my field, vessel design, I'm seeing the same thing.

We are seeing where international regulations are progressing, whether you agree with them or not. We -- of course, we could always disagree with some of them, but -- and our own regulations are, in some areas, are -- there's so much resistance that sometimes I wonder whether the resistance knows what they're resisting.

So it's important when you're resisting to really know what you are resisting, because your politicians are -- are listening to you, of course, and they push as an advocate for you. But, in some cases, we are putting ourselves behind the rest of the developed world in vessel quality and vessel operations.

We shift to a little different subject on the issue of education on fishing vessels. One of my partners, John Myers, is of Irish descent.

He goes to Ireland about every two years for a couple of weeks on vacation, and he visited a small

fisheries institute there last year.

And it was very interesting. It was just about fishing. It's like taking parts of the maritime academy that we have, and parts of the community college that offers fishing courses, and parts of what Karen and Jerry would offer in their safety courses and putting it all under the same roof.

And you go there for one year, and you get a certificate, a fishing certificate, and you come out and you understand stability, you understand navigation, all those things, as they relate to fishing boats. It's not a substitute for running a ship or something like this, but a very instructive situation.

I can't think of any parallel that we have in this country. We have all of those things, but they are -- they are under different groups, and so some of the community colleges here on the west coast offer some of those classes.

But I find that in my -- there is a substantial number of European immigrants who come

here to be fishermen. And I find the Irish actually to be really well-informed as customers. They understand stability. They understand a lot of the things that I do, whereas I'd have to explain those things to a lot of other fishermen because they haven't taken courses in those kinds of things.

But there are -- there is stability in -- for instance, in fishing vessels is extremely important, and I know that the past Coast Guard Authorization Acts have legislated that civilian training is going to be required. So that's all good. But I just -- I'm not -- I am just making a point where the international community is in some cases getting farther ahead of us partly because of our resistance, but I -- my main point here is that no one would apply to Coast Guard or remain engaged in these functions at the IMO. Very important, and it's not an easy job.

It's kind of like -- I think they would probably agree that it's a bit like herding cats.

Because there are so many different -- you've literally got a worldwide group there of which you

are trying to satisfy everyone. And sometimes, 1 you know, the -- one solution isn't good for all, 2 3 and that's one of the reasons our fishing industry 4 sometimes resists certain regulations, too. So I'll just leave it at that. 5 Thanks, Allen. PARTICIPANT: Yeah. 6 7 Any other questions or comments for either Mr. Myers or Mr. Dzugan? 8 So we haven't been tasked yet with 9 10 anything relative to STCW-F, but I would ask Captain Edwards to take mention of that. And if it is 11 12 appropriate to bring anything to the committee, 13 please task us with that. We would be I think more than happy to engage. 14 So, yes, thank you. 15 Are there any 16 questions or comments from the public or -- yes, 17 go ahead. And please state your name again. 18 LIEUTENANT DUFFETT: Good morning 19 I'm Lieutenant Jonathan Duffett. I'm with again. the Naval Architecture Division in Coast Guard 20 21 Office of Design and Engineering Standards.

I wanted to just take this opportunity to provide

a little update on another IMO initiative that is happening tangentially related to training, but more so in the vein of design standards, design of construction standards.

So I guess just, first of all, I'll say over the past 40 years or so, there have been several attempts at making an international standard for design and construction of fishing vessels, that started I think in 1975, and the latest iteration of that is called the 2012 Cape Town agreement, perhaps you're familiar with that. So that's one side of this.

Also, in the South Pacific, the south Pacific, there are -- there have been several search and rescue missions that have had to happen because of fishing vessels and pleasure yachts that have needed assistance. And so countries like Australia and New Zealand have been the ones that have had to provide that assistance to those vessels.

So they actually brought an initiative to the IMO's Maritime Safety Committee requesting

that there be some sort of regulations or rules for non-SOLAS vessels because fishing vessels and pleasure yachts, for example, are excluded from SOLAS safety -- International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea.

And so these countries are spending money and resources and risking their own lives trying to save fishing vessels and save yachts that are in these hazardous waters in the polar regions.

And so they brought this initiative to the Maritime Safety Committee.

The Maritime Safety Committee, at their last meeting, which was in May, this past May, they assigned a subcommittee, which is the Subcommittee on Ship Design and Construction, SDC, to take action in actually developing guidelines for operation of non-SOLAS vessels in polar waters.

And so -- the next session of SDC is in February. There is an agenda item for the development -- to initiate the development of guidelines for fishing vessels and pleasure yachts operating in polar waters. Polar waters has a

technical definition. It includes some of the Bering Sea and certainly everything north of the Bering Sea.

So I just wanted to -- I will just -- this, I have here the -- this is the annotations to the official agenda of SDC, and I just wanted to read, and I can provide a copy of this to whomever wants it.

The subcommittee is this SDC, Ship Design and Construction, will be invited to develop recommendatory safety measures for the following types of ships operating in polar waters: fishing vessels of 24 meters in length and over, with a view to alignment in the 2012 Cape Town Agreement.

So the idea is that these guidelines would be -- in addition to the Cape Town agreement, and much like the Polar Code is in addition to SOLAS, but, you know, of course keep in mind the Cape Town agreement has not been ratified. And, you know, of the nations that are -- that have ratified it, the United States is not one. So all of this at this -- you know, so the Cape Town agreement has

not been adopted by the International Maritime Organization.

And it has recommended at this time the guidelines that will be developed by the Subcommittee for Ship Design and Construction will be guidelines. But certainly there is potential in the future for them to be adopted as a code of some type like the Polar Code. So I guess I wanted to provide this update on what's going on at IMO, in addition to what has already been discussed about STCW-F.

And I just, you know, reassure everyone in the fishing vessel community that the Coast Guard is maintaining -- is engaged at IMO. My office, the Office of Design and Engineering Standards, takes the lead at the SDC sessions, but certainly anything fishing vessel-related to the work in coordination with CDC-3 and Mr. Myers, and I would be happy to respond to any questions if I could just about the development of these guidelines.

And keep in mind, this is a brand-new agenda item that is in its infancy. There is a

1	chance that there will be a working group at this
2	session, it is not certain.
3	But with that, I would, you know, be
4	happy to answer any questions if I could.
5	PARTICIPANT: Thank you, Lieutenant.
6	Are there any questions?
7	PARTICIPANT: I have one, Mr.
8	Chairman. How is this using Tarbalenos
9	(phonetic) and Cape Town as a base, or just a
10	reference going forward?
11	PARTICIPANT: The former.
12	PARTICIPANT: Okay.
13	PARTICIPANT: Much like the Polar Code
14	uses SOLAS as a base.
15	PARTICIPANT: Okay.
16	PARTICIPANT: The idea is that these
17	guidelines are used in the Cape Town agreement,
18	the latest version.
19	PARTICIPANT: Is that just for the idea
20	of putting more detail into it or or what was
21	that?
22	PARTICIPANT: I think the idea is so

1	that it's focused on risks presented in polar waters
2	only. Everything else, all the other risks
3	associated with operating fishing vessels in open
4	waters would be covered, in theory, by the Cape
5	Town agreement.
6	PARTICIPANT: Okay. Thanks.
7	PARTICIPANT: Thank you very much.
8	Any other comments or questions on the
9	presentation?
10	PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, just a
11	little bit. I just had a couple of questions about
12	the that I'd like clarified by the committee
13	on STCW-F. I think when you're looking at talking
14	about these things, I think for a lot of people
15	in the fishing industry, a lot of it went over their
16	head.
17	It was not you know, they're really
18	not paying a lot of attention to it, and so I think
19	it's important that when we talk about things like
20	this, to provide some clarification like who
21	who would STCW-F apply to?
22	I thought I heard over 79 feet. I heard

that it's related to a license. So that could be
vessels over 200 gross tons. Is it for all crew?
Is it for just licensed crew? And then I think
also it would be useful to have a better
understanding of how the current training
requirements, whether it be for license position
or the what is provided in the currently approved
Coast Guard or fishing vessel safety courses, how
that compares to what is required under the STCW-F.
You know, have like a gap analysis just so people
have an idea when somebody is talking about STCW,
you know, how does that it allows them to evaluate
how does that compare to what I am currently doing
for my vessel or for my group. That is my comment.
PARTICIPANT: Yeah. Thanks, Chris.
Well, I would ask Mr. Myers or Jerry
if they can respond to any of those questions.
There's a number of questions that were asked there,
and you might have to repeat some of them again,
Chris, but
PARTICIPANT: Yes. Well, and I think,
going back to it depends on the applicability

that -- and I think you -- depending on what element of STCW-F we're talking about, we would -- we would -- some of those -- for example, with relationship to gross tonnage or applicable waters, those discussions still have to be flushed out.

So, and that -- you know, we voiced that in July on several -- on several layers, just about everything Mr. Woolley (phonetic) just conveyed, that we don't have a clear and concise answer for that -- many of those items right now. And I agree 100 percent. We'll be getting more information, and it will be a gap analysis or a bridge on equivalencies. We can detail those out and say, "Here you go."

But I think what -- at least what I saw, and we're still a ways before we can lay it out, and I wish I had more detailed comment on that, but it's still being built, you know, the point being a lot of these decisions are based even on the Cape Town agreement, for example, as a model.

Well, if that has not been ratified thoroughly internationally, our -- some of our

1	comments are, well, is that an appropriate model?
2	And so and not saying it's good or bad; it's
3	just saying that there is room for fine-tuning of
4	this.
5	Sir?
6	PARTICIPANT: If I may?
7	PARTICIPANT: Go ahead.
8	MR. DZUGAN: Just in response to that
9	Jerry Dzugan for the recordkeeper STCW-F is
10	available, and that is probably the best place to
11	find out who is required, what size vessels, et
12	cetera, and it's pretty clear here and it has been
13	in existence for a long time.
14	The basics 24 meters, 300 tons
15	haven't changed.
16	PARTICIPANT: Thanks.
17	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
18	PARTICIPANT: Any other questions or
19	comments?
20	PARTICIPANT: Okay. Let's let's
21	proceed with the old business of the first page,
22	summary of 36th and 38th meeting. You should have

1	received those minutes. Hopefully, you've had an
2	opportunity to read those over.
3	Mr. Myers, do you want to comment on
4	the minutes at all?
5	MR. MYERS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. And
6	I wanted I jotted down basically a brief summary
7	of where we stand with basically a on the summary
8	of previous meetings.
9	And let's see, okay, I just want to give
LO	you a brief summary of the 36th and 38th meeting
L1	minutes. And just for the public's knowledge, if
L2	you do not know, this the 36th meeting was in
L3	2016, so we have a little gap. That was the last
L 4	face-to-face meeting in Savannah. The 38th
L5	meeting was convened this past I think it was
L6	this past spring, May. I believe it was in May.
L7	PARTICIPANT: March.
L8	PARTICIPANT: Oh, March? Okay.
L9	March. Thanks for the correction.
20	The 36th meeting, which, again, was
21	convened in Savannah, Georgia, focused on
22	classification requirements for new builds,

alternative standards for vessels that are 50 to 79 feet, mandatory exams, survival craft requirements, changes applicable to a three nautical mile boundary line, alternative safety compliance program development that was suspended in lieu of the enhanced oversight program.

And, let's see, that was -- that was basically a snapshot or a summary of what transpired on the 36th meeting. The 38th meeting that convened this past spring, 38th meeting focused on accepting recommendations on regulatory reform of the Coast Guard regulations and policies as directed under Executive Orders 13771 and 13783.

Executive Order 13771. This Executive Order requires at least two existing regulations or guidance documents to be reviewed before it publicly issues a new significant proposed rule, new significant rule or new significant guidance document. Let me read that again because I think I broke that up.

Executive Order -- this Executive Order requires that at least two existing regulations

or guidance documents to be reviewed before it publicly issues a new significant proposed rule, new significant rule, or a significant guidance document.

Order requires agencies to review all existing regulations potentially -- that potentially burden the development or the use of domestically produced energy resources and appropriately suspend or revise those that unduly burden the development of domestic energy resources beyond the degree necessary to produce public interest or otherwise comply with the law.

The Coast Guard sought out input from the industry via PISAC (phonetic) regarding the review and identification of the Coast Guard regulations and guidance documents within the scope of the committee's purview, in accordance with Executive Orders 13771 and 13783, as just defined. So these topic discussions that were voiced -portable or these topics encompass fire extinguishers; equipment, inspection, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

maintenance documentation; life raft servicing; 1 life raft data collection; dockside safety decals; 2 3 commercial fishing vessel documented versus state parity; CG mix; drill frequency; commercial fishing 4 vessel stability; and fishing vessel tonnage. 5 And the committee voiced comment, and 6 7 that comment has actually been pushed up to the next level to be responded to by the Coast 8 9 Guard/DHS. And, again, that summary was the 38th 10 meeting recommendations that transpired this past 11 spring. 12 Mr. Chairman, the 36th 2016 meeting 13 minutes and the 38th 2018 meeting minutes have been presented previously to the committee. And do you 14 accept and approve these minutes? 15 16 PARTICIPANT: Yes. 17 Thank you. PARTICIPANT: 18 MR. MYERS: Okay. Just as a general 19 status update on the 2016 recommendations, as I 20 said, they have been -- since they have been rounded 21 up, we haven't had any formalized response yet,

we would anticipate after the follow-up meeting,

1	possibly the 40th meeting that would transpire or
2	come about next year, we'd have more information
3	on the status of these recommendations. We don't
4	have anything else at this time.
5	Mr. Chair, that's all I have.
6	PARTICIPANT: Any comments or
7	questions from the committee? Tom?
8	PARTICIPANT: So on the 38th minute
9	meeting, page 65, line number 9, there is a the
10	word "advantage" should have been "disadvantage."
11	And that was Chris Woodley speaking, and I checked
12	with Chris and he said that is correct; he was
13	he was misquoted. Page 65, line 9, should be
14	"disadvantage."
15	PARTICIPANT: Thanks, Tom. Any other
16	comments?
17	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
18	PARTICIPANT: Okay. We're going to
19	start on the well, we're a little early, but
20	I guess we could.
21	PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chair, I think the
22	committee advice was this may be a good time,

1	because I think in a little bit other federal
2	persons are coming.
3	PARTICIPANT: Do we need a motion to
4	accept the minutes?
5	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
6	PARTICIPANT: All right.
7	PARTICIPANT: Okay. So we'll need a
8	motion to accept the minutes, and as amended by
9	phone. Motion to accept, I've got Hal (phonetic)
10	as the first, and Chris as the second. Any
11	objection? Any comment or questions?
12	PARTICIPANT: A comment on the 36th
13	minutes meeting. I have two different copies, and
14	they're on the motion that was on page 90, motion
15	number 16, the discussion that was in the other
16	set of minutes that I have isn't part of this record.
17	And it's a little hard reading motion
18	number 16 and understanding what it was about, but
19	it was language that was being used in the safety
20	guidelines and best practices. And it was about
21	removing some certain language from that. Because

of the way this is written, you don't see that

1	language in there.
2	PARTICIPANT: Which draft are you
3	using?
4	PARTICIPANT: Well, I'm looking I'm
5	looking at the one that we just saw today, and that
6	draft doesn't have the language that I have in the
7	actual copy of the minutes from that I received
8	several months ago.
9	PARTICIPANT: What we can do is provide
10	the original draft to see where the flaw is, and
11	we can make sure we provide the committee the
12	complete draft of the minutes of that meeting which
13	we have. So we can flush out any any errors.
14	I don't have an answer for that. Yeah.
15	We can give you the minutes.
16	PARTICIPANT: That sounds good.
17	PARTICIPANT: We'll make it happen.
18	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
19	PARTICIPANT: Okay. So we have a
20	motion on the floor. We have one potential issue
21	with the motion, with the understanding that that
22	will be addressed and clarified. Is there any

1	objection to the motion passing? Tom?
2	PARTICIPANT: Just for clarification,
3	this first motion is just for the minutes of the
4	38th meeting; is that correct? Of the
5	teleconference?
6	PARTICIPANT: I understood it to be
7	both. Hal, you're the maker of the motion.
8	PARTICIPANT: Both.
9	PARTICIPANT: Both?
10	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
11	PARTICIPANT: Okay. Any objection?
12	None heard, the motion passes.
13	Let's break for lunch. Please be back
14	here at 1:00.
15	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
16	went off the record and resumed at 1:16 p.m.)
17	MR. HARDIN: All right, so as I said,
18	my name is Dan Hardin, and I'm with the Commercial
19	Fishing Vessel Safety Program in the 13th
20	Administrative District. That is officially
21	Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. The bulk
22	of our work is in Oregon and Washington.

So we have three sectors, actually we have like two and a half, it's kind of a strange situation. We have the sector of Puget Sound, and then we have the sector of the Columbia River, which includes Marine Safety Unit in Portland, which is where all of our, most of our examiners come from.

We have one examiner down in the Coos Bay area, and we also have two auxiliarists that work for the Portland units. We have a fleet of approximately 35,000 vessels, with about 800 of them being state-registered vessels, and we have about 500 that we call our distant water fleet.

For us that means that we share a fleet with Alaska, so we're having a hard time getting an exact count of the number of fishing vessels.

But we've been working with Jonathan to get a better number, so at some point we will have really good numbers. But that's what we have.

