UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

+ + + + +

39th COMMERCIAL FISHING SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + +

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2018

+ + + + +

The Committee met at the United States Federal Center South, 4735 East Marginal Way South, Seattle, Washington, at 8:00 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, and Alternate Designated Federal Officer of the Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory Committee

ROB CRAIGHEAD, Fishing Vessel Safety Division ALAN ROBINSON, NIOSH

ALSO PRESENT:

ALAN DAVIS BRENT PAINE

CONTENTS

Call to Order and Welcome 5
U.S. Coast Guard/National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Training and Research Grant Programs
Industry Updates 34
Update on Training Requirements for Operators 46 USC 4502
New Construction Option for Vessels 50-79 feet Under Title 46 USC Section 4503
STCW-F International Maritime Organization Summary Update
Automatic and Identification System and "Fish Pingers"
Global Maritime Distress Safety System Update
Discussion on Presidential Executive Orders 13771 and 13783
Discussion and Final Comments from Public 210
Discussion and Motions from the Committee 211
Future Plans and Goals for the Committee 211
Next Committee Meeting, plans and Recommended Locations
Comments on the Meeting from Committee Members
Adiourn 221

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:00 a.m.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Good morning, everybody. Thank you for coming again. appreciate you all being here and your contributions yesterday. And hopefully we will have a fruitful day today.

The first agenda item is the NIOSH Grant Program. After that is done, we plan to go into our industry update. This is an opportunity to go around the table, if you have any concerns or issues in your areas of expertise that you want to bring to the attention of the group that would be the time to do it. And so, think about that. It's not exclusive of the next presentation. And so, we'll invite Mr. Myers to start off this segment.

MR. MYERS: Good morning, everyone. What we're going to talk about in our first topic this morning, we're going to talk about the Grants Program and the partnership that the Coast Guard is having right now with NIOSH. We recently signed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

an MOU with NIOSH to help deploy and shape and build the Grants Program, which is driven by the Coast Guard Authorization Act and the created funds to deploy towards the training and research grants. There's actually two of them.

And this is a long time coming, but we're thoroughly engaged with NIOSH right now. We've had a lot of conversations and meetings and building and laying the foundation of this probably since February of this year.

I'm going to get NIOSH on the line, Dr. Alan Robinson. He is the grants guy for NIOSH. He drives the main train on this, and he's invaluable with a lot of our questions with regards to grants and how we're going to deploy it and how we're going to promote it -- that's a big thing also -- and getting the announcements out, and engaging with stakeholders in grants.

So, what I'm going to do is lay the foundation and give you a little bit of background history of the grants. We'll go to our websites, and we have a little tab dedicated to the grants

and what that will show us, also, is little hyperlinks that may take us to, for example, last year's congressional report that highlights the particulars and the cases of the grants. I'm going to show you how to get to that. Because, next week, when you may forget about the conversations today, you can drill into it, and it's very easily-read documents that kind of set the tone for the whole program.

And we have just put grants information on grants.gov, which is where we post the announcement for the grants. That is being built right now as we speak.

Mr. Robinson, that we're going to hear from in a second, he is the primary point of contact for the build of this and maintaining the grants.gov information. So for example, people that are going to want to apply for these grants, be it research or training, he is going to be the primary resource fielding questions.

With that said, what we have also been partnering with NIOSH to date on is compiling an

1	archive of frequently asked questions. That's a
2	living, breathing animal, because, as we move
3	forward with this over the next couple of months,
4	questions are going to pop up, and then, we're going
5	to populate it, so other people can read the same
6	responses. I'm going to show you where that's at
7	also.
8	So, that being said, I'm going to kick
9	this off, and again, lay the foundation, a little
10	bit of history, a little bit of the phases of grants,
11	because we just don't give grants. There's actual
12	phases legally we have to abide by. And then we'll
13	talk a little about the MOU, and we'll hand it off
14	to Mr. Robinson.
15	If you're able to maybe dial him up now,
16	if possible?
17	MR. ROBINSON: Good morning. Alan
18	Robinson.
19	MR. CRAIGHEAD: Good morning, Mr.
20	Robinson. This is Rob Craighead from the Fishing
21	Vessel Safety Division. I'm here with Mr. Joe
22	Myers. Mr. Myers has briefly introduced the

1	federal grants program and I'm going to hand you
2	back over to him in a second. Thanks for joining
3	us this morning.
4	MR. ROBINSON: Absolutely. Glad to do
5	it.
6	MR. MYERS: And good morning, Alan.
7	You can hear me fine? This is Joe Myers speaking.
8	MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Joe, I can hear
9	you.
10	MR. MYERS: Okay, great. Okay. So,
11	I'm going to kick it off. And as I just told to
12	the folks here, I'm going to give a little bit about
13	the history and the phases of the grants. Then,
14	we'll probably go to the website, and then, chime
15	you in for a comment also.
16	MR. ROBINSON: Okay. I'll be on mute
17	while you're speaking.
18	MR. MYERS: Yes, sir.
19	So, the Coast Guard Authorization Act
20	of 2010, as amended by the Howard Coble Coast Guard
21	and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, directed
22	the Secretary to establish a Fishing Safety

Grant This Training Program. program, as authorized, was intended to provide funding to municipalities, port authorities, other appropriate public entities, not-for-profit organizations, and other qualified persons to conduct commercial fishing vessel safety training for vessel operators and crew members. The program also was authorized for the purchase of safety and training aids equipment for the use commercial fishing vessel safety training programs.

The Act also directed the establishment Fishing Safety Research Program. This program, as authorized, was intended to provide funding to individuals in academia, members of nonprofit organizations, and businesses involved in fishing and maritime matters, and other persons with expertise in commercial fishing safety. The funding would be used to conduct research on methods of improving the safety of the commercial fishing industry, including vessel design, emergency and survival equipment, enhancement of vessel

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

monitoring systems, communication devices, design technologies, and severe weather detection.

The Act stipulated that the grants were to be awarded on a competitive basis and would cover up to 75 percent of the cost of any training or research activity. The Act authorized appropriations of \$3 million for each grant program each fiscal year from 2010 to 2017. And we would like to note that, until recently, the Coast Guard did not establish a training or research grant program because the Agency did not receive specific appropriations for these programs until 2017. so, we just want to make that clear. And by the way, that is also laid out, those details, in the report to Congress that I'll share with you also.

So, Public Law 115-31 included \$6 million for the two grants programs. Funding's are available through September of 2019.

Okay. So, the phases. Phase 1 is the pre-award phase, and this encompasses budget appropriations and program authorizations. It also details the Notice of Funding Opportunity and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the approval and clearance of the Notice of Funding 1 Opportunity, or NOFO, posted to grants.gov, which 2 we'll take you to in a little bit. It will be 3 basically a hyperlink, and we'll show you where 4 these postings are hung electronically. 5 So, that's the initial phase 1 Okay. 6 7 construct, and we're in phase 1 right now. The other phases, again, take shape as we move forward. 8 9 So, when we move into phase 2, the award 10 phase, that's when we have the award selection. 11 Grant applications will be reviewed and rated for awards on the basis of the intent and value to the 12 13 program, as set forth in the authorization for the 14 program. Award notification. Award grantees 15 16 will receive a letter stating which project or 17 projects are funded, the award amount, and the 18 assigned grant technical manager. 19 acceptance. After Award mutual acceptance of the revised proposal, the formal 20 21 grant is drafted and signed. Then, we move into

That is payments and drawdown, financial

phase 3.

monitoring, submissions of quarterly reports from the entity that was awarded the funds. That takes place. Programming, monitoring. This includes review of the grantee's work plan and review of the grantees submitted progress reports. So, it's oversight.

Technical assistance. Such assistance may involve concerned personnel and/or grant technical managers answering questions, fielding questions from time to time, and audits. Generally, audits are required only if a single entity is awarded \$750,000 or more. However, the Coast Guard does expect to conduct audits of all awardees periodically, keeping the pulse of the program.

Lastly, phase 4, which is the closeout.

Pre-closeout notifications provided as required.

Final reports, the Coast Guard will create programmatic and final reports as needed and close out notification. The notice will indicate the period of performance as closed. This lists any remaining funds that will be needed to be

de-obligated, if any, and address the requirements of maintaining the grant's records.

So, with regards to the MOU between -- and by the way, these phases that I just detailed out, I just hit the bulleted points but when one goes to the grants or the congressional report, as I said, there's a lot of good details in it. It lays out all these different phases. So, if you want to soak them in and read them and then field questions as they may come along, we'll be standing by throughout this whole process.

An MOU, or Memorandum of Understanding, partnership was signed between the Coast Guard and NIOSH in the spring of 2018. NIOSH was identified as the ideal partner to lead efforts in administering these grants due to their in-depth expertise and history in grants management and facilitation.

The purpose of the MOU is to define roles and responsibilities between the Coast Guard and NIOSH in managing and deploying various grant processes and phases. So, for example, when we

go to the MOU, there will be specific segments that will just detail out, hey, what's the role of the Coast Guard in this and what is the role and expectations of NIOSH? And sometimes there's a blending of both, obviously, because we're both major stakeholders.

Now the grants.gov site, which I think we'll take you to right now -- now, first, I'll just back up just a second, and I want to make sure I spoke of all my talking points here.

We of the Deputy of Commandant Operations, the acronym being DCO, this is our official website that the Commercial Vessel Compliance has generated, and there's many, many layers to this. You can see, when we go to this site, we have ports they control, we have areas domestic vessels dedicated to and offshore compliance, but we also have our swim lane, being fishing vessel safety.

So, if Rob will click on that. And by the way, this site is open to everyone to go to.

Some Coast Guard portal sites are restricted to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

who can access them and who can't, but this one is ideal for the public, this Committee, everyone to go to get information.

And we have just started building this over the last, I'd say the last year. And you may remember, back in the day, we had the FishSafe site, still had FishSafeWest for D13 that sets the tone for much of the program. But we have migrated the old FishSafe content that CVC-3, my office, used to manage, and we've populated it here at this site.

And before you go today, we're going to give you this link, so you can get to it. But it is -- Rob, he clicked "fishing vessel safety," and then, you get a dropdown tab. And we have a lot of categories here.

Just to kind of show you the capabilities or the search engine, Rob, could you show them where we would find our District Coordinators, because we talked to them yesterday?

So, we -- "find an examiner" -- he clicked on that tab, and this will populate. This is updated frequently, every several months, when we need to.

And this will give you, the public, everyone, access to numbers and emails -- phone numbers, emails of our District Coordinators.

There's Dan Hardin. We have Charlie out in D14.

And so, if you need to get a hold of the Coordinators or the local examiners, it's here.

Okay?

Go all the way down, if you wouldn't mind. Okay. And by the way with headquarters, if you have a need to just send us some kind of word or question, we're here also. So, we're not hiding.

And so, then, we go back here, and now we get to the grants. Let's maybe go to the grants, if you wouldn't mind. This is federal grants, and you see that dropdown tab?

And then, since we are in phase 1 of this process, and we are building this -- what I would say is, if there's something here -- and we always say this -- if you don't see something here that you want to see or we're just missing some element, let us know. Maybe we haven't thought

about it, and we could, more than likely, hang it here. And this isn't just for us, it's for you. So, you're the customer, and we're here for the customer.

So, for one, could you please click on the "Report to Congress" that I've been talking about? And we go to the report to Congress, which was, I believe, in October of last year, 2017, last year.

What this does is this sets the tone and the foundation and the particulars of this grants program. If a general person is even remotely interested in these grants, they go to this. This is going to spell out a lot of detail and answer a lot of questions, specifically the phases, and some of the background knowledge. And it does talk about our partnership with NIOSH and why we deem them a very valuable partner in this. Okay?

And it also gives you cites, CFR cites.

You'll see littered through this key Code of

Federal Regulations cites -- or I'm sorry -- U.S.

Code cites. Correction, U.S. Code cites. And then, you can go to that part of the U.S. Code and see where that spells out the actual details of this grant that transpired from the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010.

Okay. So, we won't read this because it's there for your viewing pleasure at a later date. But, if you wouldn't mind, Rob, if we could just go back one? And please click on the memorandum, the MOU with NIOSH.

Now what this does, we talked a little bit about the roles and responsibilities between the Coast Guard and NIOSH, the partnership. This launched last year, May -- 3 of May.

And so, what I would encourage everyone to do is look at this also, if you're remotely interested, because this spells out not only stakeholders and roles and responsibilities, but at the tail end I think it gives you a couple of point of contact names. I'm not sure where that is, but, yes, if you come down just a little bit? Yes, there we go. And these are one of our prime

NIOSH point of contacts also. That's Dr. Jennifer Lincoln, and that's my office right there. Okay?