I can tell you that we, of all the boardings that we get, we rarely get a vessel that has an exam over five years old, the decal is over five years old. It was interesting the other day

we had a vessel operating inside of Puget Sound that was only required to get a voluntary dockside exam.

So when we boarded the vessel, the lady on board said, well, I don't have all the equipment you require because I only have to have a voluntary exam. I said no, that's not right. So that was kind of a -- so some of them don't quite understand what a voluntary dockside exam means, that you still have to be in compliance, whether or not you have a voluntary exam or not.

I'd like to now go to our slide show here. So our fatalities in 2018 was just one, which I'm relatively happy to report. This was the vessel Kelly J (phonetic), we had one fatality on that boat. There was only one person aboard the vessel, and we got a phone call from the wife that the vessel was overdue in Washington, south of here.

And we conducted a search and found the vessel down 40 feet under the water line. And so that investigation's underway. I'm not aware that we have solved that one, that's ongoing.

One of the things I have been doing is trying to calculate how much our commercial fishing vessels utilize our SAR responses compared to other kind of vessels. So for commercial fishing vessels, I think that they use more of our SAR responses than other vessels types. And that's what I'm trying to figure out right now, is how many reserve, or excuse me, recreation vessels did we respond to as opposed to commercial fishing vessels.

So for example, in January we had six search and rescue cases. These are usually had something to do with a vessel that's broken down for one reason or another, so I'm trying to track that equation too. They have either run out of gas or they've had a starter problem or a battery problem or something that requires a response to the vessel and help them return back to port.

Every one of these vessels, when they're hauled back to port, did a post-SAR boarding, and they checked to make sure that the vessel had all of the required equipment, they had

the required decal and so on. Every once in a while, we'll get a --- tactical order, maybe once a month or twice a month, where we'll hold that vessel to the dock because they're not in compliance with the additional safety regulations.

In February of '14, calls for SAR, March 5, April 8, May 7, and so on; looks like August was our busiest day so far. We've had two in November so far this month. So it's just something that I'm interested in and trying to find out, you know, how much resources are we using from our Response Department, and what can we in the Prevention Department do to reduce those numbers. So I just thought you'd find it interesting, I find it interesting.

One of the other things I like to talk about, in fact Walter talked about the work they're doing with their AOR as it relates to the drill conductor training. My guys in Portland have been very busy doing drill conductor training. I just returned from last week with them, they were at Coos Bay and Newport and they had two classes going

on that week.

And so I was down there, kind of watching what they do. They are all AMC qualified instructors. And where sector, Puget Sound doesn't really do that much. They have the MP --- UA up here that performs that function.

But Portland is, for the Oregon coast, it doesn't have a lot of coverage down there. And so just to provide them with some way of getting this training, MSU Portland's got their people qualified as AMC instructors, and they go down and do this training, along with one of our auxiliarist dockside examiners.

So this year so far, they've done seven classes. They have two more -- in 2018, and they've completed, or 80 fisherman have been trained in that class. And they try to do this, especially these last two, just before the start of our dungeness crab fishery, which is our most hazardous fishery.

I would like to talk to you about GMDSS. I know that somebody is coming here to talk about GMDSS, which is the Goal of Maritime Distress and Safety System. And normally what we look for when we go on a vessel that's carrying 300 gross tons, and we do have a lot of vessels that are the larger vessels of all the vessels in the country, we have a lot of the larger ones, like my counterpart in D-17, we deal with a lot of bigger boats.

So we've been going on these vessels and finding that they don't have the GMDSS suite.

Well, back in, when the GMDSS regulations came into effect, the FCC allowed limited and a temporary waiver for commercial fishing vessels and small passenger vessels. And it was provided they carry certain equipment.

At some point, the Coast Guard installed DSD alerting equipment, which would have caused this waiver to go away. And in any case, we kept finding vessels that were not in compliance. So we've been pushing really hard to the FCC to have them fix this problem, because we believe that these vessels, especially the ones that go to Alaska, should be kind of full GMDSS suite aboard

the vessel.

And so I'd just like to report to the Committee that we've been successful in that. They will no longer be issuing these waiver letters. They have to be in compliance by a certain date, and I'll let the expert talk about that and what that looks like.

But we're happy to report that we've broken through that and now these vessels will be required to comply. That's a fight that we've been fighting and finally got through to conclusion.

If you would allow me, I'd like to just talk about fishsafewest.info. That's our local website, which actually works across the country. And that website's been working really well. And for those that aren't from there, this is the website here. And it has a lot of tools on it that are useful and helpful to fishermen.

It has, this is the home page, and it has information about all the latest changes to regulations. For example, here's a headline down here, it talks about a three million dollar grant

that is kind of the fishing vessel training grant program, and also safety research. And there is the link to specifics about that.

There's a page if you look at the top of the page for dockside exams, and that's for our checklist generator that Tom alluded to. There's the regulations section. Any regulation related to commercial fishing vessels is in this section. And so commercial fishermen can go to this site, go to the regulations page, and you notice down here that there's different folders here that you can open up.

And anything that's having to do with commercial fishing vessels, it's here. So for example, if I open up the alphabetical listing, you can down through it and find what it is. If you want to know about fish alarms, you open up a folder and it'll tell you anything you ever wanted to know about fish alarms on one of the two commercial fishing. So that is there.

And then I'd like to talk with you about our checklist generator. I won't show it to you

unless you specifically ask me to.

But what it does is that we know that the regulations are relatively new, I understand, because what you're required to have aboard your vessel is dependent on a lot of different factors, like are you documented or state registered, how many people do you have on board, how far ashore do you operate. All kinds of different operating parameters make regulations apply or not apply.

And so the checklist generator's job is to provide the fishermen with an exact list of what their particular vessel is required to have. So what you do is you log into the checklist generator, you fill in your vessel's length and how many people on board and how far ashore you're operating. All those things that make regulations apply or not apply.

And when you get done, you hit the go button, and then you get a list for your particular vessel. And what I really wanted to do was show you how well that is working. So first of all, this is a survey that I did with our dockside

examiners around the country a couple years ago, and I asked them some questions.

So this is like survey motif. The one on the lefthand side there I have, I tried to figure out how many people responded. So I got four -- 47 responses from dockside examiners across the country. We have, at the time we had 81 of them, so we got about a 60% response rate. That's pretty good for a survey.

So Question 1 told us that 80% of the checklist generator, the feedback that we got was I asked them how accurate is the checklist generator. And they said, about 80% said that it's accurate at generating a correct checklist. We've been working on that and we should be way better than that by now.

Before doing this, implementing the checklist generator for people to use, I asked how many times did you usually have to visit the vessel.

And if they don't or if they've never had a dockside exam before and they haven't used the checklist generator, then the answer to that was at least

So you have to visit the vessel at least 1 twice. 2 3 And so in my experience, I've been a dockside examiner, if I go out to the vessel, I 4 have to board the vessel, find out where they 5 operate on what parameters. Then I generate a list 6 7 of all the things that they need, and then I go through those things, and we'll normally wind up 8 with a work list that they have to get done before 9 10 I can return to. I have to give them all and talk 11 about that. 12 And so the third question was, I wish 13 I could read the thing, but it was about how High degree of positive 14 PARTICIPANT: 15 responses. 16 PARTICIPANT: Yeah, high degree of 17 possible -- positive responses that the solution 18 was successful at preparing them to pass the exam. 19 And so you can see that at the very top there, like 90% and 80%, there's almost 80% of the time 20 21 and 90% of the time is my highest return.

the majority of the visits,

So

majority of our dockside examiners were saying to us that if they used the checklist generator, or they went to the vessel, the fishermen, that a large percent of the time they would pass on the first visit, as opposed to two visits.

And so what I thought I would show, or share with you is an example of visitors to the website. They're using the checklist generator. For example, this is a run from January 1, 2018 through today. And you can see that 4778 people across the country used the checklist generator to prepare their vessel for a dockside exam.

And so what does that mean to us? It means that if they use the checklist generator, and if the majority of time they get a decal on the first visit, we're reducing the man hours that the Coast Guard has to expend to go out there. In addition, it relieves them from having to call the Coast Guard and have them come back.

I do want you to see something right here, something right it says zero. So for a few days, I got a phone call, I was on vacation. And

the site had gone down, so that's what that is, 1 is the site was down. So there was nobody visiting 2 3 it, everyone was calling me from Headquarters to 4 Was it a hard time? PARTICIPANT: 5 PARTICIPANT: Yeah, so I could see 6 7 that, yeah, that was a hard time. So what am I trying to show you? 8 So 9 if in 2018 that chart that I just showed you, there 10 was 319 people that visited it. That's 319 days. If there's 4,778 users that used the checklist 11 12 generator during that timeframe, that means that 13 14.9 users per day accessed the checklist generator to get their exam done. 14 That means that 14.9, or let's say 15 15 16 vessels every day got a checklist for their 17 particular vessel to prepare for a dockside exam. This is again, across the country, not just --18 19 And so if we go back to what the dockside 20 examiners told me about how long it takes to get to the vessel, get back, and do the exam, it's about 21

three hours per visit to the vessel.

22

So if you

1	don't use a dockside exam, you're probably going
2	to visit the vessel twice, and that's three hours
3	per visit, which equals a total of six hours of
4	Coast Guard time for man hours used.
5	If they use the checklist generator,
6	a majority of the time, we only need to make one
7	visit. That's three hours per visit, which saves
8	us three hours every time you don't have to go back
9	twice.
10	And so if we take those three hours
11	times that many people, that is a savings of 14,334
12	man hours up to this date, or just for 2018 of man
13	hours that we didn't use to respond to these
14	vessels.
15	So I would just ask if there's any
16	questions I could answer. Anne's selling this
17	checklist generator.
18	PARTICIPANT: Questions for Mr.
19	Harden. Tom Dameron.
20	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21	Tom Dameron. Dan, how are you handling the new
22	requirement with the fire extinguishers and whether

they have a extinguisher that's grandfathered or 1 if it's been replaced and it has to be changed? 2 3 MR. HARDEN: Okay, so if you go to the 4 checklist, checklist enter it right now. The first change that I made was the new numbering system 5 for the fire extinguishers. So, and rather than 6 7 Bls and B2s and that kind of thing, I put the new 8 Performance-based. 9 PARTICIPANT: 10 MR. HARDEN: Performance-based 11 requirement for those. And then in, so for every 12 item that shows up on the checklist there's a info 13 button. If you hit the info button then it gives you specific information about what to look for 14 on those fire extinguishers. So it's under the 15 16 info window that comes up. 17 So you had the info, if MR. DAMERON: 18 it's a grandfathered extinguisher it's okay to be 19 It's a new extinguisher, a new vessel, it this. had to be the -- because there's two different 20 21 requirements, right now, because of the changes

that were made.

1	MR. HARDEN: I would say that I'm not
2	that far along with this. I've made the update
3	to the type of fire extinguisher, the new type.
4	Not that much information
5	MR. DAMERON: More of an issue with
6	training the examiners?
7	MR. HARDEN: You mean for my guys out
8	doing dockside exams?
9	MR. DAMERON: Yeah, so your guys doing
10	the dockside exam, if they have a boat that's
11	recently been converted, they're going to have seen
12	the ABC fire extinguishers in the engine room.
13	If it's a boat that's been around for a long time,
14	the CO2s might be grandfathered in.
15	MR. HARDEN: Yes, all of dockside
16	examiners have been forwarded all the information
17	related to the changes. So they're aware of those,
18	so those are the things that they would be looking
19	for. But to empower the fisherman to be able to
20	know that before we even get there has not been
21	integrated in the checklist generator yet. But

it's a good reminder for me, I've got to get that

1	done.
2	PARTICIPANT: Is there any other
3	questions? Great, really appreciate your
4	MR. HARDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
5	and thanks for that.
6	PARTICIPANT: Okay, Mr. Metnikof.
7	Are you going to need the PowerPoint, Charlie?
8	MR. METNIKOF: No, sir. Good morning,
9	Mr. Chairman, good morning, everybody. I'm
10	Charlie Metnikof, I'm the Coast Guard 14th District
11	Fishing Vessel Program. And Hawaii is an
12	interesting place, 14 is huge. It's very big, but
13	our fleet is actually quite small.
14	We have 160 federal permits for
15	long-liners, I believe about 140 give or take a
16	few are currently being fished. The Honolulu
17	longline fleet is where 90% of them sail out of,
18	is boats for the most part less than 90 feet. They
19	are all under 200 gross tons, so a license is
20	required.
21	Usually have crews anywhere from four
22	to seven people and they do carry observers,

sometimes 100%, sometimes less, depending on the fishery. Within that fleet, I think this year, we've had two men overboards. We don't have a lot of boats sinking or we've haven't had a fire in a long time. But we did have boat called the Hawaii Princess, right, Joe?

PARTICIPANT: Hawaii Princess.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah, that sank about a year and a few months ago. And everybody got off safely, five people got off safely. They used all their safety equipment. But it was the observer who -- because he was the only guy on the boat that wasn't properly trained.

The other fleet we have is what's called the distant water tunas fleet. These are large industrial boats, ranging anywhere from 150 feet to over 200 feet. Crews of 25-45 people. They're fishing in the South Pacific, mostly operating out of -- in the Marshall Islands.

Some of them are operating out of Mexico, some of them are operating out of California. But mostly -- And Pongo Pongo in

American Samoa -- operates out of Pongo Pongo. 1 So we rarely see these boats anywhere near the 2 3 States. After last 4 the Coast Guard authorization act, they no longer have to report 5 once a year to Guam or American Samoa. 6 7 longer have to have an annual inspection in order to take advantage of their manning exemption. 8 9 Because under the Migratory Species 10 Act, they only have to have one US citizen on board, 11 and that would be the master. They're allowed to 12 have four mates and engineers and all the crew could 13 be foreign. They have a very good safety record. 14 NIOSH did a study about six years ago and found 15 16 that the injury and fatality rate within that fleet at that time which only 41 boats was as bad as the 17 18 Bering Sea-Aleutian Island crab fisheries were back 19 in the 90s, before rationalization. So that's over 20 200 boats, and this is now a fleet of 34 boats,

are

accidents

and they're still killing people.

The

2.1

22

man

usually

overboards and industrial accidents. We had some fires, but nobody was injured. So the kinds of accidents we're seeing, man overboards, people getting heavy things dropped on them, confined space injury, winch entanglements, lines popping out of blocks and chocks and hitting people, that kind of stuff.

I believe, we've done a lot of work with them, and they've gotten a lot better. This year, again, that's two man overboards off of the distant water tuna fleet of 34 boats. So now with that fleet, pretty much the only time we have an interaction with them is when they have an accident.

They're using third party, primarily ADS and DME to do their exams and all of their pollution stuff that they have to do every 16 months. So they really work hard to try and keep us away from them.

I've been working with the third party organizations to try and get them to be a little bit better about giving us a heads up so we can

occasionally provide some oversight.

So we get South Pacific -- and they come down and monitor -- and do the -- of their boats, that gives me a marine inspector from Guam or somewhere. And that's time to go and follow the third-party guy just to make sure that everything's being done properly.

I'm kind of anticipating that this fleet's going to get a little bit smaller because of the economic conditions. In the tuna fishery, the market's really being gutted or flooded. And the price is down, it's kind of hard for them to make some money.

I've seen a few boats make deliveries in the last year to --- Ecuador and Mexico. And then under a longline fleet, they're starting to be some deliveries made to San Diego. I'm not sure why that is, I think it's because fuel's cheaper, that's where the sport fisher is starting to go. And it's just cheaper to operate out there. So I think we've lost about ten boats to San Diego in the longline fleet.

Similar to the other districts, we have a large fleet of about 1500 what I would call recreational subsistence-type fisheries. The same thing, the state worked with the Land and Natural Resources will issue a, what do they call it, a commercial marine license.

And it's fifty bucks and I think the price went up to a hundred bucks. And why the locals do this is because then they can go out in their 22-foot boat and they can bottom fish, and they don't have to meet the sport fishing limits. They can catch as many fish as they can get.

Very few of these, about 1500 boats, actually sell fish, like in a big way. Sure, you can go up on the north shore every once in a while and you'll see somebody's kid sitting in the back of a pickup truck with sign that says ahi, and they got a cooler with, you know, a couple ahi.

But by looking at the DNLR's landing records, because that's part of the thing of getting commercial marine licenses, now these guys are required to report what they caught. Before,

nobody knew how much bottom fish was being caught, or anything. So now they have to report the catch, so that's a good thing, that's something that National Marine Fishery Services supported.

But looking at landings, identified about 20 guys down in an alley that are actually going out fishing and coming back with several hundred pounds, and they're selling it to the restaurants. If you go to Hawaii and you like a nice fresh fish, that's where it's coming from. It was probably caught that day or the day before.

And then down on the big island, same thing, there's about 20 trawlers of -- And they've all had exams and they're good. But for the average guy that, you know, goes fishing once a month occasionally does well and sells the fish in the market so he can pay for ice, gas, and beer, we've crafted it looks at exemptions.

So if they're less than 36 feet, fish with fewer than four people, inside 15 miles, which is where most of them fish, then they're exempt from life raft requirements, -- and some other

things.

And it has brought a few people calling us up curious about, hey, can you drive out to my house and look at my boat. And yeah, we'll do it. But it's not, those fishers are not considered a huge priority for us, because quite frankly we hardly ever do any SAR. And whenever any of them do get in trouble, they're usually fishing with their buddies and they just self-rescue.

Same with the longliners. They do interact with us for SAR. Generally it's like medevac situations. But for the most part, they self-rescue. Their buddies will tow them back to town.

And when I first got down there in 2012, it was like out of that 140 boats that were fishing in those days, I mean, it was literally like once or twice a week a boat was breaking down, 900 miles away, 500 miles away. And they'd just be bobbing around out there. Somebody would have to go get them and tow them back to town.

So we started, you know, issuing

captain of the court orders, and they couldn't leave until we sent the examiner. And then we started sending fully qualified marine inspectors. Because it was always, or not always, but pretty much always something was going wrong in the engine room. Generally do poor maintenance, just not taking care of stuff.

So, by sending a marine inspector with machinery qualifications, identifying their shipping, identifying, you know, you guys need to fix all this stuff. And if you don't fix it, otherwise you're not going fishing. And then they fixed it. And then our numbers were starting to go down as far as boats breaking down.

Another big issue we have in Hawaii is with compliance with the drills and training stuff, because we don't have anybody qualified to do the training. We lost our one and only MDMPO8 guy five years ago out of POP.

I attempted to conduct a couple of AMC classes where you could come and take --- Maui one, big island, one in Honolulu. And then we had a

really successful one about a year and a half ago down in American Samoa. We had about 30-35 people show up for that.

So that's the issue. When I first got there, it was just the material condition of the boats, seriously, you don't even have an anchor. It was really bad. Bad bug infestations, living conditions, you know, machinery stuff, trying to get all that squared away. And then we started looking at safety equipment. So doing pretty good with compliance.

But then we started looking at all of the marple (phonetic) stuff where you guys looking through garbage and he went out to sea for 20 days in a 60-foot boat, and you could back in and your bilge is spotless. Like, where did all the oil and stuff go. And we've had some pretty big marple cases against 20 people right now.

It's definitely going to increase tension. They're tightening things up, they're not floating anymore. We've got the city and the state actually provide them with places at Pier

38 and the piers where they line up or they can dispose of oil and oily rags and --- and stuff like that, other garbage. So that's getting better.

Yeah, and so we've got, I work at the district. We got two sectors, sector of Honolulu, sector of Wong (phonetic). We've got an MSB in Pongo Pongo. So we don't really have any dedicated fishing billets except for me.

I've got a first class petty officer now who spent a year and a half out in the Dutch Harbor, so he's got some fishing boat experience. He's going to start helping with exams. For the past couple of years, probably 80% of the exams done in our AOR are varied responsibility have been done by the auxiliary. So the auxiliary is a big part of our program.

We're doing about 100 exams a year. And I'd say 95% of the exams, the vessels are getting decals. And they're using the checklist generator. And like Dan says, it's definitely cut down on us having to go back, when we run some of the boats three times, or -- So it's definitely

lightened the workload, it's been a good thing.

Again, in the paper captains huge problem in the longliner fleet of Honolulu. Because of the Highly Migratory Act, the only person on board that has to be US citizen is the master. But the law says that actually it can be command.

So they got all these young kids, especially down in American Samoa, 18, 19, 20 year old kids, and they put them on the boats. But really, it's the old guy from Thailand or Vietnam or the Philippines that's running the whole show.

I don't consider it a huge safety problem. And I think we're actually wasting a lot of time pursuing it. But it is the law. It's part of the old Jones Act, it's protectionist stuff. I mean, what we're thinking about doing, and the Samoan Government, Western Samoan Government, has asked us to do some training, and American Samoa.

So we're going to probably start doing some stuff in January. We're going down to Pongo Pongo and teaching these young guys, look, there's like basic stuff you got to know. How to operate

the radios, blah, blah. Like I say, I don't consider it a safety problem.

I think I'd say we never had an accident that was directly because the person who was a full captain was the American citizen but didn't really have any experience as a captain of the boat. It's always what we call the fishmaster that's running the show, and they're usually people who have a lot of experience and know how to operate.

That same situation in --- is this one or two? But those folks are big enough that the US master does have license. So they kind of have a sword hanging over their head that if they get too out of control with that whole situation about who's running -- they may lose their license.

And we have issued several letters of warning to US captains, saying, hey, you've got to -- and actually be in command of the boat. You can't just watch movies and hang out in your statement.

Yeah, so there's me, I have two auxiliarists qualified right now in Honolulu, one

petty officer. I've got an auxiliarist down on 1 the big island who's really good. I don't have 2 3 anybody around Maui. And I've got an auxiliarist, 4 yeah, on the big island. So between us all, we're handling it, 5 but we're lucky because we have, again, a small 6 7 fleet, and we, our vessels operate in a pretty benign environment most of the time. They're very 8 9 good about when hurricanes are predicted, they're 10 out of there. So that's probably why most of our 11 accidents are slips, trips, and falls and that sort 12 of thing, accidents. 13 Any questions? Yeah, thanks, Charlie. 14 PARTICIPANT: from the Committee? Ouestions I have Mr. 15 16 Goldberg first and then. Chris Berber. 17 PARTICIPANT: I think 18 for -- you said, if I understood you correctly that 19 there's been an exception for boats within 15 miles 20 or something like that, that that was based on the

fact that they have had a relatively safe fishery,

no lives lost. So is that the case?

21

1	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, based on that.
2	And you know, looking at the casualty data, like
3	you were saying. And also, in the existing regs,
4	there, up in the Alaska, for instance, there's
5	exemptions in the actual regs for vessels less than,
6	I think it's, yeah, 36 feet and within 12 miles,
7	three or fewer people on board. Then they have
8	to meet a lesser regulatory burden than a boat
9	that's bigger.
10	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
11	PARTICIPANT: Yeah.
12	PARTICIPANT: Mr. Huggleman.
13	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, thank you. Just
14	a comment on distant waters. I worked with those
15	vessels in the early 80s, I worked at Campbell
16	Industries in San Diego when it was a San Diego
17	company. And it's interesting, because most of
18	those vessels were built in the 70s, and some in
19	the 60s. So you're looking at 40-year-old fleet,
20	plus.
21	PARTICIPANT: Some of the, like the
22	South Pacific tuna, they've got boats that were

1	built in the mid-2000s.
2	PARTICIPANT: Sure, there are some.
3	And many, many
4	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, there's old ones,
5	yeah.
6	PARTICIPANT: And having some
7	experience in that area, even vessels that are ten
8	years old, working in the tropics like they did,
9	corrosion is a real challenge.
10	And while the conditions were nice,
11	meaning warm and the waters are warm, there are
12	very large it's a giant standard. And so
13	handling goods and things when you're bringing nets
14	onboard is really critical. And somebody's got
15	a real good touch.
16	PARTICIPANT: Yeah.
17	PARTICIPANT: With the rigging. And
18	then handling the fish, putting them down low too.
19	You've got, in many cases, well, they have more
20	skipjacks in western Pacifics, but I know in each
21	of the Pacifics you have a lot of 200-pound dolphin

-- and you didn't want to be in the way of them.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah, we had a fatality about five years ago where there was a hole in the whaler, and an 80-pound yellowfin frozen solid fell on a guy. He was wearing a hard hat. That was the end of him. Yeah, so.

PARTICIPANT: Yeah, so one of my first experiences as a naval architect was designing rigging for tuna supersanders (phonetic). And it was pretty impressive the size of gear, that in the North Pacific we know about the large size of some trawlers. But some equivalent sizes in these large sanders is fairly dangerous stuff. If something breaks it's not good.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, sir. Well, they are starting to use crane surveyor people because they've been educated as to the fact that this is all ocean stuff, and you could get in a lot of trouble. But then the thing is the people that are getting killed aren't American citizens, they're people from Vietnam, Philippines, Kiribati, etcetera.

PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

Charlie, that kind of PARTICIPANT: brings up another question that I think on one of your last visits to the Committee, you talked about issues with indentured servitude. PARTICIPANT: Oh, yeah, human The fleet in Honolulu's been accused trafficking. of that. We've investigated extensively. Honolulu Police Department's investigated, the CDP, and Homeland Security Intelligence, the FBI. And we couldn't find any real true incidents of human trafficking. There's a large tuna fleet, and working conditions are bad. I think there are people on some of those boats that don't want to be there and they can't get off. There's been problems with people not getting paid. It's gotten better, so as the media's put on a spotlight on it. And CDP has done a great job,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they're not even supposed to step off the boat.

But CDP lets them, you know, they got to work, get
on the pier and do their stuff.

And they've come up with a good system for the people if they need to go to the hospital, they go to Fred Meyers--- Well I don't know if they have a Fred Meyers. If they need to go to the store to get some stuff. If they're sick and they need to go to the doctor, they can, you know, if they want to go home.

All they got to do is get a hold of CDP and go through the process. They let them out, give them a pass for 24 hours or 12 hours. They know now that they got to come back. If they don't come back, CDP will get them there. They just put on the plane and fly them home. So that's really calmed down a lot. And part of examination process and our boarding process, the observers are hip to this too. We're asking the people on the boat are you okay, are you getting paid.

We've even had meetings where we've had

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

like CNN, MSNBC, you know, everybody showed up, the local media, print media. And sat around a big table like this, had a big crowd back here, and talked to crew members randomly made like CDP off the boats, and have the media, you know, say do you want to be here, are you happy.

And they, to a man, they all say yeah,

I don't want to go back to being a fisherman in

Vietnam. I want to be a fisherman here, because

I make ten times as much money. Even though by

our standards, it's not a lot of money. To them,

a thousand dollars a month is huge payday.

PARTICIPANT: Great, thanks, Charlie, appreciate it. Khris Bermer.

MR. BOEHMER: Khris Boehmer. One follow-up. I think I heard you say that one of the reasons for a lot of effort, it was the one American master and four nationals that they were, one national didn't have the impact. But unless you're doing something different, they're a US-backed flag vessel, unless they don't step off the boat for a Jones Act sea action.

1	PARTICIPANT: They're still what?
2	MR. BREMER: They're still covered
3	under Jones Act. So there's just the same
4	liability as we said earlier.
5	MR. BREMER: I don't know
6	(Simultaneous speaking.)
7	PARTICIPANT: Anybody else, comments
8	or questions? Thanks, Charlie.
9	PARTICIPANT: Okay, last but not
10	least, Mr. Willard.
11	(Pause.)
12	MR. WILLARD: Okay, thank you, Mr.
13	Chairman. Again, Scott Willard, District 17 out
14	in Juneau, Commercial Fishing Vessel Safety
15	Coordinator for the state of Alaska. Just have
16	a short presentation because my memory's not as
17	good as my colleagues' apparently, so I had to have
18	some things up here to prompt me, so.
19	Start off with a few things that you
20	won't see on the slides that I kind of picked up
21	on in listening to my colleagues here. We have
22	about 9,500 fishing vessels that fish in Alaska.

It doesn't mean they're all from Alaska, but it means they wind up fishing in Alaska from both places.

We have about 1,707 dockside exams this year. We have about 80-85% decal issuance rate, so we're pretty happy with that.

One of the unique things, one of the many unique things about Alaska is because of the lay of the land and because of how some of the global lines are drawn, we have a huge fleet that operates inside three miles from the territory of sea baseline. So we have a huge fleet in Prince William Sound and a lot in southeast Alaska that don't find themselves in the mandatory exam waters.

So, and we still have a really high voluntary dockside exam rate with those folks. So generally the state of Alaska, for a long time the fishermen there have embraced the dockside exam program, even back when it was 100% voluntary.

So we have Prince William Sound and southeast Alaska as two places where if you had a chance to look at the way that they're shore to

sea baseline was drawn, you will understand those opportunities to stay in those inside waters and not have to go outside to make a living. So that gives us quite a large voluntary fleet.

As far as personnel, we have Sector Juneau and Sector Anchorage. The state's pretty much whacked into with MSULE's kind of handle the Prince William Sound. Sector Anchorage is areas, enormous, I don't know that statistics on it, but it's a huge area from the Arctic Circle out to — and everything in between.

We have five civilian dockside examiners, myself, well, at the district with being six. We count on active duty to augment that. At any given moment, we probably have 45-50 qualified people in the state operating out of our marine safety detachments.

We have probably four or five qualified auxiliarists right now scattered throughout the state to help us out and a couple third-party exam surveyors that are qualified to do the dockside exams in places like Cordova and Wrangell so they

don't miss out. Because we don't have much of a presence in either of those places, so that's pretty handy.

A little comparison up there between the last two fiscal years, 1,707 exams, like we said this year, 1,652 last year. Ten operational fatalities, ten operational fatalities again. That, unfortunately, is never going to be an acceptable number, especially when in '15 we had zero. And in '16 we had two, and now we're at ten and ten.

Fatality summary for the ten. This fiscal year we're, or I'm sorry, fiscal year '17 where vessel capsizing counted for eight and PNW had a report counted for two. In that particular year, we did lose an investigation where we lost all six people in the same capsizing, and a capsizing marked out by Kodiak, where we lost two. So there was a couple of big hits there.

Outreach trips, we visited about 33 communities that year. This year, our fatalities were scattered throughout the dive harvest

fisheries, which has become our own little deadliest catch in Alaska. As we track the numbers with the dive harvest with the amount of time they spend in the water and the way they fish and the effort, we're losing quite a few divers.

And we find that the dive harvest fatalities are not generally related to fishing vessel safety or carriage requirements, but they have a lot to do with a lot of the things that we as examiners are not really trained or the equipment's not regulated.

So they have to do with pre-existing medical conditions, drug use, using compressors that weren't intended for air for human consumption, multiple lines off the compressor walking around the anchor entangled, panic.

So anyway, these are commercial fishing fatalities. We claim these as a program, but we're trying to work hard with the dive harvest associations so that on their end they can be providing better training for the divers.

It's, there's not a lot of requirements

in Alaska to go in the water and start harvesting 1 the ducks or sea cucumbers. You basically need 2 3 a permit, you need 16 and 3 and you're on your way. And that's not a lot of training for an evolution 4 like that. 5 This year, I think we reached about 44 6 7 communities, so a lot more work is done by travel. We only have five examiners, as I said, and a 8 variety of active duty folks, but there's a lot 9 10 of communities with no Coast Guard presence. 11 talk about the Arctic, you know, places like that. We're constantly flying to spend, couldn't even 12 13 tell you what we spend annually on travel. It's a lot. 14 But we're traveling all the time and 15 16 basically outreach trips is how we achieve a lot 17 of our dockside exams. I think it's one of the 18 reasons we have such a high participation rate. 19 Because when you show up in a town, you're there, 20 they're there. 21 And they take advantage of the fact that

hey, the Coast Guard's here, we're going to get

an exam, whether we need it or not or whether it's mandatory, voluntary. Or maybe they got one last year and they see you, you know. So that actually works to our advantage to travel.

Some of our focuses in '18, I have a status quo, and the status would be, kind of what I tell the examiners is just concentrating on what they're good at and what we're good at. And that's getting out, making contact, and doing exams. Kind of you, know, grass roots campaign.

There's a lot of regulations in the wind from 2010, a lot of things that we worried about for years and kind of underline, sitting down, where we're just going out and doing what we're good at.

In the wake of some information we have from one of our investigations into the sinking of a investigation, we've started a, we didn't start it, I'm sure it's happened in the past in places like Dutch Harbor. But we bought a bunch of load cells and we went around and started weighing crab pots, photographed, weighted.

And that was something that was really

well received and the guys are really interested in what their gear actually weighs compared to what it said in the stability and instructions. So that was kind of a fun drill. Every boat that we were on, 42 boats that was on that trip, they all participated in the pot weighing and they really I think enjoyed knowing, you know, what the numbers were and what they were carrying around.

Arctic outreach. Arctic has been sort of a cash cow for us. There's a lot going on in the Arctic, and we get up there a lot because of it. And we do a lot of good outreaches in communities.

A lot of I think you see in the picture, a lot of smaller settlements and communities that don't get a lot of Coast Guard attention now we're up in the Arctic. A lot of them are starting to get boarded, and that's resulting in you know, raising their awareness as to what their regs are and making contact beforehand.

We also work with them for, you know, some pretty creative commercial skip exemptions

from the immersion suit, just things that are more practical for someone outrigged in a skiff. And open mic time in 2018 seemed to be centered around the safety recommendations from Alaska Juris, Destination and Exito.

And those are all large vessels that sunk and some resulting fatalities and some not of those three ports of investigation all kind of came to a head at the same time. So it was a busy time.

For 2019, kind of what we're looking forward to, there's a lot of stuff that's not up there, but just a couple things to highlight is again is the status quo, is just getting out there and doing what we're good at and using the money we have to, you know, increase our footprint.

Commercial skiff safety with NIOSH, I want to talk to Samantha this week about an outreach program for skiffs, because we're finding that skiff casualties and fatalities, I think she would tell you or might tell you later, that in the last five years, skiff fatalities have accounted for

most our fatalities in the commercial fishing fleet.

And there's plenty in the recreational side as well. So we're going to be working on that this year, hitting the road and seeing what folks understand about their regs in their small skiffs.