And then, there's legal jargon.

Okay. And then, let me see, if you could please click on "USC 4502"? Because not everyone has in our back pocket or at the office a copy of the U.S. Code. So, what this does is this is just kind of a scanned version. You can always go to the electronic version of the U.S. Code. But what this does is this lays out in black and white what the U.S. Code says about the grants training and research, so there's no confusion. Okay?

And if we could, lastly, I think what we're going to do is, I've talked a little bit about grants.gov. As I said, there's going to be some frequently asked questions that will come from time to time. We're going to take what is hung -- why don't we just go to grants.gov? There's a hyperlink.

When we go to grants.gov, this is where the details are hung. You'll see, for the funding,

the opportunity title is in that second lane, the number, RFAOH1904. If we click on that, please?

This is the announcement here that will get into the research grant. And so, a lot of this language, when you do your homework and read, again, the documents that I just showed you previously, a lot of this verbiage here will seem familiar because it spells it out again.

And there are different tabs that will be in the near future populated that will highlight, hey, what we need in the package, history, forecast.

And so, I don't talk out of line on this, I want to go to the technical expert, Mr. Robinson. And he's going to talk a little more on this.

But what I wanted to do before I handed it off to him, I wanted to come all the way -- if you wouldn't mind, Rob, going all the way down to the bottom? And you'll see right there, the grantor contact information. This is the prime point of contact to field questions if we are unclear on something. And if anything, that allows us to kind of streamline our questions and go to

1	one source, so 16 people aren't fielding questions.
2	And then, as appropriate if, for example, Mr.
3	Robinson couldn't answer a question maybe it's
4	Coast Guard related well, we may field it out
5	to the appropriate source. But his email, CDC
6	email, and phone number is listed there also.
7	So, what I would say, if you ever have
8	a hard time finding this portion of the link, you
9	go to grants.gov. And then, with the search engine
10	all the way in the upper right-hand corner, you
11	simply could type in "commercial fishing," and it's
12	going to take you right to this. I've tried it
13	and it works.
14	Dr. Robinson?
15	MR. ROBINSON: Hello.
16	MR. MYERS: Yes, sir. Joe Myers
17	speaking, and I think I am ready to hand this off
18	to you for comment, if you would like to comment
19	on any of this.
20	MR. ROBINSON: Sure.
21	MR. MYERS: Yes, sir.
22	MR. ROBINSON: Sure, I'll make a few

comments and I'll be very brief. Can you hear me?

MR. MYERS: We can, very good.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay, great.

So, let me just mention a couple of things. We're very excited, NIOSH is very excited to be working with the Coast Guard on this effort. Either most of you or all of you are acquainted with Captain Jennifer Lincoln, and she is the NIOSH subject matter expert in commercial fishing safety, commercial fishing occupational safety and health. And she will be engaged in this effort in that capacity.

NIOSH has long history of occupational safety and health research in a wide range of areas. And the Institute has a strong extramural research and training program. Some of you in the room are probably familiar with our Training Project Grant Program, and some of you familiar with the research arm, mav be the extramural research arm of NIOSH, and some of you may actually be funded under a research grant or a training grant. I don't know for sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	But I've been here since I came in
2	2006, managed a variety of portfolios, including
3	AG, forestry, fishing, and several others. And
4	now I manage the office, and it's been a fascinating
5	journey because we get to deal with so many
6	different subject matter areas. So, we're looking
7	forward to this.
8	And I think, Joe, what we'll do is you
9	keep track of the questions, whether we can answer
10	them or not today, keep track of them. And if
11	they're not on our FAQ list, we will add them.
12	And I have made a couple of notes to follow up with
13	you after the meeting for a couple of questions
14	that we should add to our list.
15	MR. MYERS: That sounds great.
16	MR. ROBINSON: Okay, that's it.
17	MR. MYERS: Okay. Are there any
18	questions with what we've just laid out? Yes?
19	It looks like we have one question
20	coming up.
21	MR. DAMERON: Mr. Chairman, Thomas
22	Dameron.

1	So, I'm curious, what is the timing
2	between phase 1 and phase 2? When might the Coast
3	Guard and NIOSH be finishing up phase 1 and starting
4	phase 2?
5	MR. MYERS: Mr. Robinson, the question
6	is with regards to the timing. Can you elaborate
7	on the timing between phase 1 and phase 2
8	logistically?
9	MR. ROBINSON: Sure. Yes. So, those
10	phases cover a wide range of activities. So, maybe
11	I'll just cut to the chase and that the next critical
12	event that will happen that I think all or most
13	of you are interested in knowing is when these
14	announcements will be published, so you can see
15	those and start working on your applications.
16	Hold on one second here, let me stop
17	this call from ringing.
18	And the plan, the current timing is that
19	the research announcement is expected to be
20	published in early December, and the training
21	announcement will follow closely behind that.
22	MR. MYERS: Thank you.

Thank you.

1	MR. ROBINSON: Okay.
2	MR. MYERS: Did that answer
3	MR. ROBINSON: And let me just comment,
4	too, that, Joe, a question for you. Did you show
5	them the grants.gov website?
6	MR. MYERS: I sure did. Yes.
7	MR. ROBINSON: Thank you. Okay,
8	great.
9	So, when these announcements are
10	published, they will be posted or, as Joe said,
11	hung right here under the "Related Documents" tab,
12	and that's where you'll find them.
13	And then, when they are published, I
14	think we're planning on sending out a pretty large
15	email to folks that we know are interested. And
16	that probably includes everybody in the room there,
17	or most people in the room, I imagine.
18	So, we'll be doing some outreach and
19	communication to inform people broadly when these
20	announcements are published.
21	MR. MYERS: And with that said this
22	is Joseph Myers speaking again with that said,

1	what we will attempt to do here is get point of
2	contacts or a list of names and contact information
3	for that announcement. There's a possibility,
4	because I know you have NIOSH has generated a
5	pretty hefty list of recipients for this broadcast.
6	And we'll provide to you extra names to make sure
7	that they're captured in that list.
8	MR. ROBINSON: Right. We will
9	disseminate that information as widely as we can.
10	So, if you're interested, maybe here's
11	a hint for the public in the room. If you're not
12	sure if you're on a list to receive this
13	information, you should make that known before you
14	guys end your meeting or before you guys go your
15	separate ways, before you all go your separate ways.
16	MR. MYERS: Are there any other
17	questions?
18	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Can you just
19	assume that the entire Committee is interested and
20	put us all on the list?
21	MR. MYERS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair, we'll
22	make sure that happens.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Any other
2	questions? Comments from the public? Questions?
3	(No response.)
4	MR. MYERS: Mr. Robinson, I think we
5	are wrapping this up. There are no more questions,
6	and we appreciate you opening up your schedule.
7	MR. ROBINSON: Okay. Thanks for
8	taking it easy on me, and I will certainly be
9	available to answer questions as they come up.
10	If you have other questions that are on your mind,
11	let Joe know and if we don't have an answer for
12	you in the FAQs, we will put our heads together
13	and provide an answer for you.
14	Thank you very much.
15	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Any other
16	questions about the website or anything? Mr.
17	Boehmer?
18	MR. BOEHMER: Kris Boehmer.
19	I'm just trying to get on the website.
20	It's www.dco.uscg.mil. But where do I find the
21	part where I'm not seeing the same screen you
22	are.

1	MR. CRAIGHEAD: See "Our
2	Organization"?
3	MR. BOEHMER: Yes.
4	MR. CRAIGHEAD: Go down to where it
5	says, "CG-5P". Scroll over to "Inspections &
6	Compliance". And then you'll see
7	MR. BOEHMER: Okay, I go down to which
8	one? The third one down?
9	MR. CRAIGHEAD: "Inspections &
LO	Compliance".
L1	MR. BOEHMER: Okay, yes.
L2	MR. CRAIGHEAD: And you get into a
L3	dropdown. You'll have to go down to "Commercial
L 4	Vessel Compliance". Click on that.
L5	MR. BOEHMER: Well, that's easy.
L 6	(Laughter.)
L7	MR. MYERS: If I could, we'll make it
L8	even easier. Let's give him the FishSafe
L9	remember that condensed
20	MR. CRAIGHEAD: Yes, I wish I had it
21	in front of me, but I don't.
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)

1	MR. BOEHMER: I like this whole document
2	searching area but I just couldn't find where you
3	were. Thank you.
4	MR. CRAIGHEAD: We have a much shorter
5	website address we can send.
6	MR. MYERS: I think we have it here.
7	MR. CRAIGHEAD: That will make things
8	a lot easier.
9	MR. MYERS: If you can bear with me,
10	I think I've got it right here. That's a good
11	question.
12	MR. BOEHMER: Thank you.
13	MR. MYERS: Okay, I've got it right
14	here.
15	Not to interrupt, but just for
16	everyone, if you want to write this down, I believe
17	this is a little more condensed than what we used
18	to have. It's https://www.dco.uscg.mil/fishsafe.
19	And so, not to cut you off, Rob, but
20	what I'd ask, if you wouldn't mind getting out of
21	this and maybe type that in up there, so everyone
22	can see the way it should look. And then, we'll

hit "enter," and that should populate. 1 So, https://www.dco.uscq.mil/fishsafe. 2 3 Again, if we can ever shrink this 4 shorter, by all means we will. But what we did, we knew it was long. So, we kind of condensed 5 things, and that's as condensed as we can get it 6 7 for right now, yes. CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Other questions? 8 Yes? 9 10 MR. RANKS: Yes, Mr. Chair. Craig Ranks with D13. 11 12 Just to make it a little easier, on 13 Google, if you type in "CG-CVC-3," it will bring it up and it will get you to the link there. 14 The other thing is I think we have a 15 16 link to it directly from FishSafeWest. So, you 17 can get to it that way. MR. CRAIGHEAD: Most of the stuff I've 18 19 got here is pretty self-explanatory. But I'll give 20 you an example. Yesterday we were talking about 21 fire extinguishers, the whole fire extinguisher 22 conversation, and it got mentioned the Policy Letter that was sent out -- what, a year or two ago, Captain?

CAPT. EDWARDS Yes.

MR. CRAIGHEAD: And it's not on here, but this is a place where those kind of questions will pop up. We can add it to this website. So, I guess that's the point. If you have questions, or we're getting a number of questions on the same topic that are of interest to everyone in the community, we can post them here. So, like Mr. Myers mentioned earlier, it's a living, breathing website, and it will continue to grow. As long as you're interested in participation, that process continues.

Again, everything else here is self-explanatory. Finding an examiner, look at the grants. All of the meeting minutes are posted here. That's all the previous year listed there and associated documents. Training information is here. Anyway, I won't give all the details here, but it's a useful site. Again, that's what we have here.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Will there be a
2	place where the public can access things like
3	approved courses for fishing vessel safety
4	training?
5	MR. CRAIGHEAD: So, that will be the
6	National Maritime Center.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Accepted courses?
8	MR. CRAIGHEAD: Yes, but I think in
9	that case NMC speaks specifically to those courses.
10	But you can get in through this DCO site to the
11	National Maritime Center.
12	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: So, I would be able
13	to access Karen's organization through this site?
14	MR. CRAIGHEAD: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, good.
16	MR. CRAIGHEAD: Yes, through the DCO
17	site. So, you may have to do a search specifically.
18	And again, you can run through the same thing with
19	Google, like Joe mentioned, and it will get you
20	there. But, again, National Maritime Center would
21	be your site.
22	MR. MYERS: Mr. Chairman, I think you

1	got me thinking as you made that question. We can
2	look into maybe adding to our training dropdown
3	tab and maybe creating a hyperlink. So, if you
4	have questions on the status of an accepted course,
5	for example, then they go to our site. You click
6	it, and that will launch you over to NMC. That
7	may make it easier for everyone. So, we'll jot
8	that down as a takeaway. CHAIRMAN
9	JACOBSEN: Great. Thanks.
10	MR. MYERS: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. Any other
12	questions or comments?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right. Thank
15	you very much. Okay so, we will go into the
16	industry updates. So, this is an opportunity for
17	you to discuss/raise any issues that you're
18	involved in, in your particular area of expertise
19	and association. So, if there's a particular issue
20	or several issues that you would like to discuss,
21	now would be the time to do it.
22	I think I'll start with Karen. Do you

have anything, Karen, from your perspective that you think needs to -- and then, I'll go around the table here.

MS. CONRAD: Hi. This is Karen.