Dive harvest safety, again, is an area we're going to focus on. Training with the Alaska Department of Fishing, and that's the EOG up there. That's something that we're going to be doing this year that we really haven't done in the past. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game puts a lot of their personnel on fishing boats when they are not so much charters, but when they're test fisheries or things that they solicit, you know, from the fleet.

And they'll put a couple of their biologists on there, and they've kind gone once that in many cases they're not really trained in safety and survival like the NOAA observers are.

So we're starting a program with them this year, and they're, they've embraced it, told them we'd

do it for nothing. So they're all about that, and 1 I told them. So they're on board. 2 3 Again, and the investigations into the 4 Alaska Juris, Destination and Exito are still going on and will probably be going for a while, 5 especially with regard to implementing the safety 6 7 recommendations and making all the changes. Τ think between those three 8 9 investigations, there are probably 40 safety 10 recommendations that need to be addressed by 11 various people either at the district or at some 12 other sectors, or back at Headquarters. So we're 13 working on that. I think that's really all I have up 14 That's it. Any questions for me or D-17? 15 16 PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman? 17 Yeah, go ahead, question PARTICIPANT: for Mr. Willard. 18 19 Mr. Willard, I'm just PARTICIPANT: 20 curious if your examiners when they board the boats, 21 they're looking at the document. Are they looking 22 at the document or the Coast Guard certificate and

document issue, do they look at it for accuracy? 1 Or do they just look for it to be present? 2 3 MR. WILLARD: No, they should be 4 verifying, at least all the coordination, they should verify the name of the vessel and the 5 documents that main boat that they're on the ship. 6 7 Also to go and verify that that certificate or that documentation number is in some integral part 8 of the hold and tell us that it matches. 9 10 Gross tonnage should jive with what they're standing on, link should jive with we're 11 12 standing on. We look at the endorsements and 13 restrictions, so is it endorsed for fishery, commercial industry, does it have any strange 14 restrictions because it was a buy-back vessel or 15 16 it was, you know, had work done overseas that restricts it from a fishery endorsement. 17 18 So I'd like to think that we're checking and not just looking and making sure it's there. 19 What about in the case 20 PARTICIPANT: 21 of the vessels that's under five metric tons that

is obviously a larger vessel? Are they able to

document that that vessel is, the certificate is accurate?

MR. WILLARD: So, yeah, but that runs pretty rampant in Alaska, I think just our access to Canada allows for a lot of Canadian vessels to find their way to Alaska. So we're pretty well versed in tonnage certificates. Again, I previously mentioned that when boats are under a certain size we, you know, we do believe that even an admission is really not a problem, we just need an exercise in math.

There are any deep framings or anything you generally have to do, whether it's 20 or 30 to get them under five met tons is they're not there already.

When we walk on say, a 68-foot boat that's sporting AK numbers, then yeah, we look at the tonnage certificate. We get a, you know, we try to find out from the vessel owner, we have tickets down that shows us the work that was done to achieve 4.92 met tons whether those are tonnage openings or deep frames or and kind of make sure

1	that that stuff's still in place.
2	And we haven't run into any instances
3	where someone's paid for all this work, paid for
4	the admin work and as soon as the measurer left,
5	they undid it all. I'm not saying that doesn't
6	happen, but we haven't come across it yet. But
7	we do look for it on state-registered boats.
8	PARTICIPANT: Are these vessels
9	required to keep that documentation on board?
10	MR. WILLARD: In our eyes, yes. If we
11	step on board for a dockside exam and it has AK
12	numbers and we're not comfortable with the fact
13	that it's under five met tons, if you don't show
14	us it's under five met tons, then we're not going
15	to move forward with you. So can I find that in
16	a book? Probably not. But to be satisfied when
17	we board, then we're going to want to see that
18	documentation that you're less than five.
19	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
20	MR. WILLARD: Sure.
21	PARTICIPANT: Any other questions?
22	PARTICIPANT: I have a question.

Years back, it was noted that there was, there were a few vessels that were built after 1980 that could no longer participate in fisheries because of rationalization that wanted to do tendering. And because of the way that the regulations are constructed, it would appear that they need a load line to be able to do that, and the vessels are not load line. Can you get us an update on where that is?

MR. WILLARD: Sure. We've been working, and I talked with Joe prior to coming here about that subject. And so we've been doing a lot of work. It does seem that we've discovered maybe an anomaly of sorts and some interpretations of in terms of part-time tender and what that exactly relieved the vessel from and what it is.

So we're looking into that scenario.

The fish tender that is working as a fish tender that no longer fishes that doesn't meet any of the exemptions in the code for tonnage, operating solely inside the boundary line, the existing vessel, that kind of thing. And so we're still

1	looking into it.
2	We've actually had a working group down
3	here in Seattle I think about a month or two ago,
4	where we sat and we basically just pulled our heads
5	together and some of our Coast Guard legal
6	interpretations and try to see if we're going down
7	the correct road, correct process.
8	So I would say that, you know, when I
9	get back from this, it will be something that we
10	revisit. And I think at some point we're certainly
11	going to look to the industry if we do determine
12	that, hey, this is something that we need to do
13	address, we'll look to the industry for some
14	assistance, some alternatives to load line, getting
15	load line or, you know.
16	PARTICIPANT: Great, thanks. I
17	appreciate the fact that it's still on your radar.
18	MR. WILLARD: Oh yeah.
19	PARTICIPANT: Any other questions?
20	Thank you very much.
21	MR. WILLARD: Thank you.
22	PARTICIPANT: We'd like now to hear

1	from Marty Donohue. Marty, come up and give your
2	report.
3	MR. DONOHUE: Yeah, good afternoon.
4	Chief Warrant Officer Marty Donohue from the
5	Training Center in Yorktown. I'm one of the
6	Commercial Fishing Vessel Examiner Course
7	administrators.
8	We put on two courses a year. So for
9	2019, we've got a course coming up May and June.
10	The dates are May 20-24, June 10-14. And we
11	typically have 25 students in each course. And
12	it's open to active duty, reserve, Coast Guard,
13	civilians, auxiliary, Coast Guard auxiliary.
14	Yeah, I appreciate all the support from
15	the district coordinators that provide us guests
16	and truckers and we also have DC trainer that we've
17	been loaning out to the field. We're located at
18	Yorktown, VA, which is in D-5's area. But we're
19	looking to
20	PARTICIPANT: You're one of the 20?
21	MR. DONOHUE: He's got two on the web
22	trainers, so we're trying to hold ours back and

1	just keep it for the training centers. We've had
2	some issues with platform. We have loaned it out
3	in the past. So they're coming back with issues
4	of the things for that sort. And yeah, unless you
5	have any other questions.
6	PARTICIPANT: Any questions for Mr.
7	Donohue?
8	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9	Thomas Dameron. I missed it, who did you say that
10	the training was open to?
11	MR. DONOHUE: It's Coast Guard active
12	duty reserves, Coast Guard civilians, and Coast
13	Guard auxiliarists.
14	PARTICIPANT: Do you ever let in third
15	party examiners?
16	PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chair, it is not set
17	up for third-party examiners, and it has to do with
18	billet structure and for our resident courses and
19	the intent of the resident courses. So that
20	unfortunately is the problem. Now, I would say,
21	though, an option, because we can't train everyone
22	that, or necessarily train everyone that we'd like

to, even with the active duty auxiliary and reserve pool.

But there's always a segue to a district

coordinator-sponsored training from time to time.

So I think if industry has ever voiced a need for training, I think we could always entertain something. And I'll give you an example.

I won't get too far into a segue. But we made several trips to Sault Ste. Marie to train the tribal officers out there. Which in turn train, and oversee the programs for the different tribes in that peninsula area.

And we, you know, occasionally we've come up with funding for that. So it's not to say that we don't do it, we'd have to see what the need is. So that's, so just keep that in mind.

And I would say one last thing, if within the districts at your industry or panel or if you do see a need, either please probably try to reach out to your district coordinator and talk about some logistics or the want and the need. And then you know, maybe we can work something out.

1	PARTICIPANT: Do we
2	PARTICIPANT: Do you have a question?
3	MR. DAMERON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, Thomas
4	Dameron. Marty, this has always been a little pet
5	peeve of mine. Is your training teaching the
6	examiners how to match up the fire extinguishers
7	with the proper brackets?
8	MR. DONOHUE: We talk about that, and
9	where it says specifically on fire extinguisher
10	what bracket to use, we go into detail on that,
11	and we do make sure and train them to make sure
12	it's a marine type of bracket. Or if it specifies
13	exactly what bracket to use, then to verify that.
14	MR. DAMERON: Okay, thank you.
15	PARTICIPANT: Any other questions?
16	All right, thank you very much.
17	MR. DONOHUE: Thank you.
18	PARTICIPANT: Next?
19	PARTICIPANT: If you prefer, yes.
20	Now, Mr. Chair, and I'm not sure where we're at.
21	Now, actually, I don't know where a break may fall
22	into this, but I do know when we do choose to go

1	to a break, we'll probably be calling up the next
2	segment by way of conference call over here. So
3	what would a best, what you'd like to do, and then
4	whenever we're done with that, then we can call
5	up our next presenter. He may need a couple
6	minutes.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: What makes the
8	most sense?
9	PARTICIPANT: I would recommend,
10	myself, maybe we cut one up, maybe a ten-minute
11	break. Because I notice people are getting
12	restless. And then maybe a good timing for that,
13	and then we can segue into the next instructor.
14	PARTICIPANT: Thank you very much.
15	PARTICIPANT: We'll take a ten-minute
16	break.
17	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
18	went off the record at 2:18 p.m. and resumed at
19	2:34 p.m.)
20	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: We're going to
21	listening to a presentation on the telephone, so
22	please go ahead. You'll have an opportunity to

1 ask questions. Sean Ramsey here. 2 MR. RAMSEY: 3 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Hey Sean, it's Bob 4 again. I've got you on speaker phone here with the Commission and an audience of open public. 5 going to -- your presentation. And then, if you 6 7 would, just stay on the line in case there are any questions at the end of the presentation. 8 9 MR. RAMSEY: Oh, okay. So, my name is 10 Sean Ramsey. I work with the US Coast Guard, 11 particularly Ι work the PEH4 which is t.he 12 life-saving and fire-protection division. 13 And so, my major understanding was that the PSAB had a couple of questions in regards to 14 portable fire extinguishers. 15 By my trade, I am 16 a fire protection engineer for the group. So, I 17 would be willing to answer any questions they'll 18 have, or discuss the issue topics. 19 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: So, are there any 20 questions about portable fire extinguishers? 21 thought we were going to listen to a presentation

here?

1	MR. MYERS: Yes. Hey, Sean, do you
2	have a presentation prepared, or were you just going
3	be answering questions from the audience?
4	MR. RAMSEY: I do not have a
5	presentation prepared. My understanding was I was
6	going to be answering questions that the committee
7	had. And I apologize, I had not been prepared for
8	that.
9	MR. MYERS: Okay. If you wait just a
10	second here, we'll generate a couple of questions.
11	There were some earlier about performance-based
12	extinguishers, rackets, that kind of thing. But
13	I'll talk to the audience real quick, and I'll see
14	if there are any questions.
15	MR. RAMSEY: Yeah, I don't know if you
16	already talked about the recent Coast Guard changes
17	when it comes to getting rid of the Coast Guard
18	weight standard and moving towards the UL ratings.
19	So, that's probably a topic that's, you know, it's
20	still
21	(Simultaneous speaking.)
22	MR. MYERS: We touched on it earlier.

1	And real quick, Joe has a question for you.
2	MR. RAMSEY: Absolutely.
3	MR. MYERS: Sean, can you hear me?
4	MR. RAMSEY: Yeah, you're a little far
5	but I can get you.
6	MR. MYERS: Alright, Joe Myers here.
7	You can hear me now?
8	MR. RAMSEY: Yes, absolutely. Thank
9	you, sir.
10	MR. MYERS: And I think if you could
11	maybe share with the committee and the public maybe
12	a little background history of what part of the
13	discussion of the portable fire extinguisher filing
14	rule that came about in that correct me if I'm
15	wrong about July of 2016, you had a final rule
16	come out. And if in the past there were questions
17	on, hey, what goes into that firing rule, what did
18	your decision making out of your office. And then
19	some of the checks and balances of going through
20	the weight-based performance rating system, the
21	old rating system. And then the new

Underwriter-Laboratory-based system. And maybe

you can go -- maybe elaborate a little bit on that.

MR. RAMSEY: Absolutely. That would be a great topic. So, a little bit of background, the refit reg project that we've done was the fire rule, which was published July 22nd, 2016, called the Harmonization Standard for Fire Protection, Detection, and Extinguishing Equipment. That was a fire rule we published, and which affect the vast majority of 46COFRs, as well as some 33COFRs. And this affected commercial vessels, recreational vessels, pretty much the entire gamut under the Coast Guard's purview.

And kind of how that process ends up happening, how do we get to a final rule, is projects generally start depending on feedback we get from the public. So, there may be an issue that businesses identify with our regs, some kind of inconsistency, some kind of problem. And, you know, we generally hear about it through our partners in CBC, or through BSF, or just from, the biggest factor, people coming up to our office and asking standards questions. We get a lot of those.

basically, after problem's а identified, we work it out to figure out what kind of solution works best in this -- for this given problem, and we develop a reg project out of that. It goes through multiple levels of internal clearance in order to evaluate is this project worthwhile to do. What kind of basis does it have? Does it cost anything? And so, inside the Coast Guard, we have a fair bit of predetermined checks and balance in regards to that. You know, reg projects that generally come, you know from the public. There has to pros to outweigh that con. So, that's one of the major things that we look at to determine when we do a reg project.

We love to do lots of reg projects, we love to leave the world a better place. But, you know, the truth of the matter is that there are some projects that are good ideas and some that, you know, when you start looking at what the actual costs aren't as great of ideas.

So, where the public starts getting involved is the Coast Guard ends up drafting an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

NPR, a Notice of Proposed Rule-making. draft those complete with proposed reg text changes, as well as a summary and an analysis of the cost benefits. So, that goes through Coast Guard Internal Affairs, and then it eventually goes up to the Department of Homeland Security, where they also get on that, and they'll ask very much the same things, is this worthwhile, does this make sense? You know, how is your economic analysis? Does it make sense? Do you have the ability to do what you're about to do? And then if the rule is considered a significant rule, we get a couple million dollars' worth of change. Then it also goes into a higher level of clearance at DHS, and at the OED level. So, where the public starts getting involved is we publish this NPR, and then it goes through Coast Guard and DHS internal clearance.

A NPR is published. And in our case, the NPR for this rule was published January 13th, 2014. And so, we published something in the February, where we announced to basically the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

entire world that this reg project as something we're looking at. This is a notice of proposed rule-making.

And in there, we talk about, you know, if we have the Executive Summary, in the summary, where we talk about what the rule is, kind of what we want to deal with it. And we also have questions inside the NPR to the public, you know, if there are things that the Coast Guard is unclear on or that, you know, we have an idea, but we want more feedback for the public, in order to, you know, make our rule as strong as it can be.

So, in the case of these -- this NPR, we have, you know, so many questions that we are asking the public through this announcement in the Federal Register, where, you know, we chose to adopt the UL ratings. And we asked the public, you know, are these numbers acceptable? Do they make sense? We asked a number of questions in there.

And at that point in time, the NPR is open for, I believe, 60 to -- at least 60 days. And that's the official time period where, as a

regulatory body, that we give this information to the public, we give them the EA, we give them, you know, all of our questions as text, and we say please talk to us, give us information back.

You know, and from there, you know, we eventually close that, we take all those comments back, at the Coast Guard, and we kind of deliberate on them. We look at what was being asked, we look -- you know, does it make sense? You know, is this, you know -- can we answer this question, you know?

Do, you know -- is this a good question?

And then, we will iterate on the rule, based on public feedback. So, that public feedback, we will reiterate on the changed rule a little bit, we make tweaks and changes. We might scrap whole sections, depending on, you know, how strong the feedback is in one way or the other.

And then, once that's done, we go through the same internal clearance, Coast Guard, DHS, and maybe OMB, to then publish the final rule. Where the final rule will be, you know, we'll indicate on it, you know, we received these

questions from the public. And then we have, you know, statements and replies, answers to the questions the public had, as well as, you know, statements of what did we change as a result of that, if we changed anything at all.

So, throughout the process, there's generally a couple of good avenues in order to get public feedback. If we find that we're hit really hard on the NPR stage with a lot of comments, and we have to make, you know, fairly significant changes, what will end up happening is we will actually bring that back through the NPR and do another round of, basically, questions and proposals.

So, depending on the amount of comments we get, and the amount of confusion, or clarity that's needed, we'll go through that process multiple times.

In the case our final rule, we ended up, you know, 2014 published the NPR and took comments on it, and then iterated on it, and then had our final ruling publish almost two years, 2016.

In there, we only had about a little over a dozen comments from the public, and, you know, there were some questions on the final rule and about clarifications. Is there grandfathering on fire extinguishers? We also got a couple of questions about, you know, am I affected, or other things. But for the most part, most of the comments we got were not very strong or very opposed to a lot of the changes we were making.

So, that's kind of how reg process works for the Coast Guard. And that's kind of how it worked on this case. Some of the background of how we ended up coming with what we came up with was this UL rating standard is something that had existed since, I believe the 40s, if my memory serves. I could be off on that. It's definitely been around for a number of decades.

And that is the UL kind of takes charge in the US world, when it comes to rating and listing fire extinguishers. So, they are pretty much the body that does a lot of that work. And the Coast Guard has had a good previous experience with them.

They are a Coast Guard-tested lab in that case, for fire extinguishers.

So, we've got a little bit of history of working with UL. They do a lot of qualification tests. But this UL rating system is something that is done almost entirely on the shoreside industry. So, basically, we'll have 40, 60, 70 When talk about fire years. we extinguishers in the US, you know, we are looking to the fire extinguishers that have UL ratings on And that's generally how the shore side them. If you've got, you know, your 2As, your operates. 10Bs, your 20Cs -- and this is a lot of the language that, you know, the US uses.

The performance standard that UL talks about with their ratings, they are performance-based standards. So, basically, you have a fire, and the test is, in order to issue a rating, your extinguisher must be able to put out this fire. This is a little bit different — this is very different than what the Coast Guard rating system was, which was entirely weight-based.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The previous Coast Guard standard didn't require you to do a, you know, a fire test. So, we hear fire extinguisher, and you say, you know, I can put, you know, a 40-square-foot, you know, pan fire. That's nice and all, but what the Coast Guard cared about was how big your extinguisher is.

So, one of the side-effects of that is it's kind of a little bit of a -- you can develop a better wheel, you can develop better mousetrap, or fire extinguishers. But the Coast Guard, under Coast Guard basis, doesn't -- just because you have a better fire extinguisher that's smaller, more portable, it can take out a bigger fire, we wouldn't give them a very high Coast Guard rating because it's not big enough, it doesn't have enough weight, it doesn't have enough volume.

So, moving to the UL rating system gives us the ability to say, your fire extinguisher, it doesn't matter how big you are, how bulky you are.

Can your fire extinguisher put it out the fire?

And if it can, you get the rating.

And so, a lot of our issue with the fire extinguisher rule was we had adopted, you know, take these apples that were weight standards, and change them to oranges, which are performance standards. And in order to do that, we looked at current standards that were out there.

And if they had a National Fire Protection Association, I believe, they are the industry leaders when it comes to fire protection in the US. And a lot their standards I already talked about. You know, if you have a high cabin space, an ordinary cabin space, you need this range of it per, you know, this large a space.

And so, we looked at what's going to be done on the US shore side and kind of mapped over what our first extinguisher would be on the performance side, on average.

So, part of that -- that's kind of how we came up with what the performance standard is going to be now. We basically looked at a lot of innovative literature and a lot of things that were already out there and being done on the shore-side

world.

When it comes to items like -- I forget the -- wait a moment. Oh well. I forget these. So, when it comes to our performance rating and our fire extinguishers, that's what we primarily looked at. We primarily looked at what was the shoreside industry already doing, what's already out there, what kind of rating that they would, you know, indicate on a shoreside world.

So, that's kind of how we did a mapping everything over it. We made sure that in the rule we indicated as frequently as possible that, you know, for these changes — this is obviously going to be completely and totally a paradigm shift, that your extinguishers that you already have are grandfathered. You know, may have a very large extinguisher that perhaps doesn't test very well. Just because we made this change, we didn't want — we did not want people to go out and rip out all their fire extinguishers and chuck them and then get a whole new one.

As part of our economic analysis, part

of our rule-making process, we didn't want people to do that because that's very expensive and very cumbersome. And our best effort was to map everything over as best we could.

Some extinguishers, you know, didn't test very well and so didn't necessarily make the grade on a one-to-one basis, but some extinguishers that are much smaller can now be used. They couldn't before. So, we tried, between grandfathering, and between making that transition as smooth as possible, to really minimize the effect it would have on, you know, the industry in general.

But I think that gives a little bit of context when it comes to fire extinguishers, how we end up going with the new ratings, kind of why we ended up going with the UL ratings. primarily because the Coast Guard system existed all by itself. It was weight-based, it didn't matter how good your extinguisher was. The performance-based standard, it's something that's already already done, out there. These extinguishers that out there already get UL tested,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	already UL listed, already get UL rated. They're
2	already there, it's just on a different place on
3	the bottle.
4	And so, we wanted to align with the
5	shore side, we wanted to align with all the other
6	industry standards out there in the US. And then
7	we wanted to be able to, you know, state that this
8	fire extinguisher will put out this size fire.
9	And on the weight-based standard, it didn't
10	necessarily allow well- to high- performing units
11	to be put in those standards, just on the basis
12	that they weren't big. So
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: I'll turn over
14	here to the committee and the audience and see if
15	they have any questions.
16	MR. RAMSEY: Yeah, absolutely. Thank
17	you.
18	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Boehmer?
19	MR. BOEHMER: I don't know if you can
20	hear me or not, but we've had a in New England,
21	they're starting to use the fire suppression
22	portable what was the name of those things?

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: The throwing
2	grenades?
3	MR. BOEHMER: Yeah. And then, are
4	they have they been approved, or looked at being
5	approved by the Coast Guard? I mean, the reason
6	I'm bringing this up
7	MR. RAMSEY: Are you talking about
8	MR. BOEHMER: We had a boat that became
9	fully engulfed in flames, so they tossed it in the
10	engine room, and it wasn't big enough to bring the
11	fire down. And then after It may have suppressed
12	the fire, but it didn't actually put it out, so
13	there's it works differently.
14	MR. RAMSEY: Okay. So, let me just
15	clarify, you're talking the portable aerosol
16	grenades that sound kind of like flashbangs, you
17	thrown them and they smoke out?
18	MR. BOEHMER: Exactly.
19	MR. RAMSEY: Is that kind of what
20	you're talking about?
21	MR. BOEHMER: Yes.
22	MR. RAMSEY: Alright. So, yeah, those

are actually pretty interesting and novel technology. One of the things that, you know, when the technology comes on, one of the difficult things that we have to make sure that, you know, these products are being made to a standard, made to some kind of reference that we can ID and pin down.

So, one of the issues with that industry in particular is they're working towards developing and codifying a lot of their technology for the throwables. I know in particular the aerosol committee NFCA 10, we actually have Coast Guard members in my office who were on that committee. And so, they are working with, you know, aerosol developers, trying to update their standards, to create a throwable standard.

So, where the Coast Guard sits is, I'm really for that because, you know, we're interested to see that technology. It's very interesting, very novel. I don't know if it's a -- from my personal experience as a fire fighter, it gets used in utility spaces and little server rooms, particularly underground areas. They were very

effective there.

But from the Coast Guard point of view, we want them to develop that standard, and so that we at the Coast Guard can reference the standard, then we can say that, yes, you may use this product if it meets the standard. Right now they don't quite have that standard, but I do believe, you know, the Coast Guard allows excess equipment to be used, as long as it is, you know, kind of lifted by a testament.

So, there is the possibility of that being used, kind of as excess equipment, but until they solidify what their standard is and what their product is, they are kind of not approved by the Coast Guard.

MR. BOEHMER: Thank you. I forgot to -- This is Kris Boehmer. Thank you for that explanation.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: More questions for Mr. Ramsey?

I think where the concern of many of this committee members came in was when these new

regulations were published and we hadn't even heard about it because we don't make a practice of studying the Federal Register every day for changes. So, it was a surprise to many of us, and I believe that, kind of, we would have liked to have commented as a committee on these new standards, and we feel kind of slighted in that regard. I did anyway.

So, the initial implementation of the rule is immediate. And so, as I did third-party examinations of fishing vessels, I'd tell them they had to replace the fire extinguishers in their wheel house because they didn't meet the current standard. The grandfathering clause came in later, after two boats replaced several fire extinguishers.

And I appreciate that grandfathering allowance. It gives fishing vessel boat owners a chance to adapt and build on an addition to their wheel house so they have a place to put on the -- what is it? Twenty-pound CO2 extinguishers. You have to have a big one in the wheel house now.

But anyway, that's my comments. 1 It's kind of a sore point. 2 3 CAPTAIN EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman. So, 4 this is Captain Edwards. I just wanted to make sure that people are aware that we do have a CDC 5 policy letter 1804 that discusses fire 6 7 extinguishers and the performance-based versus UL or weight-based. And there is a section in the 8 9 enclosure that is specific for commercial fishing 10 vessels and just provided that cross-block. 11 feel free to pull that out and use that at will, 12 and ask the standards if you have any questions. 13 MR. MYERS: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. Just a comment on that, is that something that 14 we could probably post when we get back? 15 16 we bring them up on their website they know where 17 to go to? This policy letter? 18 PARTICIPANT: Oh, sir, yes, sir. 19 MR. MYERS: And that's so you're not 20 trying to fumble around trying to find out where 21 it's out. We're going to take you to our site and 22 show exactly -- Now, it's probably not up to date,

1	but it'll be up next week.
2	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, thank you.
3	MR. MYERS: Because there a lot of good
4	information. And that came out, I believe in June
5	or last spring, April.
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Any other
7	questions for Mr. Ramsey? Tom Dameron?
8	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9	So, another point of contention on this was that,
10	when this committee originally heard about this,
11	we were told that existing extinguishers under the
12	Coast Guard classification would meet the UL
13	classification that was being proposed, and there
14	wasn't going to be that much change. And when the
15	final reg came out, we found out that we had a whole
16	lot of extinguishers that were approved under the
17	Coast Guard classification that would no longer
18	be approved under the UL classification.
19	And it was very frustrating because
20	there was no research or analysis done that showed
21	that the extinguishers that were approved under
22	the Coast Guard classification, that there had been

any situations where those fire extinguishers were 1 inadequate for the space and fires that had to be 2 Thank you. 3 fought. 4 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Tom. other questions? Questions from the public? 5 Mr. Davis? 6 This is Alan Davis. 7 MR. DAVIS: I have a question similar to Kris' and along the same 8 I'm one of those early adopters of new 9 10 technology. I test things, I test them again, I 11 make them prove to me that they work, and then I 12 jump in with both feet. 13 There are new and emergent technology in life safety and fire suppression. For instance, 14 there is a new portable device that Kris was 15 16 referring to, that's made by Flame Guard USA. 17 believe its acronym is FST, that it does not fit 18 into any NFP or UL certification standards. I do 19 believe it's certified in a variety of different 20 European standards though. The US Coast Guard doesn't have a 2.1 22 process for approval, and you spoke to the fact

1	that the NFBA is looking at something now, but is
2	there a way that we can create something that helps
3	these new categories and emerging technologies get
4	looked without the companies having to come up with
5	250,000 or 500,000 dollars to create an entirely
6	new category of approval?
7	For instance, this product can be used
8	both as a portable fire suppression device, and
9	in a different form as a fixed fire suppression
10	device, that I'm convinced is more environmentally
11	friendly and effective.
12	So, that was my question. How can we
13	look at not only the approval processes here the
14	in US, but look for other fields, accept some of
15	the things that are tried and proven in other
16	countries, and not take ten years to get things
17	done?
18	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Alan.
19	Mr. Ramsey?
20	MR. RAMSEY: Absolutely. That's a
21	good question. So, when it comes to emerging
22	technologies and things that are out there that

might be -- So, I'll need to break this rule down.

So, ultimately, kind of our office has a lot of say over gets approved and what does not get approved. It generally looks kind of, if you've got a standard to it and it's a good standard, yeah, okay, we can move off of that. That's not a lot of thinking required.

But we do allow for companies that have products that, you know, meet the -- in particular you mentioned, you know, the products that may -- they may both be fixed and they have portable capability. That's something that's not -- I have not personally come across yet, so that's very interesting, definitely novel technology.

approval, you know, I don't know anything about their product or anything, but I would recommend them come to our office. We have an email, <a href="mailto:typeapproval@uscg.mil">typeapproval@uscg.mil</a>. And our office has a lot of that authority to issue Coast Guard approval based on products.

So if it's, you know, let's say it's

1	a novel product that would be used in a way that's,
2	you know, not necessarily non-standard, we do have
3	that ability to issue Coast Guard approval because
4	we are the Coast Guard.
5	They don't necessarily have to have a
6	standard out there that already exists. I
7	mentioned before that, you know, the aerosol guys
8	are hoping to get a lot their portables codified.
9	They can get, you know, the NFCA credentials.
LO	But in the case of products that, you
L1	know, straddle the line between NFCA standards or
L2	are unique, we do have that ability to issue Coast
L3	Guard approval by ourselves. The best way for them
L 4	to start that process is to just give us an email.
L5	That's definitely an interesting case,
L6	and I would love to hear more about that.
L7	MR. DAVIS: I will get you connected
L8	with them.
L9	MR. RAMSEY: Absolutely. Do you need
20	our email?
21	MR. DAVIS: I can find you.
22	MR. RAMSEY: Alright. That works,

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, thanks Alan.
2	CAPTAIN EDWARDS: I'm sorry, this is
3	Captain Edwards. Just to add on another thing,
4	the equipment approval process includes not the
5	performance of the actual that you're looking at,
6	but as well as looking into the company to see if
7	they have the appropriate structure in place to
8	ensure that that's also maintained.
9	So, there is a couple of points that
10	need to be looked at for the approval.
11	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks. I
12	appreciate that. Tom?
13	MR. DAMERON: Mr. Dameron. Yes, it's
14	my understanding that, if you want to carry that
	my understanding that, if you want to tally that
15	as excess equipment, that you don't need to get
16	as excess equipment, that you don't need to get
16 17	as excess equipment, that you don't need to get the Coast Guard's approval, but you would need to
16 17 18	as excess equipment, that you don't need to get the Coast Guard's approval, but you would need to get a UL approval.
16 17 18 19	as excess equipment, that you don't need to get the Coast Guard's approval, but you would need to get a UL approval.  MR. RAMSEY: May I answer?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as excess equipment, that you don't need to get the Coast Guard's approval, but you would need to get a UL approval.  MR. RAMSEY: May I answer?  CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: I think it's a

is do you need, to carry it, a different type of fire-extinguishing apparatus, does it need to be UL approved as excess equipment?

MR. RAMSEY: So, when we get into the works, UL approval is important to understand that there are different standards, and UL has a business model of listing and approving things to a certain standard. But in general, my understanding is we do allow things to be used as excess equipment that, you know, do not necessarily have to have --

I believe they do have to list by a -not necessarily a Coast Guard testing lab, but an
NTRL, a Nationally Recognized Testing lab. So,
that can be UL, that can Southwest Research, that
can Entertech. There's a number of different
companies that they can go to.

And that's more for quality assurance purposes, like we've mentioned before that with approval, there's aid of your equipment, you know, meeting standards in your work. But there's also the side of it, are you making the same product back and forth. And that's kind of what listing

1	takes care of here. So, yes, there is definitely
2	a way out there.
3	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mike Rudolf.
4	MR. RUDOLF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5	Mike Rudolf from Reef Safety in Portland. I'm
6	an examiner. And Mr. Ramsey, I understand that
7	you worked on the regulation project when they were
8	developing these Federal Register and the language
9	that went into it.
10	MR. RAMSEY: I personally did not. A
11	lot of folks in my office did. I am on working
12	on other reg projects and have been doing a lot
13	with this reg project since roll-out, but I did
14	not personally help craft that language, no.
15	MR. RUDOLF: Okay. My question is in
16	particular to SS Fire protection equipment after
17	the regulations changed. If you reference 46 CFR
18	28, decimal 155, and that's the section within our
19	fishing vessel regulations dealing with fire
20	equipment, you know, the title of it is excess fire
21	detection and protection equipment.

That's the title of it, but prior to

2016, it addressed both fire detection equipment and fire protection equipment that was in excess of the minimal equipment requirement on the vessel.

And it identified that this protection equipment had to be exactly what you just said. It had to be recognized by a laboratory, and, you know, maintained, and, you know, have some sort of standard to follow.

But after the regulations were changed in 2016, if you compare the two texts, the title remained the same for 28.155, but they took out the part about protection equipment within the verbiage, within the language of that section. So now, 28.155 only deals excess fire detection equipment, not protection equipment.

And so, I mean, for me out in the field, it's confusing because for many years we've identified if you have extinguishers that are beyond your minimal requirements, then, okay, let's make that it's not going to endanger the crew, that it's, you know, maintained, listed, you know, that it's something appropriate for the vessel.

But now with that language omitted --1 I don't know if it was done on purpose, to make 2 3 way for these, you know, novel designs and ideas, to allow them to be carried on board, that aren't 4 listed, or if it was done by mistake or was an 5 overlook. 6 7 I compared the different sections of the other subchapters for other vessels, and their 8 9 does identify both protection language 10 detection equipment, but subchapter С for uninspected vessels, it does not. So, I'll let 11 12 you answer that. 13 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Mike. Mr. Ramsey? 14 That is -- So, as you're MR. RAMSEY: 15 16 talking about that, I'm trying to write down CFR 17 I cannot say off the top of my head why numbers. 18 C would be any different in regards to not allowing 19 protection to be used by protection systems, to

have that excess rule. That maybe be one of the

things that we stated in the NPR, you know, kind

of multiple times, that do allow excess equipment.