The only thing I would like to maybe update is we've got our two-day course accepted, as we talked about yesterday. But, moving forward, NPFVOA has a four-hour stability course that's Coast Guard approved. I have given that to Gerry for review, and we're matching that course up with the objectives that came out of the Committee. So, we could resubmit that and try to get that accepted, rather than approved.

And then, we also have a collision avoidance navigation course that's already Coast Guard approved. And Gerry and I are working on that, too, to do the same thing, to make sure our objectives are covered in that course and try to get that one accepted, rather than approved.

So, we are moving forward with all the other courses that are in the auth act.

Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. Thanks,
2	Karen.
3	Mr. Hockema?
4	MR. HOCKEMA: Mr. Chairman, if I could,
5	I would like to defer.
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, no problem.
7	Mr. Dameron?
8	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9	This is Thomas Dameron.
10	Yes, in the New England and
11	Mid-Atlantic area, we had a recent development with
12	traffic corridors through wind energy areas. And
13	these traffic corridors are being proposed by
14	fishermen and wind developers, and they're being
15	considered by BOEM without any in-depth special
16	spatial use or historic traffic analysis.
17	I feel, as a fishing industry
18	representative, and those that I represent feel,
19	that this is a major safety issue. With the
20	introduction of wind turbines, these traffic
21	corridors will be particularly confined and busy
22	areas of traffic.

The traffic corridors will not have the same regulatory weight as traffic lanes and traffic separation schemes, as we all know in the marine industry how to handle meeting situations in traffic lanes and traffic separation schemes.

The COLREGS Rule No. 10, which precludes a vessel engaged in fishing from impeding the passage of any other vessel following a traffic lane, will not apply to fishing or traveling within the wind energy area traffic corridors. This will likely lead to confusion as to which vessel is actually the stand-on vessel and which vessel is the give-way vessel.

30 CFR, Part 585 of renewable energy regulations requires that BOEM will ensure that any activities authorized in this part are carried out in a manner that provides for safety. It also requires that BOEM coordinate with relative federal agencies, including, in particular, those agencies involved in planning activities that are undertaken to avoid this type of conflict.

And the fishing industry in my area

1	believes that the United States Coast Guard is the
2	one that they should be coordinating with to make
3	sure that these types of conflicts are mitigated
4	among users and to maximize the benefits of all
5	users of the Continental Shelf.
6	So, I have a motion this morning, and
7	it reads that:
8	"The Commercial Fishing Safety
9	Advisory Committee recommends the Coast Guard
10	coordinate with BOEM in developing routes, as
11	appropriate, through all wind energy area leases.
12	As part of this process, the Coast Guard should
13	look at historical vessel tracked data, both AIS
14	and VMS" which is vessel monitoring
15	system "from both fishing vessels and commercial
16	vessels.
17	"The Coast Guard should propose to BOEM
18	routes through the wind energy areas that follow
19	very nearly the routes currently being used by both
20	fishing vessels and commercial vessels alike as
21	they transit the area.

"The Coast Guard should work with BOEM

1	towards finding routing solutions with appropriate
2	traffic lane widths, setbacks, and areas of
3	separation that balance the many competing demands,
4	will ensure an appropriate level of safety, and
5	will avoid impediments to vessels traveling along
6	the designated routes through the wind energy
7	areas."
8	And that's the conclusion of my motion.
9	And if there's any questions or discussion
10	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: A motion has been
11	made. Is there a second?
12	PARTICIPANT: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Boehmer?
14	MR. BOEHMER: Do you have a copy of the
15	motion, Karen?
16	MR. DAMERON: She will.
17	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. Any
18	discussion?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: The maker has
21	already spoken to this motion. Do you have
22	anything to add?

MR. DAMERON: I think that pretty much covers it. The fishermen and the wind developers and BOEM are getting together as a group and they're talking about these traffic corridors. And these traffic corridors are not going to have any regulatory significance.

So, what the fear is is these areas, being high fishing areas, that fishermen could congregate within these traffic corridors, and commercial and fishing traffic that are trying to use those corridors for safe transit will not be able to do so. It will be confusing if the vessel that's fishing is the give-way vessel, which is not the case because it's just a traffic corridor, not a traffic separation scheme or not a recognized traffic lane. The vessel within the lane actually is the give-way vessel, and it's going to be very confusing.

There's been no spatial and use analysis done in this area to see what the proper width of the lanes, to make sure, is there enough vessel traffic that you need widths enough that

2.1

ships can pass tugs and tows? Do you need a 1 separation lane? Do you need setbacks from the 2 actual wind turbines? 3 None of that has been looked at, and 4 the fishing industry doesn't think that they are 5 the proper ones to be negotiating with BOEM and 6 7 negotiating with the wind developers on what these should look like. The Coast Guard should do the 8 9 analysis and consult with BOEM and give BOEM 10 recommendations that come from the analysis of good information. 11 12 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Tom. 13 I think we're ready to vote. If you could read the motion again? 14 I sure will. 15 MR. DAMERON: 16 "The Commercial Fishing Safety 17 Advisory Committee recommends the U.S. Coast Guard 18 coordinate with BOEM in developing routes, 19 appropriate, through all wind energy area leases. 20 As part of this process, the Coast Guard should 21 look at historical vessel tracked data, both AIS 22 and VMS, from both fishing vessels and commercial

1	vessels.
2	"The Coast Guard should propose to BOEM
3	routes through the wind energy areas that follow
4	very nearly the routes currently being used by both
5	fishing vessels and commercial vessels alike as
6	they transit the area.
7	"The Coast Guard should work with BOEM
8	towards finding routing solutions with appropriate
9	traffic lane widths, setbacks, and areas of
10	separation that balance the many competing demands,
11	will ensure an appropriate level of safety, and
12	will avoid impediments to vessels traveling along
13	designated routes through wind energy areas."
14	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Tom.
15	All right. We'll do it by a raise of
16	hands.
17	All in favor?
18	(Show of hands.)
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you. Any
20	opposed?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, it's

1	unanimous. Thank you very much.
2	MR. DAMERON: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Is there anything
4	else that you have, Tom.
5	MR. DAMERON: No, sir.
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right. Thank
7	you.
8	Mr. Londrie?
9	MR. LONDRIE: I have nothing at this
10	time, Mr. Chairman.
11	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you very
12	much.
13	Mr. Boehmer?
14	MR. BOEHMER: I'm not sure how relevant
15	this is, but I'm concerned with the implementation
16	of tier 4 engines. And I guess a surveyor or an
17	architect could answer this better. But will an
18	older vessel be required to put in a tier 4 engine
19	if they repower? If so, are we addressing the heat
20	that's going to be built up, and the exemptions?
21	I'm seeing a potential fire risk, is what I'm
22	concerned with, and how we look at that as a

1	committee.
2	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Mr.
3	Boehmer.
4	Are there any questions or comments?
5	MR. HOCKEMA: Mr. Chairman?
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, Mr. Hockema?
7	MR. HOCKEMA: This is a subject that
8	I've been curious about myself. I hate to say that
9	I've kind of given up on understanding it. So,
10	I continue to defer to the major engine
11	manufacturers to provide reliable information on
12	that.
13	We have, I think, two repowering
14	projects now where we are removing existing engines
15	from trawlers and putting in substantially larger
16	engines. I would say that the engine size is not
17	putting us into a major conversion category from
18	a Coast Guard regulatory standpoint, but it is
19	touching on the EPA standards for exhaust
20	emissions.
21	And one of the vessels I know is able
22	to and it's not from my consulting side but

one of the vessels they put in a tier 3 engine, 1 where the original engine was a tier 1, I believe. 2 3 The other vessel is putting a tier 4 engine in. And again, we've kind of given up on trying to 4 understand the matrix on this, and we've deferred 5 just to the engine manufacturers. 6 7 Thanks. CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Great. Thanks 8 9 for your comments. 10 Mr. Derie? Yes, Joe Derie. 11 MR. DERIE: 12 It's been my experience it depends on 13 where the vessel is going to be operating, whether it's going to need the tier 4 engines or not. 14 just surveyed a tugboat down in San Francisco that 15 16 had it, but it's moving someplace else, will not 17 need it. That's not part of why the guy is buying 18 It depends on where it's going to be operating. 19 With regards to the heat buildup, you 20 know, that comes down to the architects and the 21 manufacturers to be sure that's taken care of when

they do the installation.

22

It should be done

1	properly and take that into effect. I can see where
2	that would happen with these engines. But, again,
3	it's the yard and the naval architects and the
4	engine manufacturers to take that into
5	consideration when they get that thing done.
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you very
7	much. Appreciate your comments.
8	Any other comments?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: No motions? Do we
11	need a motion on that?
12	(Laughter.)
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. Mr.
14	Hockema?
15	MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16	I'm referring to the Tasks and Recommendations
17	list that was provided to us for the meeting here.
18	So, I have some concerns here.
19	The Committee over the years has made
20	numerous recommendations to the Coast Guard, and
21	some of them have been acted on fairly swiftly and
22	some are not acted on for many years.

So, there are two groups here that I'm 1 curious about. One is the new vessel construction 2 3 for vessels 50-feet length and less. There were some reference numbers; 13G through 13I address 4 new vessel construction and standards for such. 5 And it was recommended that the Coast Guard develop 6 some standards in addition to those set forth in 7 33 CFR 183. 8 And I see there's a note in the NPRM 9 10 on this. And I apologize, I didn't read the NPRM that this is referring to. 11 I'm wondering if 12 Captain Edwards or Mr. Myers could comment on where 13 those are, particularly 13G and 13H. And again, I'm only looking for 14 general comment on this. I'll go ahead while 15 16 they're taking a look at that. 17 My next comment is on -- again, it's 18 the equivalent class issue. And I believe Mr. 19 Myers indicated that they are working on this. 20 All I would say is that industry does need some 21 guidance on this, not on which equivalents are

to

class,

equivalent

considered

22

the

but

documentation of such and whether documentation is necessary.

As a licensed professional engineer, I'm obligated under state regulations to design to an accepted standard. For most of what we do, an accepted standard is available. In this case, it could be classification rules or Coast Guard regulations, or even another standard that we feel has become an industry standard by default.

So, don't have a problem with we determining what an acceptable standard is, but we would like guidance from the Coast Guard, recommendations on how to document equivalency. We have our own methods right now for doing it, but we would like the naval architect community to have some quidance from the Coast Guard on how to document this. Again, we've done it ourselves already. We're not worried about us. We're concerned about the industry in general.

And if we compare this to some other issues -- for instance, stability documentation -- the Coast Guard has guidance for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

presenting stability calculations to them. It's fairly flexible. It's not super-rigid, because they understand that different naval architects may have a little bit different way of doing things. Different industries have different needs as far as what their guidance is.

So, it's already been done in other areas. Anyway, I'll stop there on that.

The third thing, and the final thing,
I'm concerned about is, and I think this is
something that the entire Committee is concerned
about -- is that the Alternate Safety Compliance
Program was essentially halted recently in lieu,
I think, in favor of some voluntary standards.
I really want to see that program carried through.

And a lot of work has been done on the ASCP, by the Committee here, by the Coast Guard, by a lot of industry people that are not here. It's probably the most important safety issue we have as far as vessel construction. Because the real world has a lot of older boats out there, and we will continue to have those older boats. We

have boats in the fleet that are -- well, some of them are a hundred years old, of course. But, by and large, the fleet is between 20 and 50 years old, and those alternative safety standards are extremely important.

We have a number of vessels that are not maintained correctly. They're out there fishing right now and they're not safe. The private surveying industry has not -- this isn't a thing against marine surveyors at all. It's more a matter of the bar is set so low for existing vessels that there's been some tragedies that are totally unnecessary.

And this is something that's relatively unique to our commercial fishing industry. We don't have this in many of the other industries, commercial industries. Our commercial fishing industry, as far as regulatory standards, is far behind Europeans and developed Asian nations.

If you take any of the European countries, any of the developed Asian countries, Japan, Australia, you know, these places, their

standards are higher than ours. And I'm very concerned, as a career naval architect -- I'm approaching 40 years in the industry; I wouldn't trade it for anything as far as a profession -- but I'm very concerned that our progress for improving our construction standards has been very slow.

I hear a lot of comments from fishing vessel owners that they can't get crew because now our younger generation in many cases hasn't been trained in blue collar jobs or grown up around them, and these kinds of things. But one of the reasons we can't get crew is some of the vessels I think most of us in this Committee wouldn't want to work on. And it may be related to safety issues. It may be related to just the quality of the vessel and its cleanliness, or lack thereof.