20

21

1	I don't have an answer for you why it's
2	different in C or if was an oversight or not. It
3	seems like you've done a fair bit of that background
4	proofing. I would be glad to get back with you
5	guys, but I suspect you may be onto something there,
6	and it may be an error. If you could, could you
7	send me some information on that particular
8	question? Is it possible for you to write it out
9	by email mail?
10	MR. RUDOLF: Yes, Mr. Ramsey, I could
11	look you up in global, and if not, I'll get if from
12	Mr. Myers. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Get it from Alan
14	Davis. Alright, thank you very much. Any other
15	questions? Yes, Mr. Wilwert?
16	MR. WILWERT: Thank you. This is
17	Scott Wilwert. I'm a District 17 fishing vessel
18	safety coordinator. And one thing I haven't heard
19	mentioned that I believe there were a lot of
20	questions originally, Mr. Ramsey, could you please
21	walk us through what the thought process and the

intent was, and what the current arrangement is

for the inspection of these portable fire extinguishers now, and how maybe that differs from how we used to do business, in regard to sending in portable extinguishers for annual servicing or being able to service them yourself?

MR. RAMSEY: That's a very good question. So, one of the things that we ended up doing in Iraq was we ended up codifying the requirements that your extinguishers must be maintained to a standard. That standard is the same one Tom Short inquired about, placing the extinguisher, how many you need to have, how big they need to be.

But the other half of that standard talks inspection about and maintenance requirements. So, this is where we get details the particulars fire about of the extinguisher that we're looking at.

So, extinguishers can be broadly broken down into two different kinds for maintenance purposes. You have your disposable, your non-rechargeable ones, that's one category,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

disposable non-rechargeable. And the other category is rechargeable.

And so, your standard for your accepting your maintenance differs depending on what kind of extinguisher we're talking about it. Is it disposable, is it rechargeable? So, for the most part, on your, you know, common civilian life, if you have a fire extinguisher in your house, on your boat, it will mostly likely be a disposable extinguisher, not a rechargeable one. And you can always tell the difference between the two. Tt. literally says on the bottle, after use dispose, or after use recharge.

with disposable And so, these extinguishers, the requirements that kick in for them is you need, you know, basically do a monthly You need to make sure it's there. know, the indicator needs to be green. It needs to physically be there. And stuff like, you know, it hasn't been damaged, it has pressure. Basically, it's visual inspection just to check that it's there and it doesn't appear to be off.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In addition to that monthly check, that monthly visual check, whenever the fire extinguisher expires, which, I believe the rate used to be about 12 years. You do need to eventually replace a disposable extinguisher because they will go bad, they will need to be replaced.

For your -- and now, I'm going to the other paradigm. So, for your rechargeable(s), your maintenance inspection requirements become much more strenuous, or there's a lot more kind of going on with them.

So, besides your monthly check, you make sure it's there, make sure it's green, you know, make sure it hasn't been used or tampered with, you also have to have an annual inspection by an NFCA 10 technician. And so, you know, those technicians, they're generally certified either by the manufacturer or by the state and local county.

Most of your fire protection companies out there do this kind of business. They cover

all the shoreside industry, so they're out there somewhere, and they're probably maintaining the marina just up the road.

Every year you need to have this technician come on board and do an annual inspection of your extinguishers. So, you can do the monthly checks, you know, make sure it's there, but every year you need an NFCA 10 tech to come down and take a look at your extinguisher.

And what they will end up doing is, depending on the age of the extinguisher, how long it's been, they may take it back, and they hydrotest the cylinder to make sure it's still keeping pressure. Then they refill it and they change out the powder. It gets gas. They will most definitely hydro it.

So, during the annual check, that's their opportunity to get in there and make sure that the rechargeable extinguisher is still functioning, that it's still working. And it's much more -- it's more of a maintenance aspect, rather just a protection.

So, for your rechargeables, you will do your monthly visual checks, and then every year you will have a technician come down and basically kind of survey your extinguishers, pull them out if they need to be pulled out, hydro test, recharge, replace. And then they'll drop them back off or give you a different replacement, depending their business model.

So, those are kind -- that's kind of what goes on in the old fire extinguishers. You will generally find that most of your small extinguishers, you know, your 20Bs, your dry powders, they tend to be disposable. And that just means you have to do a monthly check, and then, whenever they expire, they expire. Those tend to be much less maintenance involved with them.

For your CO2, your gas systems, if you have any specialized extinguishers, like for metal fires, those tend to be rechargeable, as well as they're bigger, bulkier, dragged-ins. Those tend to be rechargeable, and you have to check them monthly, as well as get a tech in there every year.

So, that's kind of -- that's what the maintenance world looks like for your extension purposes.

MR. WILWERT: Mr. Ramsey, thank you for that. And just real quick, this is, I guess, a comment that you could maybe comment on. But one of the things that we found in especially smaller locations in Alaska, where the servicing is not as prevalent as you may think, kind of an unintended consequence, I believe, of this final rule is that what we're finding is a lot people are going out and purchasing what I would consider a lesser extinguisher.

They're going to Costco or Ace, and they're -- if you give them the choice of packaging up their rechargeables and putting them out on a barge because no one will fly them to get serviced, well what do you think they're going to do? You know, they're going to go get the \$4.99 one at Ace.

And so I think an unintended consequence may be that maybe during the NPR it would have been nice to address is that folks are

1	using lesser equipment because it's easier for them
2	to deal with because of their inability to get
3	servicing.
4	So anyway, that's just a comment. It's
5	something that's going on out there. I don't know
6	if you've heard that before or you're aware of it,
7	but I just wanted to again, those unintended
8	consequences, I think, of the maintenance regimen
9	that the rechargeables have to go through, as
10	opposed to the disposables. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Scott.
12	Great point. Are there any questions or comments?
13	Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ramsey. We appreciate your
14	time today.
15	MR. RAMSEY: Yep. Thank you all for
16	the opportunity. I'm sorry I've taken up so much
17	of your time, but I hope it was informative.
18	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Alright, Ms. Case,
19	if wouldn't mind coming to the microphone. And
20	do you need the podium?
21	MS. CASE: No podium, but I do have
22	slides.

1 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okav. slides. So, for the committee's information, we are on the 2 3 NIOSH update. And that is actually on tomorrow's We're moving it forward. So, it's 3:30 4 p.m. tomorrow -- or no, I guess I -- we're right. 5 We're right at almost the right time. 6 Okay. 7 great. Thank you. MS. CASE: Good afternoon everyone. 8 9 Alright, so we'll go ahead and get started. 10 good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the 11 committee. My name is Samantha Case. 12 researcher from the National Institute for Safety 13 and Health, or NIOSH, which you've heard from a few people today. 14 I work out of our Anchorage, Alaska 15 16 office, so it's nice to be in warm Seattle. 17 I just want to give you a brief update of what's 18 going on the fishing safety research world. 19 First, I'll start off with a brief NIOSH 20 introduction for those of you who may not be as 21 familiar with us and what we do. And then I'll

go into our fatality data update.

22

So, this will

be commercial fishing fatalities for the country from 2000 through 2016. Then, I'll talk about what's new.

So, it's been a couple years since we last presented at the Savannah meeting, so I'll talk about some projects and products that we've been working on, and then wrap up with what's next for us, so, the projects that we're currently working on or will be really making some progress very soon.

So, NIOSH, or the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, it's a federal agency, and we're housed in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or the CDC. And that's within the Department of Health and Human Services. NIOSH does sound a little bit like OSHA, but we do not have regulatory or enforcement authority. Rather, we conduct research on worker safety and health issues, and make recommendations to make sure workers are coming home at the end of the shift or trip safe and healthy.

Within NIOSH, we have the Center for

Maritime Safety and Health Studies. And our goal for this center is to bring researchers together, both internal to NIOSH and external to NIOSH, to study workers' safety and health in six maritime industries. That includes commercial fishing.

And our goal in studying these worker populations is to identify the leading problems that are causing injuries and illnesses among these worker populations and try to come with solutions.

And much of this work is possible because of our strong partnerships with a variety of industry stakeholders.

Within the Center, we have our Commercial Fishing Safety, Research, and Design Program. So, NIOSH's work in fishing safety research really began out of our Alaska office in the early 1990s, but we did expand to be a national program in about 2007.

So, right now we have active projects, or we support different on the east coast of the country. Our program has three disciplines. The first you'll see there on the left is epidemiology,

and that's what I do. I study patterns and characteristics of injuries, fatalities, and adverse vessel events, to really understand systematically what's causing them and what the leading concerns are.

We also have a team of safety engineers working out of our Spokane, Washington office. And what these engineers can do is find hazards on a vessel and develop some interventions, like winch guards or flooding liner, to try to mitigate those hazards.

And finally, we have some health communication staff, also out of our Spokane office, who can take our scientific messages and translate them into products, and videos, and other documents that are great for our audience who aren't scientific researchers.

I do want to mention that most of our is possible because of our close working partnership with the Coast Guard. So, we have a formal inter-agency memorandum of agree. And this agreement facilitates data sharing between the

Coast Guard and NIOSH.

So, NIOSH scientists, such as myself -- I think I'm the only one at this point -- have credentials through the Coast Guard as a federal affiliate. And what this does is I can access MSL, which is the Coast Guard's electronic system that houses reports and investigations of marine casualties. I can go in, review those cases and abstract data that we can analyze later.

And there's some formatting issues with the software, so, sorry this didn't translate well, but I'll just talk through this.

So, when a marine casualty occurs, like a vessel sinking or a crew member fatality or injury, typically the Coast Guard is notified and they respond and investigate accordingly. Sometimes local law-enforcement agencies may also be involved, so we do use them as a resource, as well.

But we review the case files, the 2692s, the witness statements, the actual investigation report from the Coast Guard, and we review these

And we pick apart some of the relevant information. So, we capture about 100 data fields for each case, or as much as possible, that describe the event, what happened, what contributing factors, information about the crew members who were involved, and information about the vessels. And then we can use that for analysis. All of this data is collected in our commercial fishing incident database, or CFID. So, once we get into the data update and some of the products, these are direct outputs from CFID. So, starting with the data update --So, this isn't coming through, but -- let's see -- over this 17-year period, 2000 to 2016, there were 755 total crew member fatalities. If the bar chart was appearing on the early 2000s, we were seeing about 60 fatalities a year. And for the most recent years, 2014 through 2016, we were down

And in fact, you'll see here the average for the entire time period was 44 fatalities a year, and we haven't been over that number since 2009.

to 30 fatalities a year.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

SO, I think there's a lot of great progress there.

And this shows the trend of the imaginary bars over the 17-year period. Again, very promising. We've seen a 42 percent decline in the number of fatalities.

This one would show the number fatalities over time, with the fatality rate. the rate would be expressed as the number of 100,000 fatalities for full-time equivalent workers. So, what that means is it's the number of fatalities we would expect to occur if there 100,000 fishermen who were working regular fullOtime hours.

This allows us to compare the deaths among fishermen to other types of workers, as well as make year-to-year comparisons that take into account the number of fishermen in the workforce.

So, again, you can't see it here -Hopefully I'll be able to provide all of these
slides so that will be able to see. But we've seen
a general decline in the fatality rate since 2009,
which again is very, very promising. But there's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

still a lot of work to be done. In 2016 alone, we know that the fatality rate for fishermen was nearly 25 times higher than the average US worker. So, very much still important work to be done.

Here we go. So, here is -- I've put some of the data that we're going to show up. This shows the breakdown of those fishing fatalities over that 17-year time period, by the event that caused them. So, we can see that in red, nearly half of all the fatalities were the result of drownings, or sometimes hypothermia, or blunt force trauma, after a vessel disaster. Those are events like sinkings and capsizings, and sometime groundings and vessel fires.

In second, at 30 percent, in blue, we have fatalities due to falls overboard, and we'll talk about those in a little bit.

Less frequent, we have onboard fatalities. So, these are typically incidents that are related to the vessel's gear or machinery. So, these resulted in 13 percent of the fatalities and were due to a variety of causes. These are

things like winch entanglements, being struck by gear, caught in running machinery, and exposure to Freon, ammonia, or carbon monoxide.

We have diving fatalities at five percent, which are typically dive harvest incidents. And then onshore injuries at four percent, which are often drownings after someone falls from a dock.

This should show commercial fishing fatalities by region. And if I recall correctly, I believe the order is East Coast, Alaska, Gulf of Mexico, and West Coast. And then we do have just a few in Hawaii.

That bar isn't very big. We don't have our own regional summary, which we'll talk about in a minute, for Hawaii. As Charlie mentioned, in Hawaii the fleet is fairly small. He's not seeing a lot of incidents. And in addition to that, we do not routinely collect data on the distant water tuna fleet. So, we don't have a lot there.

Fleets with the highest number of fatalities. There are a number of fisheries that

should be listed here that make up about half of 1 all fatalities in the US. And the fleets with the 2 3 highest number are actually on the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico. 4 SO, Gulf of Mexico is at the top of the 5 shark fishery, followed by -- let's see. I can't 6 7 recall the order exactly, but we have East Coast lobster, West Coast non-tribal Dungeness crab, and 8 9 East Coast scallop. 10 And then when we looked at fatality 11 rates by fleet, what you would see at the top, the 12 highest rates of fatality are in clamming quahog 13 fishery and the multi-species ground fish fishery, both in the Atlantic. 14 Now, Gulf of Mexico shrimp had the 15 16 highest number of fatalities, but because that 17 fishery is so huge, that rate is actually one of the lowest we were able to calculate. And we can 18 19 see that in the regional summary documents. 20 So, it's important to consider the raw

number of fishermen who are dying while working,

and also the rate.

21

Okay. So, here we can look at the fisheries that we've identified as kind of most hazardous, based on the number and or rate, and what's causing these fatalities.

So, starting at the top in Alaska, we've, as you heard from Mr. Wilwert, the skiff capsizings among the salmon set-netters are in issue. The salmon drift gillnetters have the highest number of falls overboard in Alaska, so that's also an issue that we're concerned with. And the dive harvest incidents, which have typically been in the cucumber fishery, but we did

On the West Coast, in the Dungeness crab fishery, vessels disasters. These are typically rapid vessels capsizings while crossing a bar. Those are a concern. Dive harvest incidents there as well, as well as groundings, which we've seen kind of across all fisheries.

have a couple of geoduck fatalities this past year.

Down in the Gulf of Mexico, again, in the shrimp fishery, we're seeing winch entanglements and falls overboard. And across all

fisheries we're seeing a lot of fires and explosions that result in vessels sinking.

And then finally on the East Coast, we're seeing issues in the New England lobster fishery with falls overboard. That's their primary cause of fatalities in that fishery. And we've also seen many vessel disasters, capsizings in the scallop and multi-species ground fish fisheries, due to gear getting caught on the ocean floor.

So, updated fatality data. We presented this at the Savannah meeting. It was broken down by each region. And I'm happy to say we actually have physical documents, so you'll be able to see charts. I did bring some products that we'll be talking about, including these regional summary documents, some I was able to fit in my If we run out of copies and you want suitcase. some, for any of these products, please feel free to let me, and I'm happy to get more for you, either electronically or send you hard copies.

So, now that we are through the data.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I just want to talk about what's new. So, one thing I wanted to spend a couple minutes talking about was our report that we published this past year of fall-overboard fatalities in commercial fishing.

So, we've looked at this a lot, we've presented it before, but this is the first time we've really published a detailed report about these events. And what we wanted to do in this analysis was look at all these unintentional fall-overboard fatalities, look at. the circumstances around those events, the and subsequent rescue attempts, and try to think about different ways that these could be prevented.

So, we looked at over 200 unintentional fatal falls overboard. The fisheries with the highest number of fall-overboard deaths, as we've already heard, were Gulf of Mexico shrimp, East Coast lobster, and Alaska salmon gillnet.

We've looked at what the crew member had been doing immediately prior to the fall, and probably not surprising, we saw that they were most

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

often working with gear, typically setting the gear, but also hauling the gear.

But we also had a host of falls that occurred while the crew members were off duty but still on deck. So, we're seeing that this fall risk is there any time they're on deck, even if they're not actively working. Fifty-nine percent of falls were not witnessed. And this is typically the result of the crew member working alone on deck, or single operator working alone on their vessel altogether. And another thing I'll mention here is that in all incidences, there was not a personal flotation device or PFD worn.

So, this is a figure that's pulled straight from this report. And it's kind of hard to read, so I'll walk through it. I think I have a little pointer. What we wanted to do was look at all 204 fatal falls overboard and look at the subsequent rescue attempts. So, if we just focus on this, up here in the dark blue box, we have all 204 fatal falls overboard.

The second row shows whether they're

2.1

witnessed or not witnessed, so we divide them up that way. As I mentioned, most of the m were not witnessed.

The third row talks about immediate rescue attempts, and we felt pretty generous giving that immediate definition of an hour. So, this -- for example, this box says recovery attempted within one hour. We noticed that, even in cases where they're witnessed, as, again, there's no personal flotation device used, it's very easy to lose sight of the victim if they go underwater. So, that's what this row is showing.

And then the final row talks about the recovery attempts and whether they were successful of getting that person back on board.

So, we looked at these rescue attempts and these scenarios, and we lined them up with different levels of prevention strategies, which is a very public health way to say, how can we prevent these at different stages. So, the first is primary prevention. That first level means how do you prevent all 204 crew members from falling

from the vessel in the first place.