This is a minority of vessels. Don't get me wrong. It's definitely a minority of vessels. But we have to get this Alternative Safety Compliance Program off the ground, and its worth whatever effort it takes to get it done.

So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Mr. I appreciate those remarks. 2 Hockema. 3 Mr. Myers? 4 MR. MYERS: I do want to respond to That was a lot of information, and I want 5 that. to make sure that we -- part of this I was going 6 7 to address with my next construction presentation, as you know. So, when we go over this, some things 8 9 may be a bit redundant. But I was jotting down 10 a couple of notes. 11 And, yes, you did comment on the 12 enhanced oversight program. This went in effect, 13 obviously, January, I believe, of '17. It offers best practices and guidance to the commercial 14 fishing industry for commercial fishing vessels. 15 16 The Coast Guard, we feel there's a lot 17 of tools that the industry can use with regards 18 to vessel construction and adopting those tools 19 to help along the way. And going back to the oversight of a 20 21 licensed person to oversee, a state licensed 22 person, architect, naval architect, to oversee the

construction of a vessel, the Coast Guard, we are not in a position where we have oversight on many uninspected commercial fishing vessels. So, we are leaning on those credentials, and the flexibility to use those credentials, to accomplish the mission at hand.

And just along with that said, just to say that there is a lot of tools out there. We have NVIC 7-68 for construction, IX standards, ASME 9 standards for pressure vessel welding, for example, ABYC standards. There's a lot of standards out there.

And I've spoken in-depth with the Marine Safety Center on this topic. I don't want to speak for them. I think we can get further comment from them for more detailed questions. But I think, overarching, the Marine Safety Center, the Coast Guard feels that there's a lot of assets out there to be used and they are hiring key persons to use those tools.

That being said, along with this enhanced oversight program and your concerns, there

may be a solution if industry wishes to partner up and provide further best practices specifically on this topic. I know that the EOP document here spans many topics, several topics, and maybe this -- I'm saying "maybe"; I'm throwing this out there -- that we can tighten up the topic and address the issue at hand by way of perhaps a Committee work group or an industry-driven work group that we may detail the concerns a little more. That may be the solution.

I think there's, again, a lot of assets out there that could be tapped into, but maybe a formalized recommendation to the issue at hand may be the route to go.

With that said, Captain, I don't know if you want to add to that.

on the Alternative Safety Compliance Program of some of the problems or challenges of setting that up. One is that an alternative suggests that there is something to have an alternative to. There is nothing in regs to develop an alternative to. So,

you're developing alternatives to something that 1 doesn't exist. So, that created a challenge. 2 3 That's kind of why we went with the EOP out there. 4 But, like Mr. Myers said, we would encourage, if there is best practices -- I know 5 this is done by other segments of the industry, 6 7 that they come together and develop best practices for either construction or best practices for 8 9 And that would be probably a great task operation. 10 for this Committee to work on. It's to initiate 11 perspective; what are the recommendations? So, 12 we can look into that. 13 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, thank you. So, the Committee spent a lot of time 14 working on the Alternative Compliance Program. 15 16 I think we were under the impression at the time 17 that we were looking at an alternative to class and load line requirements. 18 19 Mr. Chairman, I second MR. HOCKEMA: Yes, it was very obvious that it was an 20 21 alternative to class. And this goes before the 22 Coast Guard or this Committee even got involved.

It was during the lawmaking portion of it.

There was a discussion amongst industry and Congressmen about classification of vessels.

And it was creeping into the existing vessel fleet, which was unacceptable for the industry.

I don't have a documented record of this. So, I apologize for that. But I know that industry scuttlebutt was, a few years ago, was on that subject. And I got a letter from one of the fishing associations in 2006, as early as 2006, where it was related to some fishery endorsements for the American Fisheries Act. And there was some concern that lawmakers were looking at classification for even existing boats or major conversions of existing boats.

And so, this is where, after that, an alternative was developed. Eventually, it was named Alternative Safety Compliance Programs, but there was a period of time where, for the industry, it was fairly silent, I think, and it wasn't a subject. And then, it came up just in new construction. And then, the existing vessels came

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

up as this alternative.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, it's kind of a matter of semantics. I think the name "alternative" is probably, as you guys would probably agree, is not the right terminology in the law literally, unfortunately for us. And so, if we take the name away, the issue still stands, you know, the issue of existing vessels getting older and needing more maintenance, and basic integrity issues still stands.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Any further comments?

PARTICIPANT: Captain Neberts (phonetic) here. Again, you bring up existing On very rare occasions does the Coast vessels. Guard retroactively apply regulations to existing vessels. There are some, especially within the The wall anchors is another fire protection world. But in very rare occasions have we gone back in time. So, again, I think that's another challenge that the Alternative Safety Compliance Program poses, is to develop something that is fair and equitable, and that meets it.

But I hear what you're saying. 1 2 you. Mr. Chairman? 3 MR. BOEHMER: Mr. Boehmer? 4 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: MR. BOEHMER: Kris Boehmer. 5 I think it's our duty, as the Fishing 6 7 Vessel, the Fishing Safety Committee here, to help develop this, not look for the industry to get it 8 That's what we all get together for. 9 together. 10 I do think that the Coast Guard has 11 retroactively done a lot of -- the Fishing Vessel 12 Safety Act was pretty much a retroactive plan. 13 We had no regulations in place and we put that in start a baseline, which is a very 14 beginning. 15 16 But maybe we named this wrong. 17 we should just start it for vessels built before 18 a certain date of when we were starting to have 19 it built to a similar class. We should be looking 20 at compliance program. Let's not call 21 it -- because if we let this go, we're pretty much

letting everything we've worked for go by the

wayside. And something needs to be done. That's what most of us are here for, I think.

So, do we need to repackage this as Hal says, take out the alternative? Because I think he's right, it wasn't implied alternative class, and call it a Fishing Vessel Compliance Program and look at the area that we want to capture? And work on how to gradually implement, like this Committee did? Because to ask the industry to do this one, nothing is going to happen. We're going to have life lost, and that's what we're trying to prevent.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, even in the context of revamping Part 28 -- and we've been tasked with that before, and we submitted a lot of recommendations in that regard -- I think this Committee would be well within its responsibilities to consider that kind of thing if the Coast Guard would task it.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Do we need to make a motion for that? Or that's something you would work on anyway? I mean, what is the best way to

1	proceed with this?
2	CAPT. EDWARDS: We'll have to get back
3	to you on that because I don't know
4	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: It sounds like we
5	should make a motion on that.
6	(Laughter.)
7	CAPT. EDWARDS: Well, you can feel free
8	to make a motion. I mean, the challenge that we're
9	in now is you know, we touched on it a bit
10	yesterday. Captain Edwards speaking.
11	New regulations are very challenging
12	to move through at this time. So, it's tough to
13	put something new in. But, when it comes out, we're
14	going to have to come down, and there's also, you
15	know, if it's even a significant rulemaking.
16	That's why we are looking for where are
17	opportunities that we can capitalize on industry
18	best standards. Are there other non-regulatory
19	solutions to promote compliance? Or are there ways
20	that the Coast Guard can reward people who are
21	following those best practices?

So, that's kind of more the lane that

we're in, I think, at this time, yes. 1 MR. BOEHMER: Kris Boehmer again. 2 3 My concern is that, up until now, it's been left up to certain owners that have a very 4 good idea of what they need to do and others that 5 don't. You know, it's really been pushed upon my 6 7 industry to be the enforcers. The insurance companies will tell you, hey, you need this test; 8 you need this; you need that. And that's great 9 10 for the guys that have insurance. I hate being the bad guy, but it's 11 12 worked. But there's other people that don't. 13 voluntarily compliance hasn't saved too many lives. So, I understand there's a problem and 14 an issue with putting new regulations out, but I 15 16 don't think that should stop our mission statement. We're trying to create a safer industry. 17 18 I've got to be honest with you. After 19 listening to, I believe it was Tracey yesterday 20 that was telling us about the formation of the 21 committees and the general idea of removing a third 22 of the advisory committees, which I sort of

get -- none of us are making any money at this. 1 We're doing this because we believe it's important. 2 3 I don't see anything on this agenda 4 that's really pressing why we're here. And if we don't have some issues to take this forward, I think 5 we're just going to drive to a slow death and we're 6 7 going to be looking at another rise in casualties that will make this Committee be important again. 8 9 I just don't see that's necessary. I think we 10 have an obligation to push this forward. Mr. Chairman? 11 MR. HOCKEMA: 12 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, Mr. Hockema. 13 MR. HOCKEMA: First of all, I would like to thank Captain Edwards and Mr. Myers and 14 their supporting cast, their departments, 15 16 working on these things. I think all of us understand on the 17 18 Committee your limitations. First of all, the term 19 "alternative" is in the law, and you're quite 20 correct on that. Second, there's no congressional 21 record that backs up my statement that I just

mentioned, that originally this was considered as

an alternative to class. Those things are out of our realm. They're out of our control. And so, we can only worry about the things that we can control ourselves.

My main concern is that I want -- and I think we've said this before, and I don't think a motion is necessary at this time. The Committee has said this before. We just want the Coast Guard to note our position on these things. And when there are opportunities for the Coast Guard in the future, congressional hearings, those kind of issues, please bring these up because they're concerns that we, as a committee, have.

And like I say, we've already made motions before on this kind of stuff, but don't forget about them. Because that existing fleet is going to be a reality for the rest of our lives. It's the one that is really the big concern that we've had.

There's been a lot of resistance to classification in new vessels. I have mixed feelings on it. I'm generally against it. But

I'm also very much for established standards because it's the business that I'm in, to design to an acceptance standard.

And I believe that everywhere we go that the car we drive, the microphone that we're talking into here, the building we're in, they're all established design standards for these. And our fishing fleet doesn't have very many, and it's a sore point in my career, and I think for many of us here.

We have a real broad cross-section of people on the Committee. There's a number of fishermen who I know also have mixed feelings on this on a different level or different priorities than what I have. But I know, by being exposed to hundreds of vessels over my career, that certain design standards have prevented tragedies. And so, the more that we can do to promote these things without those design standards being too onerous and expensive, the better our industry is going to perform from a safety standard and an economic standard, because they're not broke down.

2.1

Okay. Well, thank you. 1 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Hal. 2 Mr. Davis? 3 MR. DAVIS: My name is Alan Davis, and 4 I think I have a relatively unique perspective, 5 along with Jake and some of the other folks that 6 were involved. 7 There's three different terms that have 8 9 gotten blended into discussion here, 10 different issues. And each of them has a different piece and part in the history. So, looking back 11 12 through the lens of history might help clarify some 13 things. And a general once said, "No good plan 14 survives first contact with the enemy." 15 I think 16 the same thing could be said for no good idea survives first contact with D.C. 17 18 There was an issue found in the Bering 19 Sea fleet where we had vessels that were in violation of the letter of the law, that were doing 20 21 processing, which was a line drawn in the water

back in the late eighties to trigger certain things,

like load line and classification.

The Coast Guard, in D13 and D17, were left with 80 vessels that they had identified that had stepped beyond the line and something had to be done about it. We were losing vessels. People were dying. But there was no way that these vessels could be load lined and classed, due to their age.

Agreement was born, the first version. And it was a miracle to behold. Chris Woodley and some other people in the Coast Guard were in teach-out at the time, sat down with industry and said, essentially, here's where you're losing vessels; here's where people are dying, and here's why. You're beyond the line. So, you either need to stop doing these added-value things, like if you cut the head off and take the guts out, it's okay, but if you cut the tail off, it's processing. A silly way to draw a safety line, but that's where the line was drawn.

So, over a series of meetings, cooperating with the vessels and the industry that was in this unique situation, we came to an

agreement. And \$40 million or more were spent by the vessel owners in that industry segment to improve their vessels. Over 30 propeller shafts were condemned in the first round of dry-dockings of these vessels.

I had three vessels that were in the program. I'd like to think my company is a very good company. We wound up finding some things through the process that we spent \$300,000 on.

That program was so successful, the idea was spawned to replicate it around the country, but in a voluntary basis. Essentially, the Coast Guard kind of had us over a barrel or had a gun to our heads in this first program, because we either had to comply or we had to class and load line the vessels to meet the law. And we couldn't do it. So, we had to participate in this agreement or stop what we were doing.

The beauty of the process, though, wasn't the product that was created; it was the process itself. In safety, we do job hazard assessments, and it's not that you get a piece of

paper at the end; it's stepping through your process and finding the places where things can go wrong and correcting them.