So, we talk about things that have already been implemented in the fishing industry to a certain extent, more enclosed work spaces, anything from adding rails to the vessel, all the way to new vessel design. The use of lifelines we seen a little bit in some fisheries. We talk about different ways eliminate entanglement hazards and alcohol- and drug-free policies on the vessels. So, those are all getting at the all 204 falls shown here.

And the next lightest blue colors, this is the secondary prevention. So, this is the second level where we say, okay, they've already fallen into the water, how do we get them out? So, of course, the first thing that we would recommend is that they need to be able to float. And the best way to do that is by wearing a PFD before they enter the water, so any time they're on deck.

The second thing we saw is that so many of these falls are unwitnessed. So, if you're

working alone, you know, you need a plan to get back on your vessel. Other people need to know that the fall occurs. So, we talk about man overboard alarms and some engine kill switch devices that are commercially available.

And so, you're floating, people know that you're in the water, and they're trying to get you. These boxes here that show recovery unsuccessful. How can we change that? And then we talk about different types of recovery devices, going above and beyond a traditional life ring, which is a lifting sling.

And then finally, this last level is tertiary prevention, it's the third level. So, the person has fallen into the water, we've recovered the person from the water. How do we improve their chances of survival at that point? And you'll see the boxes say recovered not revived, of course, because these are fatalities. So, this really gets to high-quality CPR and proper treatment for cold water immersion victims.

So, I don't know how many of you are

sticking around for the Pacific Marine Expo, starting on Sunday. My colleague Ted Tesky and I are doing a session on Sunday morning that's going to go into this analysis a little more in-depth and visible, and we're also going to be talking about PFD maintenance for both foam and inflatable PFDs. So, we'll have the man-overboard-themed session.

So, none of these prevention strategies are really novel. We kind of know this already. So, the main message from this report, in addition to understanding what's happening when these events occur, is how do we promote these prevention strategies. And I think one of the most important ones is increasing PFD use in the fleet.

So, I just want to talk really quickly about a NIOSH study that we did. We started this work back in 2007, 2008. What we did was give some fishermen in four fleets in Alaska -- so we looked at gillnetters, longliners, trawlers, and crabbers. We asked them about their perceptions and attitudes towards PFDs and what they though

their risk of falling overboard was. And then we gave some PFDs to fishermen to try out for a month, said, hey, wear these on deck, tell us what you think about them.

And for each gear type, they identified a different PFD that worked for them. So, the gillnetters work very closely with this netting here. It's like mesh, it's very easy to get caught up in. So, they're not interested necessarily in this type of PFD, an inflatable that has a handle. They were interested in this PFD, which is hard to see, but it's rain gear, and it had the foam integrated into the rain pants. It goes in the bibs. So that was, you know, smooth, it's not going to tangle them.

So, each gear type, again, found something that worked for them. But in 2014 we started this campaign called Live To Be Salty. This Iverson, he's fishing is Angus our spokesperson. And we developed a bunch of messages to get out to fishermen to try to promote PFD awareness and use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And we've been working on evaluating that, and hopefully that will be published this coming year, but I can say that our preliminary results from that evaluation showed that he was memorable. He was recognizable when we did the follow-up survey. And we found that some fishermen did try on a PFD. And as long as we're making that little progress, I think that's a good sign.

So, after our PFD study, there's been fishing safety researchers from around the country who are working on other regional PFD studies. So, there was one done on the West Coast. We talked about the rapid vessel capsizings. There's not really time to get in an emergency necessarily. So, PFDs in the Dungeness crab fleet was promoted. There's also been PFD studies in the New England lobster fishery, as well as the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fishery. Each fishery has different concerns, different attitudes and perception, so that's why this regional approach is really necessary.

Another study that we did was look at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

survival factors for crew members who were involved in a fishing vessel sinking. So, we focused on Alaska, and we looked at every fishing vessel that sank from 2000 to 2014, and that's regardless of whether it resulted in a fatality or not.

But what we were able to do is compare the victims in those events to the survivors and find out what's different about them. So, the main message that's not on the slide is that we found that, if the crew members did not have to enter the water at all, if they were directly rescued from the vessel before it sank, they survived. So, the main message is stay out of the water, of course.

But so then we restricted the analysis to look at victims and survivors who had to enter the water. So, the first talks about who entered the water for any length of time. So, it didn't matter if it was a couple of minutes, or hours. We found they were more — this group was more likely to survive if they were able to enter a life raft.

And we also found that -- we captured

2.1

this weather-related variable. So, if in any investigation the Coast Guard says, not only was the weather bad, but did the weather contribute to this event, this vessel sinking, we captured that. We found that fishermen were more likely to survive if the sinking was not related to heavy weather.

Then, we restricted it crew members who were in the water for over 30 minutes, so this is that long-term immersion scenario. So, we found life raft and that weather-relatedness again. But for this long-term immersion, we also found fishermen were more likely to survive if they wore an immersion suit, which also makes sense when you think about the protective factors of the survival suit.

One thing I want to emphasize here is that, while we didn't find it in the study, this really shows the importance of training and drills. It's knowing how to quickly don an immersion suit, knowing how to right and enter a life raft. Those aren't necessarily skills that just come to you,

especially in an emergency. So, I just think it further emphasizes the need for more widespread training and routine active drills on the vessels.

We also published -- we released two safety success story videos. You know, what I do is look at the data. And typically what comes up in different data sources are these adverse events, the fatalities, the injuries, the vessel losses. That's what shows up, and sometimes it's hard to know what's working, what's going really well. Those don't necessarily show up in the data.

So, what we wanted to do was take some lessons learned from fishermen to say, hey, this safety policy, or this safety practice, or this device, works really well for us. And we wanted to share that more broadly.

So, the first video that we did recently was call My Life Vest Saved Me. And this -- it tells a story of a Dungeness crab fisherman who was on his vessel and he fell overboard. And you saw the results, or heard the results from that report that we did. The outcome can be very grim.

This was not a tragedy because he was wearing a PFD, and his crew was trained and was able to get him back on board.

Over And Hit The E-Stop. And this tells the story of a deck hand on a salmon seiner in southeast Alaska. And the deck hand stepped into some line and was pulled right to the deck winch. They had a fast-acting crew who pushed this emergency stop button. It stopped spinning, it didn't pull him in. He was very fortunate and escaped without injury.

So, we have these examples of things that are working really well, and our goal is to continue sharing these types of stories with fishermen to try to change safety practice in the fleet. We do hope to make two more videos, one hopefully out of New England, and another in the Gulf of Mexico.

My colleague, Laura Siren, is working on a new line of research for us in safety and health among seafood processors. And I wanted to mention

this because we have always captured the off-shore seafood processors, so those who are working in factories on the catcher-processor vessels and mother ships. We've always captured those in our commercial fishing incident database. So, we track the fatalities and things involving those workers.

But she is taking her own dedicated kind of research to look at this worker population in more detail. So, she basically did a study that looked at the off-shore processors in Alaska, so again, those working on the catcher-processors and the mother ships. And she used reports of injury to the US Coast Guard as her data source. And she really did a thorough examination of the types of injuries that these workers were experiencing.

And from her analysis, she found that there were often sprains, strains and tears, fractures, contusions, and the hands, and fingers, and back were most often affected. So, she identified four areas to target to prevent these types of injuries. And that was overexertion from

lifting and lowering product, workers being struck by falling equipment or boxes, workers being caught in running machinery, and probably not surprisingly, slips, trips and falls from that wet factory environment in vessel motion.

So, she's expanding this from the off-shore processors, and she should have another study published this coming year that looks at injuries and illnesses among processors who are working on the on-shore plants.

She also conducted a study with some seafood company safety managers to identify what safety and health issues they saw when they were running their safety programs. So, in addition to the general articles, she will also be working on translating the health com team, to make sure that these are presented in a good way for the industry.

And finally, what's next. We're working on a variety of things, so I just pulled out a few examples. And one is looking at non-fatal injuries and illnesses.

So, our program routinely tracks fatalities, but we have only done a few special projects that involved looking at non-fatal injuries, and even less attention has been given to illness. So, we're turning out this study that's focused in Alaska, and we're going to use three data sources to do this.

And we do this because we have already kind of seen that different cases will be captured in different data sets. So, this will give us a really comprehensive understanding of what's happening.

So, the first data source that we're using is the reports of injury to the US Coast Guard. We're just starting the analysis, but it looks like what we're seeing from these cases are reports of injury that tend to be more severe. So, these can be things like medevacs. And we're also seeing that the fleets that are reporting those most frequently are really the larger vessels that are working out on the Bering Sea.

We also have Alaska's Fishermen's Fund,

which is an emergency payer of last resort, so it's a claims-type system. Fishermen aren't eligible for workers' comp, this is kind of similar.

But what we're seeing here is injuries and illness. So, we're seeing musculoskeletal disorders, things that are chronic or repetitive, build up over time that we don't see in the Coast Guard reports.

And we're seeing a lot of the smaller fleet filing claims for Alaska Fishermen's Fund, so this a lot of the salmon and halibut vessels that are working out of the Gulf of Alaska or southeast.

And then, finally, we have the Alaska Trauma Registry, which is -- does not discriminate against which fleet. This is going to be the injuries that are most severe and result in hospitalization.

So, by using these three very different data sources, they will all capture unique cases, but we'll also see where they overlap. And when we do publish these results, we'll have numbers

and rates by fishery, and we'll be able to identify leading safety and health problem, and hopefully lead to some further research.

Another area we've made a lot of progress in over the years is to prevent winch entanglements in the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fleet. So, you've already heard from Mr. Perkins earlier today about some of this work. Several years ago, we did a study that looked at fatal and non-fatal winch entanglement injuries in this fishery.

And through that analysis we identified several areas of concern. One of them was the main deck winch drums, another was the smaller tri-net winch, and another was the cathead spools. So just focusing on the main deck winch drums and tri-net winch really quickly, our engineers developed some prototype interventions. So, for the main deck winch, it was a guard, a stationary guard that goes over the drums and doesn't interfere with fishing operations. And for the tri-net winch, it was an auxiliary stop button, which is similar to an emergency stop, where it would shut off power to

the winch.

So, they developed these prototypes, they've installed them on a variety of shrimp vessels, and got feedback from the fishermen, modified them accordingly. And we're at the stage where that's pretty much wrapped up.

So, now what the engineers are doing are putting together some guidance documents to give to the industry, that are basically, this is how you fabricate these things, and this is how you can install them on your vessel. And as Mr. Perkins said, it's not mandatory, but we're hoping that this will really take off.

Now, for the third area, that was the cathead spools. This is a new area that our engineers are working on. So, for the cathead, this kind of spins continuously. The edges can get fairly rough, can get caught on this clothing, and that contact is not good.

So, what our engineers have kind of thought about was, what if do this kind of guard, and they call spin cab. And essentially, it works

similarly to those doorknob covers for the -- you want to childproof your house. So, if a worker comes into contact with the cathead and it has that barrier, the barrier is going to stop spinning, but the cathead can still spin underneath, so it's not going to pull them in or anything like that.

Our engineers have gotten some preliminary feedback, just about the concept, with fishermen and the Coast Guard personnel in the Eighth District. And they're working on developing these and doing some further testing this coming fiscal year.

Now, in the same vein here, we're working on a new project that will working on increasing adoption within the fleet of these different types of safety technologies. So, throughout the years, our engineers have come up with flooding monitors, hatch and door monitors. This is that emergency stop device. Of course, the work in the Gulf of Mexico. And our goal is to get these technologies out to as many fishermen as possible.

So, that emergency stop device was commercialized many years ago, I think maybe in 2007, somewhere around there. So, it's been available commercially for a number of years, but it's not widely adopted by the purse seine fleet in the Pacific Northwest. So, we want to know why. Is it cost? Is it risk perception?

So, we're going to be conducting interviews with fishermen to find out what are the barriers to adopting these types of safety technologies. And we can learn a lot from this. If it's costs, or whatever, we can try to find ways to mitigate those concerns. And it'll be very useful when we're creating future technologies.

We're also very fortunate to be able to partner with seafood companies. So, we have a few formal partnerships with seafood companies right now, and we're working on a variety of projects. One is to analyze their injury and illness claims data. So again, we don't know as much about injuries, and especially illnesses, in the fishing industry, so this is really a new area

And when we analyze these claims data, 1 we're able to compare different worker positions, 2 3 different vessels, get -- and really identify what 4 the problems are. We're also able to test these prototype 5 interventions by having this access to their work 6 7 sites. And one area that we're working in right now is reducing the hand injuries while crew members 8 are material-handling, or during offload. 9 So, this is an unproven concept by our 10 11 engineers to try to reduce those crushing injuries. 12 So, if you have your heavy box of product, it's 13 got straps on it, basically these are just handles that would go underneath the strap to lift the box. 14 And it further takes away the worker's hands from 15 16 the box and prevents any crushing injuries. 17 So, we're very, very fortunate to have these partnerships, and we look forward to seeing 18 how these projects evolve. 19 20 Something that comes up occasionally, or repeatedly, is exposures to munitions in the 21

fishing industry. So, I've heard about it mostly

in the Atlantic among the scallop and clam dredgers, but basically what happens is there's these unexploded munitions that have Sulphur mustard, or mustard gas, and it's coming up with the catch, and crew members can be exposed to that mustard gas.

What happens is really terrible blistering, there's some respiratory illness. It just gets pretty nasty. So, we're not taking the lead on this, but we're working with other parts of CDC, and other federal and state partners, to come up with some guidance for the fishing industry. How to recognize the munitions, how to properly handle them, who to report to, what signs and symptoms to look out for, what you could expect.

So, we've been working on that guidance, and we expect the documents to be out very soon. They're in the review process, and they could be released as early as this month. So, they'll be on our website of course. And even more than that, we're going to work with our partners in the industry to disseminate this information,

to get it out to the industry.

So, as I wrap up, I just want to mention that the work that we do is really possible because of our great partnerships with the Coast Guard, with seafood companies, and with fishermen themselves, marine safety training organizations.

We're very grateful for that. And it so nice to be here to talk to you, some like-minded folks. I think we all have the same goal. SO, thank you very much for having me, and I'm happy to field questions.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Ms. Case. We really appreciate the liaison that this committee has had with NIOSH over the years. And so, we appreciate all the work that you do to further fishing vessel safety, and for being here and presenting at today's meeting, and also at expo. We appreciate that a lot. Any questions? Kris Boehmer.

MR. BOEHMER: Yeah, Kris Boehmer. First of all, I want to look the analytical patterns. It's so insightful, what you were going

on and how we just have to address it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But I looked at one of your slides, and I understood it correctly, if you take the proximate cause of a loss, like a capsizing, man overboard sort of a secondary event. But on the other ones -- I was thinking the Dungeness crab boats going over. The guys goes overboard from that was because they were over far enough because they actually fell the thing. Is it fair to say that it looks like a lot of -- Have you looked at how much more likely you are to go over on small of certain size, compared to a big boat? have any correlation at all? I realize there's a lot more small boats than big boats, and I don't know how that works out.

MS. CASE: To my recollection, we have not done an analysis that looked about -- that looked at specific risks comparing vessel size for fall overboard. So, the vessel disaster category, that's any catastrophic event that occurs to a vessel, so that would include the capsizing's and anyone who enters the water from that event, they're

in there.

And I know there's a lot of -- We've gotten similar questions before about vessel size and risk for different types of events. One study that wasn't mentioned here that I'm working though is looking how certain vessel characteristics may predict a future vessel sinking. So, if we're looking at prior vessel casualty history, so If they've been disabled and had to get towed in a lot, is that a risk factor? But we're also looking at the vessel characteristics, including length and tonnage, so I'm hoping to have some results. Maybe next time.

MR. BOEHMER: Thank you.

MR. ROSVOLD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes?

MR. ROSVOLD: Eric Rosvold. You had one slide that was up there for a moment that attributed a high number of deaths or drownings to the salmon drift gillnet fleet in Alaska. Was that accurate, or was that actually a combination of the set gillnet and the salmon drift gillnet

## fleets?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. CASE: Great question. That was specifically for the drift gillnet fleet. And it's for -- it's different than the original summary. That was for the whole 17-year period. So, that regional summary document that you have is just focused on 2010 through 2014, so things have changed a little bit.

MR. ROSVOLD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, Mr. Hockema.

MR. HOCKEMA: Thanks for your presentation. I just had a comment to reiterate what I've mentioned before at some of these I work in vessel design, so my motive meetings. is to keep someone on the boat, okay. safety equipment people here are more in tune with what happens after you fall off the boat, but the best way to keep someone on a boat is a higher railing or bulwark. And it's not always possible because fisheries have needs for, in some cases, lower railing heights.

But what I've found over a 39-year

career is that accepted railing height for smaller vessels, like the drift fill netters and the salmon seiners in Alaska, has steadily rose higher and higher.

I've promoted a high bulwark all along, and 25 years ago, 30 years ago, there were salmon seiners that wanted a 24-inch bulwark. And I said, why do you want it that low? Well, the net's got to go over it. And I said, no it doesn't. The net will go over a 39-inch bulwark just as well. And incidentally, a one-meter-high bulwark is the international standard for commercial vessels, as a minimum. So, it's one meter, three courses of railing. We apply that, and have been for the last 30 years or so in the designs that we do.