So, the Alternative Compliance Safety Agreement -- the initials got all mixed up, and something else was generated. And the original concept was to have the Coast Guard people in the different Districts sit and look at the data, sit down with the leaders in their different fisheries in their Regions and talk about the things that were causing them to lose vessels or lose lives.

So, the problem for a freezer longliner in the Bering Sea might be a vessel maintenance issue. The problem for a lobsterman in Maine might be an entanglement man overboard. Two different issues, two different solutions.

So, to sit down locally, face-to-face with the industry representatives, the initial idea was to have those conversations, encourage that networking and solution-building. But it wound up morphing into, okay, we have this fabulous product that we created for these two fisheries

or these two fleets in the Bering Sea. Let's take 1 this menu and spread it out across the country. 2 And then, it got all confused and all 3 entangled with new vessel building, and, oh, my 4 God, how are we going to do this? And it died. 5 It really shouldn't die. It should go back to we 6 7 need to sit down District by District with the leaders in our different fisheries and create a 8 And it may be that in the Gulf of 9 discussion. 10 Mexico with shrimpers they need to be looking at gear entanglement and they need to be looking at 11 12 man overboard. It may be in the New England 13 groundfish fishery that they need to be looking at haul and maintenance issues. Look Region by 14 15 Region at the problem. 16 And then, the classification of new 17 builds is a separate issue. It's not part of ASSE 18 or ASCA, by whichever initials you change its label. 19 Thank you. Oh, and if you don't make a motion, there's nothing that you can hold them 20 21 to.

(Laughter.)

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Alan.
2	I appreciate those comments.
3	Mr. Paine?
4	MR. PAINE: Well, thank you very much.
5	I didn't know if you were waiting for public
6	testimony at a certain time period.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Well, I've been
8	pretty lax on that. I think it's valuable to have
9	public input. And since we have very few members
LO	in the audience at this meeting, I thought it would
L1	be appropriate.
L2	MR. PAINE: Okay. Well, I'm Brent
L3	Paine, and I'm the Director of United Catcher Boats.
L 4	I've worked for UCB for 27 years here in Seattle.
L5	We have 72 catcher vessels that participate with
L6	no large trawl here, primarily in the Bering Sea
L7	pollock fishery and the West Coast whiting fishery.
L8	We fish cod in the Bering Sea and some other species
L9	in the Gulf of Alaska, small herring.
20	We were very instrumental in the
21	development of the language that was passed through
22	Congress on this issue of alternative compliance.

And I appreciate Alan's comments, and I think he's right on the mark.

When Chris Woodley and the Coast Guard put together the Alternative Compliance Program for the freezer longliners in Amendment 80, back to trawlers, we took a look at that, we being the people the policy would affect, and said, well, this might work for us as well.

Al, you're exactly right; we have a hodgepodge of all different kinds of vessels. A lot of them were field supply vessels that were built 30 years ago for fishing out of Louisiana or hauling mud and stuff for the oil-filling guys in the Gulf. We have a bunch of converted crab boats that were in the built in the seventies for The Bering Sea crab fishery. We have vessels from New England that are fishing in the Bering Sea that were original New England trawlers.

So, we don't have a standardized -- you know, we look at the Norwegians and the Irish, and they're building a lot trawl boats, and go, wow, that's beautiful. Well, first of all, we don't

have the money like they do. So, we have what we have.

So, we said let's take a look at the characteristics of our fleet. Can we develop a program like Chris did with Amendment 80 and the freezer longliners and try to figure out a way to help the vessel owners develop a -- essentially, it's a punchlist. When you take a boat and put it in the shipyard, what have you got to do to make that vessel safe?

And again, Ken Tippett, who worked for Alaska Boat Company at the time, was the Chairman of our Alternative Safety Compliance Committee.

And then, along came the House T&I Committee, and they basically wanted to force some sort of program for the whole nation on what was based on original freezer longline and Amendment 80 Alternative Compliance Program in the Bering Sea. And Doug Calfer (phonetic), we met with him a couple of times in D.C. As he was retiring, he wanted to create this safety program that's going to save lives.

And we said, okay, but we want two We want to have an alternative things then. compliance program that's based on the different Regions and the different types of vessels because one size doesn't fit all. And Al is right on. I mean, you can't force an alternative compliance program that fits a Gulf shrimper and a Bering Sea crab boat. I mean, we fish in 30-degree or You guys fish in 70-degree water. 27-degree water. If you've go overboard -- you can spend a day or two in the water in the Gulf -- if you go overboard in the Bering Sea, hyperthermia is going to kick in 30-40, you know, less than 30 minutes, right? A different type of deal, different types of seas. So, that was one thing.

The other thing is, we asked that the industry be able to work in cooperation with the Coast Guard to develop alternative compliance programs for the catcher vessels around the country. And that language was in there. Well, as you all know, the U.S. Coast Guard bill just passed, the reauthorization bill, by the Senate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a few days ago. And if you look at that language in there, it's about as clear as mud, according to what I can see. I don't read that kind of stuff very often.

But we want to develop a program we can call alternative or not, but we want to develop a program that the fishing vessel owner can use when he's dealing with maintenance on a vessel that saves lives. But we want to work in conjunction with the Coast Guard to develop this program.

We had an open-house meeting here. To tell you the truth, it was a shit show. You know, the Coast Guard -- can you actually imagine trying to roll out a national alternative compliance program per congressional direction? Do you have the manpower to do that? No.

And so, here now, you've got new definitions of timelines of when you've got to roll this thing out. You've got a year, the Coast Guard's got a year to develop the program, and I think they've got three years to implement it,

according to the new legislation.

So I think this --- Congress also deleted the clause that said to work with the industry on this. So, you don't have to work with industry now, if you look at the letter of the law from the Senate.

So, this Committee is really important,

I think. This Committee is the conduit of the industry to work with the Coast Guard in developing an alternative compliance program in the future here.

And there's a mandate by Congress to do this within a certain amount of time now. And we want to try to see if we can get it and do it right.

So, those are my comments on this issue.

It's been very frustrating. We originally looked at what, like Al said and, Chris, if he gets up and talks. The freezer longline and Amendment 80, and the Alternative Compliance Program saved lives.

And if you looked at what they did here in Seattle at the shipyards when they were inspecting these

1	vessels and doing this program, and what they had
2	to do I've talked to numerous trawl owners and
3	catchers, you know, the freezer longline owners,
4	when they went through, they put their vessels
5	through the program. They were literally spending
6	millions of dollars to do it, but they had to.
7	And they had a program that worked for them because
8	they got to help develop it.
9	So, my recommendation is, don't forget
10	about the industry because we also want to do the
11	same sort of thing that the Coast Guard wants to
12	do here, but we want to work in collaboration
13	together to develop these sort of programs at a
14	regional level for the vessels from the different
15	Regions in cooperation and together.
16	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Brent. I
17	really appreciate your comments.
18	MR. DAMERON: Can I ask a question?
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Dameron?
20	MR. DAMERON: Sir, so are you
21	suggesting that these compliance programs should
22	be regulatory? That there is no regulations?

1	MR. PAINE: I don't know about that.
2	I mean, obviously, if you look at the Senate bill
3	that passed, I think it says that they have to be
4	regulatory. And we would prefer it not to be,
5	because I think we can do something very similar
6	to what's been done for the factory trawlers and
7	the freezer longliners here and just do it on a
8	voluntary basis. So, yes, that's
9	MR. DAMERON: A follow-up question,
10	and I didn't get a chance to read what you read.
11	Did they mention the age of the vessels that this
12	was going to pertain to?
13	MR. PAINE: Well, yes, so this
14	gets yes. So, I've just looked through the bill.
15	If the House approves it, it's going to become
16	a law. And there's going to be two classes of
17	vessels. There's going to be new builds and, then,
18	there's going to be existing. And all this falls
19	into existing. There is a certain day of when that
20	new bill is going to be defined.
21	So, a new build has to be built to class
22	standards but doesn't have to be maintained to class

1	standards. That's my understanding of how and
2	Hal knows more about this than I do. But everything
3	before a certain date will be classified as an
4	existing vessel and will have to fall underneath
5	the rules of this.
6	I agree, too, it shouldn't be called
7	alternative because there's nothing alternative
8	that it was an alternative to. It should be, we
9	look at it as a punchlist basically. You know,
10	when we haul a boat out, what have we got to do
11	and how often does it have to happen, and what do
12	we have to do when we do that kind of stuff? So,
13	it's really just a vessel maintenance list of
14	responsibilities and the integrity to haul the
15	vessel and the superstructure.
16	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. Thanks,
17	Brent.
18	Any other questions/comments on this?
19	All right, Mr. Kampnich, can you voice
20	any concerns about your area of the world in Craig,
21	Alaska?

MR. KAMPNICH: Michael Kampnich.

This is my first time to attend the meeting. It's been great to listen to the various concerns from the different regions. You learn a lot. You know, we all face different challenges, different issues. Our primary focus I know is safety.

I've been involved in the industry between crewing, harbor mastering, and owning a vessel, and fishing myself for about 30 years.

I would say that relates to some of what we've just heard. Commercial fishing, by and large, at least from my perspective in the Southeast, has evolved from a, you know, kind of a "go, boy" fishery, which there was a lot of just go out there and do it, and not a lot of concern given to safety. That way, it caused problems.

I think today commercial fishing for the most part is looked upon as a professional business and people are very serious about it.

I think the trends in safety in less lives lost, less casualties, and things like that, speak to that. I think there's a number of reasons why that

has come about.

Coast Guard guidance and regulations help. I think the professionalism and the evolution of the fleet has certainly been a big part of that. I've seen that locally for sure. Safety today is much more of a concern than it was 30 years ago.

On a local level, I have a small boat, 37 feet, and Alaska has a lot of small vessels throughout the whole area of the State. If I had one concern, I think that when regulations and guidelines are developed, as we've heard here, you really have to be careful on how you develop them, because what may fit one area may be really challenging for another.

The issues with Alaska for many of the rural communities is we don't have good access to get in and out. We don't have shipyards, real professional shipyards, and a lot of the things that you might take for granted in many of the other regions of the United States. We may not have as easy of an access or it may be much more costly

to do some of these things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I think these regional concerns and looking at things to try to address the problems and the issues and challenges from a regional basis is well worth looking at and considering. I think that's very important.

One of the things that I think is great with the Coast Guard is, you know, we heard from the different District Compliance Officers that manage the inspections and stuff. Alaska has a really good compliance rate. I know that the officers that do the vessel inspections, they make great effort of getting out to the rural and remote communities and providing the service. important factor for most of the fleet and certainly in the area that I -- I fish out of Craig and the or Prince of Wales Island. We west coast appreciate the work the Coast Guard does, and doing that in a challenging environment, remote, it takes extra effort to travel and do that.

So, it's been enjoyable. I appreciate what I've learned here and hearing from everybody

1	else. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, thank you
3	very much.
4	Mr. Boehmer?
5	MR. BOEHMER: I think I want to try to
6	make a motion, but I need some help. I'm going
7	to tell you what I'm thinking, and then, the body
8	can help me out here.
9	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Well, we can get
10	to some motions later, too, if you want some time
11	to wordsmith it and talk with other people.
12	MR. BOEHMER: Got it.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes. So, this
14	isn't like your last opportunity.
15	MR. BOEHMER: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: And I think in
17	Alaska it's been a real change of culture as far
18	as safety goes. A lot of it is the responsibility
19	of Mr. Woodley, because a long time ago he came
20	to me as a representative of the crab fleet and
21	he said, "Can we speak at your meeting?" Because

we were having a meeting about prices for crab.

And that initial meeting led to other meetings that led to really the fleets embracing of safety inspections before we go fishing. And it was a major factor in making our fishery, the Alaskan crab fishery, no longer the deadliest catch, but one of the safest fisheries in the country.

So, it's that interaction between industry and the Coast Guard that was really critical in a cultural change. I think that's evidenced now in the fact that this Committee voted for two-year mandatory fishing vessel examinations. The current law is five years. wanted two years, because we understand how important it is, and how important it is to have somebody else come on the boat and look at our operations. Sometimes little we get shortsighted. So, it's that interaction between the Coast Guard and industry I think is critical in the development of any programs going forward. That's why I think this Committee is so important.

So, sorry to give a little speech.

Mr. Derie?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. DERIE: Thank you. Joe Derie.
2	Obviously, we're concerned about how
3	the enhanced oversight program is going to turn
4	out and how it's going to be applied, both as marine
5	engineers, naval architects, and surveyors, how
6	that's going to work out.
7	I did have a question with regards to
8	the audit of third parties. You know, we had one
9	in charge of NAMS's fishing vessel program, and
10	we had an audit a couple of years ago and a couple
11	of years before that. When is the schedule for
12	another audit, Joe? Have you worked on that?
13	MR. MYERS: Now I was not I'm
14	scrolling back because you asked that question.
15	Joe Myers speaking here.
16	I believe the last time we went out was
17	2017.
18	MR. DERIE: Yeah, you visited NAMS in
19	September, and I think SAMS was in August or
20	sometime.
21	MR. MYERS: So, in 2017, my office, we
22	went out and did audits or we visited the TPOs,

1	third-party organizations, that do fishing vessel
2	exams. And so, we are due to do that, I am
3	anticipating we'll do that again this year because
4	it's been a year.
5	And I believe and I'm shooting from
6	the hip right now, but I would have to look at the
7	periodicity schedules that we've had in the
8	past I believe it's about every year, year and
9	a half. So, we're due.
10	MR. DERIE: Now it's been about two
11	years. Every two years is when we keep doing it.
12	MR. MYERS: Okay. So, I would say
13	we're coming up on another cycle within a year.
14	MR. DERIE: And you're going to do that
15	out of your office? I know the local offices are
16	doing
17	MR. MYERS: Our office spearheads it.
18	MR. DERIE: Good.
19	MR. MYERS: Yes. Mr. David Belliveau,
20	he's our tech for that, yes.
21	MR. DERIE: That's all I had. Thank
22	you.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Joe.
2	Mr. Rosvold, can you comment on your
3	area?
4	MR. ROSVOLD: Mr. Chairman, I had a
5	question on that same sheet Al was talking about,
6	the Tasks and Recommendations. It's one that's
7	labeled "2016" and November, which is achieving
8	parity between state-licensed and
9	federally-documented commercial fishing vessels.
10	I'm curious as to what stage that is in, if it's
11	something that's moving forward or not.
12	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yeah, that parity
13	issue is certainly an important one.
14	Mr. Myers, do you have any perspective
15	on that?
16	MR. MYERS: Yes. This is Joe Myers
17	speaking.
18	I believe the topic of parity was a
19	recommendation, line item, for the Task Statement
20	0117 that was made this past spring from the
21	Committee. And the status of that is right now
22	we have taken the recommendation and it has been

1	routed up for official comment. And so, that is
2	the status. It's been literally two we just
3	have not received comment coming back down. We
4	routed it up to FACA and the Coast Guard. So, I
5	can't formally comment on that topic because we
6	just routed that package up this past spring. And
7	that's my response.
8	MR. ROSVOLD: Thank you.
9	MR. MYERS: But I'd like to add, if I
10	could, as I said, we anticipate with the next
11	meeting. We hope to have a response back by then,
12	but it's just been a quick summary. And a lot of
13	times, things don't come back our way as quick as
14	we would like sometimes.
15	MR. ROSVOLD: So, we still have
16	commercial fishing vessels that are every bit as
17	capable as my documented vessel that don't have
18	to perform to the same safety standards currently.
19	MR. MYERS: As stated in your comments
20	from the last recommendations.
21	MR. ROSVOLD: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Anything further,

Mr. Rosvold? Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Mr. Hewlett?

MR. HEWLETT: I think the problems that we're having down here is a lot of people in the fishery was compliant, the life raft for everybody and everything, and the inspections. But the ones that's been doing it for the last five years and kept doing it, a lot of them are taking their life rafts off their boats and putting rings back on. And a lot of them are getting a little upset that they're compliant, and the most important thing in our eyes is the inspections, and the boats that aren't compliant, nothing's being done to them. So, I lot of people are getting feelings that the Coast Guard isn't stopping them and nothing's going to happen. So, why should they comply with the regulations? That's the biggest thing that the fishermen are bringing to me right now, the ones that are complying with all the regulations.

So, I don't know what can be done or what's going to be done. I think they're trying to get done, but I think you're at a standstill

1	right now until enforcement happens. And that's
2	concerning because I really believe there's a lot
3	of boats out there that don't even have hot water
4	working. There's boats running around in the leave
5	zone and stuff like that. So, that's pretty
6	serious in my book.
7	Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, thanks,
9	Butch.
10	Mr. Dennehy?
11	MR. DENNEHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12	Ed Dennehy here, representing the training
13	community.
14	My concern evolves around the whole
15	issue of the operator competencies and compliance
16	program and the lack of regulations to actually
17	implement that. We got this wonderful opportunity
18	with the grants, the training grant program, but
19	there's no way to force fishermen to actually go
20	to training, which is one of the issues we deal
21	with right now.
22	It seems, if we want to maximize the

value of that grant, there has to be some way to make fishermen go to the training that we hope to use the grant to develop. I understand the two-out/one-in thing, and where you guys are, but I'm curious as to where are you right now as far as actually developing the process for creating a regulation that implements that competencies program.

CAPT. EDWARDS So, where we are with regulations in general is, I would just say, that twice a year, semiannually -- this is Captain Edwards speaking -- the Unified Agenda for ongoing regulations are posted, and we can send a link out for that. It says, what is the status of each of the regulatory programs that the Coast Guard is working on? Those that are longer than 12 months out are kind of put on the long-term side in the list. So, you can see what we're working on and the updates to it. Short of that, that's all that we can discuss on any ongoing regulatory work.

MR. DENNEHY: So, is there any ongoing regulatory work as it pertains to this

1	particular
2	CAPT. EDWARDS: So, that is not on the
3	Unified Agenda at this time.
4	MR. DENNEHY: So, you can't answer the
5	question? Is that what you're saying?
6	CAPT. EDWARDS: Right. Right. It's
7	not a regulation that's on the Unified Agenda.
8	So, it's not being worked at this time.
9	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: So, Mr. Dennehy,
10	you might want to craft a motion over lunch or
11	something else that would inform the Coast Guard
12	as to your concerns. Thank you.
13	Anything else?
14	MR. DENNEHY: No, that's all I have.
15	Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you very
17	much.
18	All right. Mr. Dameron?
19	MR. DAMERON: So, I have a question on
20	that last point, and then, I have a new issue.
21	So, my question is on the Unified
22	Agenda, as people on this Committee understand,

it was, I believe, maybe October two years ago that
the public comment period ended. The Coast Guard
had all the information they needed from both this
Committee and the public comment, and Congress has
passed the laws that said that these regulations
need to be written. Now, understanding that it's
not on the agenda, it's something that's currently
being worked on? Did I hear that right?
CAPT. EDWARDS Correct. If it's not
on our list, it's not currently an active regulatory
project for the Coast Guard.
MR. DAMERON: Okay. Thank you.
MR. MYERS: What I would like to do,
if I can add to that this is Joe Myers
speaking I'd like to bring up our website again.
And, Rob, if you can help us maybe bring it up?
I'm like you, I'm trying to keep the
pulse on this. But we've heard the term "Unified
Agenda" a lot not just today. But if we don't know
where to go, we don't have the pulse on it.
And what Rob is going to do is he's going
to bring up our DCO website, our Fishing Vessel

Division site. We have created a hyperlink to that Unified Agenda page. And so, any day of the week you can click on that and see the status of, for example, a fishing vessel rule, of how it's getting traction, moving forward, you know, what the latest and greatest is.

So, before we click on that, Rob, okay, so he's going to go to "Fishing Vessel Rule Making".

He's going to click that. And he is going to go -- let's go back one second.

Okay. So, he would have the rule, announced it. We've created a link and it says, "Implementation of 2010 and 2012 Legislation". He clicks on that. And again, this is going to give us the pulse of the rulemaking. There's other hyperlinks you can click on further details.

These are the dates, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. This is where it extended. But the final rule, that's the key thing we're talking about right now. For example, with the fishing vessel rule, it says, "To be determined". So, that means, right now --

CAPT. EDWARDS Captain Edwards here. 1 The other piece that you can note up 2 3 there is it will say the agenda stage of rulemaking, 4 and this has been moved to long-term actions. essentially, other regulatory projects have moved 5 ahead of this one or are being worked ahead of this. 6 7 And part of this stems from -- you know, we read through some of the Executive Orders 8 9 yesterday -- we've been directed to undergo as much 10 deregulation as we can. And so, every time we 11 deregulate or we remove a regulation, it's the same 12 process as when we establish a regulation. 13 means that there has to be a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking established and economic analysis done, 14 public comment opened, and then, we go forward from 15 16 there. So, right now, the push within the Coast 17 Guard regulatory front is in the deregulatory 18 nature, more so than on adding regulations. 19 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Dameron? 20 MR. DAMERON: Thank you very much for the clarification. 21 22 Now, if I would, Mr. Chairman, I would

1	like to make a motion that the U.S. Coast Guard
2	ask this Committee to look at the requirement to
3	continue to remain in class for fishing vessels
4	that were required to be built to class, but would
5	no longer be required to build to class under
6	subsequent U.S. Code or regulations.
7	And if I could explain that
8	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Well, is there a
9	second to it?
10	MR. DAMERON: Oh, I'm sorry.
11	MR. HOCKEMA: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: The motion has
13	been seconded by Mr. Hockema.
14	You may speak to the motion.
15	MR. DAMERON: So, this Committee, when
16	the classing requirements came out of Congress,
17	this Committee advised the Coast Guard to advise
18	Congress that we did not vote on support for the
19	classification for fishing vessels over 50 feet.
20	Subsequently, the regulations were changed so that
21	vessels between 50 feet and 79 feet did not have
22	to be built to class. There may have been vessels

that were built during that time that were built to class that, if they were built today, they would not have to be built to class.

It seems like, through the regulatory process, they are in the process of increasing that length limit again, so that vessels under a higher length than 79 foot would not have to be built to class. And the way the regulations read now, if you're built to class initially, you would have to stay in class. And this will be a very big financial disadvantage to those vessels that did what they were supposed to, let's say two years ago, and they were built to class. And then, if the regulation changes, another vessel built to the exact same class standards will be financially disadvantaged.

CAPT. EDWARDS Mr. Chair, if I may?
CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Go ahead.

CAPT. EDWARDS Unless I'm mistaken, those are under law, not regulation. And so, the challenge behind that is law is what is set by Congress and gives the Department, gives the Agency

1	direction on which to act. Regulations are the
2	Agency's interpretation of that action. So, if
3	it's written in law, that is the direction that
4	we have to go.
5	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Dameron?
6	MR. DAMERON: So, am I understanding
7	that you would not be able to task this Committee
8	to look at that?
9	CAPT. EDWARDS Yes, it's Captain
10	Edwards.
11	Correct. That's something that is in
12	law. We understand the concern that the Committee
13	has. The Coast Guard has within one of our means
14	that we work is we do proposed legislative change
15	proposals, and we work with Congress to provide
16	feedback on law, but it is only advice. Again,
17	that's direction from Congress on what we're
18	supposed to do.
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Dameron?
20	MR. DAMERON: Mr. Chairman, I would
21	like to withdraw my motion, and I will do some
22	wordsmithing over lunch and come back.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Is the second okay 1 with that? 2 MR. HOCKEMA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm 3 good with that. 4 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you. 5 The motion is withdrawn. 6 7 CAPT. EDWARDS This is Captain Edwards. I just wanted to make a clarification 8 on motions, and I know there's a couple that you're 9 10 working on. 11 Keep in mind that we can have these 12 discussions throughout the year. This is not like 13 a deadline where, if it's not done by the adjournment of this Committee meeting, that it 14 can't be opened. And so, I would propose perhaps 15 16 to the Committee that some of these may require a little bit of research behind the scenes. 17 18 rushing to try to get a motion in that would, then, 19 spin off kind of work, it may not be as productive. But what we can gladly do is to set up another 20 teleconference of small administrative matters at 21

that point. This isn't something that needs to

be -- we can check with our rule people, but it 1 doesn't have to be put in The Federal Register so 2 3 many days ahead of time. 4 So, I just wanted to make sure that, don't feel like you're rushed to try to get 5 something on paper today. We can supply you with 6 7 additional information that we have and kind of craft it that way. In the end, the whole purpose 8 behind that is for us to determine whether there's 9 10 tasking back to this Committee on projects going So, I'm not saying you can't, but just, 11 forward. 12 you know, kind of keep that in mind. 13 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. Thank you, Captain. 14 All right. So, let's go to the New 15 16 Construction Option Update, and then, we'll -- how 17 long do you think that will last? 18 MR. DENNEHY: Mr. Chairman, if I could, 19 I just wanted to get some clarification. 20 Without regulations that implement the 21 training program specified in the Authorization 22 Act, are there other ways to put the fishermen in

a position where they feel like they have to attend 1 the training? I mean, I'm asking. I don't know. 2 Just like what kind of incentives might there be, 3 4 official incentives might there be to encourage fishermen to attend training which addresses those 5 particular competencies? 6 7 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, I would look to Captain Edwards. 8 This 9 CAPT. EDWARDS is Captain 10 Edwards. Yes, actually, that was kind of one of 11 my little note things. We have to take it back 12 13 and format it a little bit more. But one idea of a potential task to this Committee is, from a bigger 14 perspective, what are those non-regulatory items 15 16 or levers that we can pull to promote compliance? 17 Regulations is one way to do it, right. 18 a "you shall do this," and that sometimes is not 19 effective. So, are there suggestions that the 20 21 Committee or the industry has on what can the Coast 22 Guard do to incentivize people following voluntary

regulations? Whether they're vessel build and maintenance or whether they're crew training, what can we do?