But so, what I have found though is that as I put more pressure on people to put higher bulwarks on their vessels -- and these are usually vessels that are either newly built or undergo a major conversion, like a sponsoning, like widening the vessel, where they have new bulwarks.

Without exception, and I've done a lot

of these, owners have never complained about their bulwark being too high. On the other hand, the higher bulwark becomes the industry standard. And so, particularly if we go to larger vessels that fish, like our crabbers and trawlers, the crab boats have always had a need for not too high a bulwark right where the pot launcher is. But every place else they've gone to higher bulwarks, you know, and much higher in some case. Likewise, the trawlers on the West Coast in Alaska, and I'm speaking mostly of catcher boats now that are between 60 and 130 feet in length, they've all got the high bulwarks.

In the early 90s we really went on sponsoning campaign of existing vessels, and many of those vessels went from bulwarks that were maybe three feet high, to five feet high. I mean, literally chest high. The only place that they're working where they have to work over the side, so to speak, it's not the side, it's the trawl ramp, in those cases. So, they wanted more protection from the side. And kind of like the crabbers, where

the crabbers are working off the starboard side hauling pots.

So, that small area where you're hauling gear may need a lower height, but the area around the rest of the deck doesn't necessarily And again, there are always exceptions need that. to this. We still have -- we did a design for a 121-foot tugboat last year. It was delivered, and it has 30-inch bulwarks all the way around the stern. And the owner just wouldn't raise them up. And the load line regs allow that to happen if you give the Coast Guard a good reason, which isn't much. But it would have been just as easy to put a 39-inch bulwark around there. The vessel would have functioned the same way.

So, some people are traditionalists, but I find that those traditionalists sometimes aren't on the boats anymore. And especially in the small boat fleet, like the 58-foot seiner at Mr. Rosvold's fleet, they're increasingly working off-shore and in other fisheries. They're no longer just seiners, they're combination fishing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

boats. And so, they may be working 20 miles off shore, versus when it used to be maybe they worked within southeast Alaska, in the bays and those kind of things, where you don't want to fall over, definitely, but the results are not quite as bad as being off shore.

And I'll close with one story here.

My -- I have two brothers that are retired commercial fishermen, and my nephew was working about 15 years ago on the back deck of one of my brother's trawlers. And he was on the Oregon coast. It was in June, so sea water temperature in June on the Oregon coast is around probably 50, 55 degrees. It's cold but not ridiculously cold.

My nephew at the time was around 30 years old, may a little -- maybe late 20s, real strong guy, rock climber. He fell overboard because he had to get up on the bulwark to handle the trawl door. And it was daylight, sunny, about four-foot chop out there. And they looked around and they found him within about less than 20 minutes.

And I've talked to my nephew about this, 1 and he said, I was just ready to give up. He said, 2 3 I was just so -- I had swallowed water, you know, everything imaginable. He didn't have a PFD on, 4 And of course, I'm not sure what 5 of course. happened, but he was supposed to have a PFD. 6 7 that boat they had a rule that had your PFD on if you were handling trawl doors at the stern or 8 9 working around the stern ramp. 10 But here's a guy who was otherwise 11 really physically fit, and the ocean, at probably 12 55 degrees, cut him down in about 15 minutes to 13 almost going under. So, it's worth the higher bulwarks and not walking on top of those bulwarks 14 if you can. So, anyway, thanks. 15 16 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Hal. 17 I have a follow-up question for Ms. Case. Have 18 you identified any bulwark heights in the studies 19 that you've done in fall-overboards? 20 MS. CASE: No. No, we have not. That 21 typically has, from what I have seen, has not come

out in Coast Guard investigations. It's nothing

1	that we can gather. The characteristics about the
2	vessel that we routinely capture are length, year
3	of build, hull material, but nothing related to
4	the size of the bulwarks, the height of the
5	bulwarks.
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Alright, thanks.
7	Any more questions and comments? Kris Boehmer.
8	MR. BOEHMER: I would just suggest
9	I know in Maine the man overboard situation in
10	lobster boats, and we were most of them have
11	cut-out stern to second gear, and I'm sure their
12	bulwarks aren't high enough, but when the stern's
13	open and they get entangled, there's no way of
14	saving them. I wonder how many people are lost
15	from boats that don't have cut-out sterns, as
16	opposed to boats that have cut-out sterns.
17	MS. CASE: That's a really interesting
18	question. Yeah, I'd be interested in knowing that
19	because so many of the falls overboard in the
20	lobster fishery, as you mentioned, are the
21	entanglements.

MR. BOEHMER: Second.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, thanks.
2	Any other questions or comments?
3	Well, thank you very much. We really
4	appreciate it.
5	MS. CASE: Thank you. And thank you
6	for being so wonderful.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Oh, stand by.
8	Mike Rudolf has a question.
9	MR. RUDOLF: Thank you, Ms. Case.
10	Mike Rudolf again. My question has to do with data
11	gathering, and you have access to the Coast Guard's
12	MSL database. And I was going to ask, are you able
13	to When it comes to a report of a marine casualty
14	for fishing vessels, oftentimes, state-registered
15	vessels may not get into our MSL data system because
16	of the way the rules are written, related to
17	commercial fishing vessels. So, I wanted to ask
18	if you are able to access other databases, like
19	the Marine Index Bureau.
20	MS. CASE: Thank you. That's a great
21	question. What we're looking at casualties So,
22	one thing that I do in addition to confirming the

fatalities with the district coordinators is going to CGBI and look at the MISLE cubes. So, we can vessel event or personnel casualties, as well as notifications. So, once that's state registered that the vessel has had any interaction because of the casualty with the Coast Guard, they should show up in those cubes.

For fatalities, we tend to also look at if the vessel's service and class is undetermined or unspecified. We tend to also look at those to see those are commercial fishing vessels that hadn't necessarily been classified as such.

And for our injuries, when we're doing these special projects, we typically limit the cubes to just vessels that are in MSL that are associated -- what they are listed as, fish-catching vessels or other fishing industry vessels.

But for other information about vessels, other than, you know, Alaska I know has a public search database for their vessels, so I can find some information there. For example, the

1	study that I'm working on for predictors of future
	scuay chac I in working on for predictors of future
2	vessel disasters, that includes vessels that
3	haven't had any interaction with the Coast Guard
4	necessarily. So, they may not be in MSL
5	altogether.
6	So, that was one way to look at those
7	types of vessels that haven't had any interaction
8	with the Coast Guard.
9	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Alright, thank you
10	very much.
11	MS. CASE: Thanks. Thanks for dealing
12	with the formatting. I'll make sure that I can
13	send those slides on to Mr. Myers and they can be
14	shared so you can see those nice bar charts.
15	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yeah, I'm sure
16	we'd all be very interested in seeing those charts.
17	So, thank you.
18	We've only got about ten minutes, and
19	I'm advised that we need to clear the building by
20	5:00. And so, we'll just spend a few minutes here
21	at the end to, if you have any other comments, or
22	questions, or general ideas, or things that you

1	want to express to the group in a short order, we
2	can do that now. And we'll stop at around 4:15
3	and start to clean up and make our way out of the
4	building.
5	So, any committee members have anything
6	that they would like to bring up at this time?
7	Anybody in the public?
8	Yeah, okay. So, we'll move on to the
9	MOA charter update that was scheduled for
10	previously today that we missed.
11	MR. MYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12	I just wanted to provide an update on the status,
13	the current status, of the Coast Guard/NOAA MOA,
14	Memorandum of Agreement, charter.
15	As many of you may know, the original
16	NOAA charter was drafted, and implemented, and put
17	into place back in 1980. It is dated, very dated.
18	It's a very small, short document, and it gets
19	into basically it details chartering vessels
20	with fisheries agents, or NMFS observers, I should
21	say.
22	And what I wanted to do And when I

say NMFS, for the acronym, National Marine Fishery Service. And I wanted to just give you a brief update. We -- I can't go into in-depth, granular particulars with how the charter is shaping because we are still into discussions on the details.

But what I can say is, with NOAA and the Coast Guard, we've met, in the last six months, we've met numerous times, and we're picking that up in frequency. We met in the late spring. And this project was kind of dormant, as you may well know, for about a year. So, we had a vacancy in the division, several vacancies, which contributed to that.

But I will say that we've engaged with NOAA and the folks at Silver Springs, in the DC area. We've had several conference calls building up to face-to-face meeting that was actually two weeks ago. We made a lot of progress, and we've been doing a lot of back and forth on shaping the language of the text.

And basically -- and I just want to read off from my notes if I could. Again, the old

charter, very dated. So, we, as the scope of responsibilities of NONFS has shaped over the last 20, 30 years, it's been recognized that it's time to re-identify NOAA responsibilities and expectations, and also Coast Guard. And some of those may be just availabilities, and how we're going to their folks on charter vessels, and how do we document that.

When we gave out letters of inspection, the way we document these structured chartered has, again, taken a new form, and we want to look at that document, how we post electronically on our Coast Guard MSL database so it's also easier for sectors and sector commanders to make decisions on availability of getting exams done to help support these NOAA charters.

And we want to make sure the scope of the agreement is appropriate. But I say that -We want to make sure that the intent of the scope of this NOAA agreement is in line with 46C of our Part 28. And we don't want to stray away from that.

And that was the original intent to begin with

2.1

1	anyways. So, we do not want to stray from that.
2	So, the report to you is, we're making
3	real good progress, we're seeing light at the end
4	of the tunnel. As I said, about ten days ago, we
5	had a real good sit-down at Coast Guard
6	headquarters, and there was a significantly I
7	guess there was about six of us. It was a pretty
8	big group. But what I think is, as we move forward
9	in the next several months, there'll be more to
10	share on that.
11	And, Mr. Chair, that is my report on
12	the Coast Guard.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Mr.
14	Myers. Any questions for Mr. Myers? Tom Dameron.
15	MR. DAMERON: Thank you Mr. Chairman.
16	Tom Dameron. So, Mr. Myers, are we talking about
17	NOAA employees going on and chartering commercial
18	fishing vessels? Is what it is?
19	MR. MYERS: Well, we were about the
20	original MOA. And again, the spirit of this, or
21	the intent of this MOA is not changing. It's always
22	been about placing a NMFS agent, NMFS, NOAA NMFS,

1	on commercial fishing industry vessels to oversee
2	certain aspects of commercial fishing. And what
3	I mean by that is that they may have to charter,
4	they do charter, vessels for a purpose, and they
5	want to continue that. And so, yes.
6	MR. DAMERON: Okay. If can follow up,
7	Mr. Chairman.
8	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Go ahead, Tom.
9	MR. DAMERON: Is the Coast Guard
10	because it's a lot more than just NOAA that puts
11	researchers on commercial fishing vessels. So,
12	is the Coast Guard looking at what implications,
13	regulatory, that those situations propose?
14	MR. MYERS: To answer that, we are.
15	We're looking at all details. And going back to
16	we want to make sure this meets this MOA continues
17	to focus on Part 28 of, 46C of our Part 28, that
18	is dedicated to commercial fishing industry
19	vessels. And once you start straying away from
20	that, there's some concern because then there may
21	be things that are appropriate somewhere else.
22	MR. DAMERON: Yeah, my point is there's

1	other researchers going out on fishing vessels that
2	aren't going to be part of your MOA with NOAA.
3	MR. MYERS: Right. No, we're not.
4	MR. DAMERON: Okay.
5	MR. MYERS: This is Maybe I
6	misunderstood. We are not looking at non-NOAA
7	researchers on fishing vessels. This MOA only
8	applies to NOAA and how they deploy their
9	researchers onto vessels, and what the vessels can
10	be used for when they're under basically a NOAA
11	charter or a NOAA payment.
12	MR. DAMERON: So, my question would be,
13	if the Coast Guard will have an MOA with NOAA, will
14	there be any additional regulatory burdens on the
15	commercial fishing industry if we take researchers
16	out that are not NOAA researchers and do not fall
17	under your MOA?
18	MR. MYERS: Yes. You wouldn't be able
19	to that unless you're working with NOAA, or the
20	vessel's certificated or in that service.
21	So, with what you just said, if This
22	is Joe Myers speaking again. So, in other words,

if it was it veering outside of the scope -- because 1 this NOAA NMFS -- this Coast Guard NOAA MOA is --2 3 again, the focus is term 28. And so, if they're 4 doing research other than connected to commercial fishing, then it's probably more appropriate for 5 something else. Again, it would have strayed away 6 7 from the MOA in the first place. CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Woodley, are 8 9 you keyed up for questions? Okay, let's take Mr. 10 Hewlett first, and then you go, and then, kind of, let's -- you know, we're at 4:30, so just try to 11 12 be brief, or we can continue on tomorrow. 13 looks like Mr. Woodley's queued up behind you there. So, let's do Butch and then Charlie. Go ahead, 14 Mr. Hewlett. 15 16 MR. HEWLETT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. 17 I'm Glen Hewlett. And a question I have is, a lot 18 of the research is being done down in the Keys, 19 is being done with FWC people chartering boats. 20 So, I mean, do you have to be certificated or 21 something?

MR. MYERS:

22

This MOA is with NOAA NMFS.

1	It's with Coast Guard NOAA. And so, again, you
2	have to
3	CAPTAIN EDWARDS: This is Captain
4	Edwards. You have to look at each case individually,
5	see if the vessel is exceeding the commercial
6	business that it's engaging in. So, I don't know
7	what the details are on that. But, you know,
8	commercial fishing vessels are may receive a
9	document to they're documented for a specific
10	purpose, right. And you start to stray outside
11	of that, and you start getting into Inspected Vessel
12	Service. You have to be very careful.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: I think we have an
14	answer from District 7.
15	MR. PERKINS: This is Paul Perkins with
16	D8. The D8 and D7 are well aware of what's going
17	on with that research, and it's been covered by
18	the OCO.
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, thank you,
20	Paul. Does that answer your question, Butch?
21	Alright, Alan?
22	MR. DAVIS: This Alan Davis. I didn't

come prepared to make comments on this, but I think that there were lots of comments that can be referred back to 2016, at the meeting in Savannah.

The partnership between commercial fishing and NOAA, National Marine Fisheries, and a variety of other fishing research organizations, whether they're state-sponsored or university-sponsored, is a long-standing tradition that's vital to maintaining the health of our fisheries. Without fishermen helping researchers

Basically, they're looking in the wrong place anyway.

find the fish, they don't know how to find them.

This was kicked around a lot in 2016. It seems to me like the key issue was that somebody -- I'll try not to be extraneous -- somebody had the bright idea of requiring a fishing vessel to change its certification status to something other than a fishing vessel, in order to do research on a charter for National Marine Fisheries, which meant fishing.

So the whole idea was ludicrous, and

it hopefully has been rescinded by now. I would suggest is, well, if National Marine Fisheries, and NOAA, and the US Coast Guard are having meetings discussing this, it might be handy to have the few people who have participated in such charters and worked from the fishing vessel side, to be present and participating in the discussions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Alan. Chris, do you have a comment? MR. Woodley: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am Chris Woodley, with the Ground Fish Forum. Davis alluded to, the Fishing Vessel Safety Advisory Committee in 2016 did address this issue, and they did make a specific recommendation to the Coast Guard, which was passed unanimously. I don't feel it's necessary -- I see Captain Edwards is I'm assuming that this is all captured nodding. in the notes from that previous meeting. But the nuts and bolts of it were to,

again, continue to use Part 28 as the appropriate

regulatory packet, or regulatory standards for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

looking at these charter vessels to, as Mr. Davis also indicated, to also get industry input on this. And I believe, at the time, Captain Williams committed to making sure that there would be an opportunity for the industry and the public to comment before any such change in policy or change to the MOA would be finalized.

And then just one last thing, and I think it kind of gets to the issue of is this just for NOAA charters. The Coast Guard also does have a similar charter agreement with the International Pacific Halibut Commission. That is not a NOAA fishery, that's an IPHC fishery that actually predates the NOAA charter by about three years. State of Alaska also has something similar. I think it would be important to -- just for a point of clarification, that it's for fishery-related research, whether it's the IPHC, or whether it's the State Alaska, State of Washington, the rules should still be the same and would create consistency for all of those --

MR. MYERS: And then to underscore --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and that's why I emphasized several times -- and 1 I appreciate you saying this. We're underscoring 2 Part 28. 3 When we come down and look at that 4 vessel, and that sticker's on the starboard 5 bridgeway, that means -- that's the tempo. 6 7 And if it's anything but that, well, it may not be appropriate. And the locals, they 8 9 might have to use their discretion and say, you 10 know, we're going to address things different. 11 So, if the intent is Part 28, it's very, very clear. MR. Woodley: And so, just to wrap up 12 13 though, again, going back to industry input, I think that would help both NOAA and the Coast Guard come 14 up with a product that will, you know, when it comes 15 16 to the time we're called upon, that, you know, will kind of sail through, and we'll be able get a lot 17 more buy-in quickly. So, thank you. 18 19 JACOBSEN: Yeah, thanks, CHAIRMAN 20 Chris. Alright, thanks, everybody, for coming 21 today and participating, and we will see you

tomorrow at 8:00.

1 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

went off the record at 4:26 p.m.)