I know there's money out there for programs that reduces the cost to the mariner. But what are ideas from industry that the Coast Guard can play a part in assisting with it?

MR. DENNEHY: I guess what immediately comes to mind for me is, if a person goes through a drill conductor course -- and that's certainly one of the requirements that's going to come out in the new regs, if they ever happen -- to say that, if you've been trained as a drill conductor, and it was two years ago, and now we finally have regs, but what you did two years still is going to meet that new requirement.

So, you can say, hey, you need to go to this course because a couple of years from now this is going to be an absolute requirement, and the Coast Guard is thinking about making sure that, if you do it today, that would meet the requirement because it would be within that five-year window

1	kind of thing.
2	Am I making sense there? I'm not sure
3	that I am.
4	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes. Well, I
5	think, yes, the threat of future action sometimes
6	is effective.
7	CAPT. EDWARDS Right. So, this is
8	Captain Edwards again.
9	I think, again, you all are experts in
10	your field. So, perhaps something to start to
11	think about is, what are incentives that are out
12	there that we can pull people along and convince
13	them this is the right thing to do? And what can
14	the Coast Guard do to help?
15	So, I'll just give you an example. On
16	the inspected vessel fleet, what we're trying to
17	do to promote safety management systems onboard
18	vessels is we've changed our Coast Guard 835 form,
19	which is the Report of Vessel Discrepancies, to
20	allow a block where a vessel can self-report items.
21	And the idea behind that is we want vessels owners

on inspected vessels to have an active safety

1	management system where they are proactively
2	finding problems on the vessel, reporting it to
3	the Coast Guard. We need to collect that
4	information from the data. But, as we move towards
5	a more risk-based approach for vessel inspections,
6	those deficiencies on the vessels won't count
7	against them. In fact, in some cases, we are
8	crediting the owner, or that we will credit the
9	vessel, with points because they're proactively
10	taking care of it.
11	So, that's just an example. That's a
12	non-regulatory way that we're trying to promote
13	the adoption and following safety management
14	systems.
15	So, I think we need, from the fishing
16	vessel community, what are some things, what are
17	either programs or what are those carrots that we
18	can offer to promote compliance?
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hewlett?
20	MR. HEWLETT: Mr. Chairman, this is Mr.
21	Hewlett.
22	I was under the impression that the

1	drill conductor class, in order to get your sticker
2	for your boat, you have to do drills once a month,
3	and a drill conductor has to do it, whether you
4	go through the class or you hire somebody to come
5	do drills on your boats.
6	So, basically, the law doesn't state
7	yet that you have to have a crew member or at least
8	a crew member on the boat that's certified, but
9	you still have to have somebody that comes and does
10	the drills and signs off on them once a month.
11	Is that correct?
12	CAPT. EDWARDS Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: So, I think at this
14	time let's take a break. It's 10 o'clock. And
15	when we come back, we'll look at the New
16	Construction Option Update. And then, there will
17	be an opportunity after lunch for additional
18	comments and motions and discussion. And so, we'll
19	proceed from there.
20	So, come back at 10:15. Thank you.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
	_

Τ	10:21 a.m.)
2	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. So the new
3	construction update, we've talked about this a
4	little bit already but I asked Mr. Myers to go over
5	it again. So Mr. Myers.
6	MR. MYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And
7	if I could, just so, if I could put a little plug
8	for the signup sheet in the back before we get
9	started, if because I know, I think we did a
LO	pretty good job of capturing names of folks here
L1	yesterday. If you wouldn't mind please doing the
L2	same today then we can get the, kind of a tracker
L3	on both days and who showed up and numbers and all
L 4	that. It's always good to reflect the
L5	participation.
L6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Also on
L7	housekeeping, I know there's some coffee and donuts
L8	back there. Do we need to reimburse somebody for
L9	that?
20	MS. CONRAD: No.
21	MR. MYERS: Thank you, Ms. Conrad.
22	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you very

much.

MR. MYERS: We appreciate that. Now I had a prepared, or I have a prepared statement and this is, I know a lot of us here are very versed of the construction standards and this is, this is put together to highlight what stemmed from the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2012, or '10 and '12 and even '15.

And so for folks that may not be privy of all the details, this is one to re-highlight this. As we said, we're going to touch base on a lot of the conversation we had over the past hour.

But at the same time, I've been thinking about maybe a long and short-range solution and again, just ideas and thoughts that I wanted to comment on at the tail end of this. And when we talk about, hey, what do we do about this.

Is there a problem and what do we do about it, if any. And so I have a couple of personal thoughts on that and I'll save that until the tail end. So I'm going to start off.

And by the way, the reason we feel the

need to talk about construction today is because CBC3, my office at Coast Guard's current headquarters, we received I'll say a half-a-dozen phone calls over the past six to eight months on this topic.

And there's concerns and sometimes maybe some naval architect that may not quite know what to do or they know what to do but they want to get our take on it. So again, that's why we felt the need to at least bring it to the table today.

So on December 20, 2012, the President signed the Coast Guard Maritime Transportation Act of 2012, the CGMTA. This law made significant changes to the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010, which had previously established safety and equipment requirements for commercial fishing vessels, which is captured in Chapters 45 and 51 of Title 46, in U.S. Code.

The requirements in both laws built upon the standards established in the Commercial Fishing Industry Vessel Safety Act of 1988. On

February 8 of 2016, the Coast Guard and Marine Transportation Act of 2015 was signed into law and made a few additions to Chapter 45 of U.S. Code, specifically to Section USC 4503.

The changes required new commercial fishing vessels built after January 1 of 2010 that are less than 50 feet overall in length to be constructed in a manner that provides a level of safety equivalent to the minimum standards established for recreational vessels.

Required new commercial fishing vessels built after 1 July of '13 that are 79 feet or greater in length to be assigned a load line.

Require new commercial fishing vessels built after 1 July of '13 that are at least 50 feet overall in length and will operate beyond three nautical miles past the demarcation line to meet survey and classification requirements.

Commercial fishing vessels built to class requirements before 1 July '13 must remain in class. The 2015 Coast Guard Authorization Act inserted new verbiage into 46 U.S. Code 4503(e).

2.1

It allows for commercial fishing vessels between 50 feet and 79 feet overall in length built after 2015, the 2015 Authorization Act was enacted, which was 8 February '16 that operate beyond three nautical miles to be designed by an individual license by a state as a naval architect or marine engineer.

The design is required to incorporate standards equivalent to those prescribed by a classification society. It is also addressed -- it also addresses construction oversight and other post-construction requirements.

If a vessel is built adhering to these requirements, it doesn't not have to be classed or carry a class certificate. Okay. So comments. With regards to the commercial fishing vessels in size lengths 50 to 79 feet.

And again that applicability date, 8
February '16, in the past year the Office of
Commercial Vessel Compliance Fishing Vessel
Division has fielded numerous questions on
interpretation of this construction requirement

2.1

as conveyed in U.S. Code 4503(e).

2.1

The Coast Guard recognizes that there are few if any finalized classification society rules that address commercial fishing vessels in the size range 50 to 79 feet. However, there are rules for vessels other than commercial fishing vessels and voluntary guidance for design, construction equipment.

And these are available to vessel designers, such as I think we commented on this earlier, you have NVIC 7-68, which is guidance on construction welding standards that encourages ABS rules.

That's not just for uninspected vessels but for the inspected vessel communities or the different subchapters. And so that's one example. And again, we have ABS rules and ASME underwrite our laboratory standards, et cetera, so there's a lot of information out there for other vessels than necessarily commercial fishing vessels.

That being said, because the Coast Guard has not issued regulations or policy guidance

the alternative classification concerning 1 approach, it is inappropriate for the Coast Guard 2 3 to provide approval or acceptance for approvals. And that is a statement issued out by 4 the Marine Safety Center -- Coast Guard Marine 5 But as written in 46 U.S. Code Safety Center. 6 7 4503(e)(1), it does not require the Coast Guard to approve the design or determine the equivalency 8 to class standards. 9 10 The law allows for a properly licensed 11 naval architect or marine engineer to design the 12 vessel and then requires that the marine surveyor 13 certify the vessel was built in accordance with those plans. 14 The intent of this provision is for the 15 16 design agent to have flexibility in determining 17 how to incorporate standards equivalent to those 18 prescribed by a classification society to which 19 the Secretary has delegated authority or other 20 qualified organizations. 21 While vessels should incorporate

design standards equivalent to those comparable

to the class vessel, the law does not indicate that the vessel be designed or built to class standards, emphasizing the intent of this provision is for the design agent to have flexibility -- offering flexibility.

In each new construction project there are numerous stakeholders and vessel owners, builders, shipyards, naval architects, marine engineers, the Coast Guard, local OCMI, district commanders.

The Coast Guard encourages all involved parties, all of these to communicate and carefully document the process. And with that being said, we've just had a lot of discussion on this topic.

And if you bear with me for one second,

I'd like to -- I don't have many notes but I have
a couple notes, but I think stemming from this
discussion we all recognize or it seems like we
do that there's some difficulties.

And some are, if we are going to create a final rule policy, you know, a new policy, and new documents, sometimes we have to, we have to

meet certain expectations of the current administration and what hurdles those may present us.

On the other hand, I think we need to consider other options, I believe as Captain Edwards said and some of the panel are is there a way of accomplishing this goal without writing a policy and, you know, again accomplish that mission.

The first thing when I hear we have tools out there, again, we've said that several times. But along with that, those standards out there -- of which there are many of them, some of them international standards -- we also have the problem with the concerns of industry and the committee.

And we recognize and appreciate all of those concerns because, you know, we have those same concerns. But one of the things that pops into my head is, okay, where is the flaw in the system?

And a lot of times when we have things

come across our table, the bean counters up at Coast 1 Guard headquarters or whoever the person is or 2 3 entity is that's making a decision, we say, well, 4 where's the problem? Where's the data? Are our vessels sinking because water 5 protect doors are not sealing properly or hulls 6 are failing? And, you know, maybe, maybe not. 7 You know, we don't know. We're trying to, you know, 8 data tells a lot. 9 10 But a lot of times we also recognize 11 that not everything is in the data. There's a 12 common sense approach, and sometimes because it's 13 good marine practice, we may have to take a reactionary stance and do something about it, 14 whatever "it" is. 15 16 And so my thoughts personally is on, 17 as a past marine inspector myself, I was in the 18 field doing marine inspections for at least 18 years 19 steady. And doing other inspections along with 20 commercial fishing vessel industry exams. 21 I do have experience with T-boats and

H-boats and I-boats and one of the tools we had

out there were 840 books. And if you don't know what an 840 book is, for example, we may have to do a dry dock on a vessel, and it may detail the process within that 840 book, and along with that you may have little, on the right-hand corner a little area that says, in accordance with this standard.

It appears to me that part of the concern, maybe not the only concern, but part of the concern is we need a checklist, or a checklist would help. Along with that checklist, you know, this EOP is good, but it's not everything.

But a 840 book type checklist may offer up a good recommended best practice on how to use dry docks and, you know, maybe it's gauging. Maybe we're not going to mandate gauging on fishing industry vessels but we encourage it because and then we say, okay, where does it say that?

Well we may bridge that gap and show a reference and say, okay, NVIC 7-68. It's our guidance. It's been around for 50 years. A lot of years.

And it's, and the, and there's no 1 indicator that the process in that NVIC is broken 2 3 right now because what it does is it tells us hey, 4 adopt ABS standards because a lot, because a lot of models are out there. 5 And we can have the scenarios with 6 7 electrical or other areas, but again that's one way to think about it. And so I think there's a 8 9 door that can be creeped open on this that industry 10 or the committee or both can partner and say, hey, 11 let's look at comparable model 840 books for example 12 for a type of vessel like a tug or a T-boat. 13 And let's see what it says about that. And are these things we can incorporate for 14 commercial fishing industry vessels, or are there 15 16 other things? And so I guess that's my thought 17 on it. 18 And that's to, you know, we understand 19 that we have regs in place or we have guidance, 20 I should say in place and moving forward with this,

And that could be, that could be as

this may be something to consider.

21

simple as meeting as a group face-to-face, or you 1 know, by way of phone. There's many ways of 2 3 accomplishing things that set the stage and then having workgroups established. 4 And I offer that to you, Mr. Chairman. 5 That's all I have. 6 7 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Mr. Any questions or comments? Mr. Hockema? 8 Myers. 9 MR. HOCKEMA: Mr. Chairman, thank you, 10 Mr. Myers. Moving back at the beginning of your 11 discussion comments that on your you made 12 initially, I would propose that those comments 13 largely would satisfy us as designers in some sort quidance statement from the Coast 14 of Guard mentioning that equivalent to class doesn't mean 15 16 necessarily classification requirements. 17 can mean -- it can mean other 18 accepted standards. And so that group of comments 19 you had initially is quite adequate on my part to 20 have some guidance for the industry, maybe adjusted 21 a bit, but it doesn't need to specify which accepted

standards.

But as long as you reinforce that other accepted standards are acceptable, then that's really good enough. And so it gives the design community kind of a baseline to go from.

And of course, us engineers are a little more in tune with statutes like the law than maybe some other industries are just because we deal with laws and regulations all the time.

But when I have to sell my services to a fisherman who is not in the room, I have to convince him or her that my services, they are going to cost more for this kind of situation than what they have in the past.

I have to convince them that there that the regulations or law where the Coast Guard has given guidance on, here's the deal. And so my services are going to cost a lot more than what they have in the past.

But I don't, if I only have the law to go by, inevitably some of them are going to say, well, Charlie over here did this other thing. And I can say, well, Charlie's new architect, if he

had one, I think they might be in trouble.

Anyway, that's, I think that's, what I'm looking for in a minimum baseline guidance for the fact that alternative accepted standards are okay. And again, my profession regulated by the state usually requires that by each state.

But it's not out front even in those standards. I know other professional engineers that are not as vigilant about their own ethics, so to speak than what I am. I'm scared to death of being, having an unfortunate accident against me, from me to the Coast Guard or my state PE board, Professional Engineer board.

So as you can imagine if you're disciplined in a profession like mine, you can lose your license. That's what makes your living and so it's very important then. I think most of my clients understand that.

We make it pretty clear, but other engineers and naval architect may not be as much so. And there's in every industry we know that there's some bottom dwellers. Most people are

1	doing the right thing and there's a few that aren't
2	and engineering is no exception.
3	It's in the fishing industry. It's in
4	the engineering industry and these kind of things.
5	And all of these things that we're talking about,
6	we want to, we want to bring that bar off the
7	baseline just a little bit so that we ensure that
8	everybody in the industry understands what the
9	minimum bar is.
10	And that minimum bar in your case as
11	in your comment, is really just alternate accepted
12	standards. Thank you.
13	MR. MYERS: And Mr. Chair, can I
14	comment on that?
15	MR. CHAIR: Yes, Mr. Myers.
16	MR. MYERS: I appreciate your comments
17	on that. And I think there could be a way of
18	offering further clarity because that's what you're
19	asking for, and I think as we move forward maybe
20	we can partner offline.
21	I don't think this constitutes policy
22	but, you know, we may be able to do a work

instruction or something, and I don't think it will 1 take 20 pages but maybe something short, concise, 2 3 and something that we could also not just for the, for you and your area, but obviously for all 4 stakeholders across the board. 5 And I think we, again working offline 6 7 on this, maybe we could kind of bridge that gap, because I know it's a concern and we appreciate 8 that. And so I think this is doable to the comments 9 10 that you made. Thank you very 11 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: 12 Any other comments? Mr. Derie? much. 13 MR. DERIE: Yeah, Joe Derie. I just wanted to comment that it's one thing to design 14 and build a boat to standards, but you need to have 15 16 somebody in the shipyard to be sure it's built to those standards. 17 18 And this is especially true if it's a 19 standard, the boatyards never built boat to such 20 as if they're going to build something, say 45 feet 21 to Navy OIC standard or whatever. And you

mentioned international standards.

Find a boatyard that knows how to build 1 to those standards. So you've got to have the 2 3 proper oversight, and it shouldn't probably just be the owner should probably hire somebody that 4 5 knows those standards to keep an eye on the boatyard. 6 7 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right. Anything else? Okay. Are we ready to go to fish 8 9 pingers? Oh a comment in the back? Oh, it's Mr. 10 Rudolph. I don't have my glasses. 11 MR. RUDOLPH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 12 Mike Rudolph from MSC Portland. Mr. Myers asked 13 me to share with everybody our experience with a new construction of a vessel that just happened 14 down in the Coos Bay area of the southern Oregon 15 16 coast. It's 78-foot trawler, fishing vessel 17 18 that's going to be operating in Alaska. It's keel 19 was laid in December of 2016. So this is one of the vessels that falls into that kind of 20 21 interesting little group of the new construction

that Mr. Myers explained when he was reading the

parameters of the law.

And so with that, we had to assure that the vessel is being designed first by a licensed naval architect and marine engineer. And so on the front end of this, I think you caught wind of this new construction while we were here at the Fish Expo that year.

And we met with the shipyard, the people doing the work and kind of made our presence known that this was going to have to go through a little bit different process. And so we engaged with the naval architect. We got his, we understood, verified his credentials, engaged with him.

We then looked at the plans that he had designed. He had already designed them to a number of different standards because of ABS rules for the steel, the hull construction.

And as far as the systems go, he hadn't quite identified the standards for the different systems such as electrical, some of the other systems. So we worked with him extensively on, okay, identify those standards, which ones do you

want to use?

And we had this back and forth between headquarters and MSC and us and the naval architect on, okay, what does that mean? And then we got it narrowed down to what Mr. Myers explained is that, you know, it's just an accepted standard.

You know, it could be a class standard, a Coast Guard inspection standard, ABYC, you know, some sort of a standard. Basically it's not drawn out on a paper napkin and say, oh yeah, let's build a fishing boat.

We then had to identify a marine surveyor to oversee the construction to make sure that kind of a third-party was overseeing it and making sure it was built as per the standard.

And we identified what would be an owner vessel in the shipyard, identified as a local surveyor that we vetted through their credentials, and the OCMI determined that he was adequate to oversee that construction.

So this -- the construction of this vessel took 18 months. And we would just

periodically visit the shipyard to check on progress. We were engaged with the shipyard themselves.

They would call with questions on different things. And it was actually a really good working relationship we had with them. As the vessels, the construction near the end, we then reengaged with the naval architect to discuss stability.

Because the vessel, even though it's less than 79 feet, it's still going to need to have a stability test done and have stability instructions. And one other provision in the law they identified was it had to have a loading mark, assign to the side of the hull.

And most, the architect kind of pushed back on that a little bit. And I'm not sure why, but, you know, this is a trawler and he felt that the loading mark wouldn't serve much purpose to the people onboard, and we had this kind of a back and forth on that.

And I think we got that resolved. But

the boat, I'm pretty sure the built boat has a 1 loading mark now because it went to Kodiak before 2 3 we ever saw it. And then for the life of the vessel, 4 it's going to need to have an out of the water survey 5 done. It's going to have to have further 6 7 engagement with а marine surveyor and modifications to the vessel are going to have to 8 9 through similar process go а where its modifications are done per standard and those 10 11 modifications are overseen by a marine surveyor. 12 And so this was a kind of a difficult 13 process to go through from the beginning because we lacked, in my mind, on the field we lacked kind 14 of a quidance, you know, a policy document or 15 16 something. When I worked at headquarters for those 17 18 few weeks, I worked on the new construction NVIC. 19 So I kind of had a little bit of a background on

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

That NVIC is still in draft form and

kind of what, on kind the program, where they wanted

to go with this.

20

21

I don't know where it is, desk it's sitting at or in process at this point. But outside of that NVIC that is really not in effect, we had to go back to the law, basically the black and white of what the law said and that's really all we had to go on.

And it was hard for us. It was hard for the owner of the vessel. It was hard for the shipyard. But we got through it. And I think moving forward now, we all kind of understand exactly what the expectation is.

And I made a, kind of a quick checklist.

I'm kind of a checklist and job aid person, so

I made an easy way for myself or any other examiner

or any Coast Guard person or even a person who's

considering building a vessel, kind of what to

follow.

So I wanted to share that experience with everybody, and I know that there's probably other vessels that are being built throughout the country or even people are considering building them, and who may not understand what that process

would look like.

In some of our other ports in Oregon, there are other designers and other vessel owners that have been wanting to, they wanted to build a new vessel, but because of the new rules they shy away from it. They weren't sure how that was going to go.

They heard rumors it's going to cost a lot of money. They don't have that class. All this stuff. So what they did, what a lot of them are doing is taking existing vessels that they have, stripping them down to the keel, and then rebuilding essentially a new vessel around it to kind of get out from the keel laid date is the effective build date.

And they're finding, we have quite a few, at least on the Oregon coast, that are being done that way. And there's nothing against the rules to do that. I mean the law, the way it was written is, those vessels would have to enter into an alternate compliance safety program immediately when it's in effect.

1	But it's obviously not in effect yet.
2	That's all I have.
3	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Mike.
4	Appreciate it. Mr. Boehmer.
5	MR. BOEHMER: Kris Boehmer, thanks.
6	What, this boatyard was building this boat in
7	December of 2016, they were unaware of what had
8	to be done?
9	MR. RUDOLPH: They had heard rumors.
10	They did know exactly needed to be done.
11	MR. BOEHMER: Had they already
12	employed an architect and a surveyor, or did that
13	come after your review?
14	MR. RUDOLPH: No, they had already, the
15	vessel had already been designed by a naval
16	architect.
17	MR. BOEHMER: So he presumably knew,
18	right?
19	MR. RUDOLPH: Yes, he did. He knew but
20	he didn't, it wasn't quite on his radar yet because
21	the vessel
22	MR. BOEHMER: So this points to Hal's

1	issue of having a standard that we need to go to
2	that we all know what we're dealing with. And one
3	of the standards that we could possibly use is the
4	American Bureau of Yacht Council, ABYC, whatever.
5	But how well does that actually apply
6	to fishing vessels? I mean it, that, some of your
7	yacht would think it's got to be wrong. But I'm
8	not sure, so more of a comment, not a question but
9	this is of concern to me.
10	We're seeing a lot of boats in the Gulf
11	and the East Coast where they're taking keels that
12	are trucking it out on flat beds because they're
13	afraid of what's going to be required for a new
14	vessel.
15	And I think that's the last thing our
16	committee really wants is to create a bunch of new
17	old boats. Somehow we want to move this boulder
18	so it's cost effective to upgrade our fishery with
19	new vessels.
20	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yeah, thanks Kris.
21	I think Mr. Derie has an answer to your question.
22	MR. DERIE: Yeah. I think this

1	customer can boat and yacht on council standards,
2	but I agree with you and hear a fishing boat is
3	not a yacht and why are we using this standard or
4	these standards.
5	I'd like to point out that new
6	subchapter M refers to these standards, and you
7	can build towing vessels now to these standards.
8	They I'm very familiar with ABYC. I've got
9	all their accreditations.
10	And some do not apply to fishing
11	vessels, but most will. Basically it's for a boat
12	itself and they just use the yacht for whatever
13	reasons. That's how they got started. But
14	they're good standards and they do apply.
15	MR. BOEHMER: That's encouraging.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, thanks.
18	Mr. Dameron?
19	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20	Thomas Dameron. We just actually got started with
21	a new build under 79 foot and in our contract with
22	the naval architect, it, you know, simply states

1	that it's to be designed to classification
2	standards.
3	And in our contract with an approved
4	surveyor, approved by the Coast Guard that he is
5	to oversee the construction to those design
6	standards, but I'd love to have a look at your list.
7	So that we can make sure that because
8	it is new to both the naval architect, the surveyor
9	and the shipyard that we're doing this through a
10	process so that at the end we can get that
11	certification that it was designed and built to
12	those standards.
13	MR. RUDOLPH: Yes, and this is Mike
14	Rudolph. I can make that available to you or to
15	anybody who needs that. And I want to preface it
16	is a Portland checklist. It's not nationally
17	endorsed. It's something I threw together, if it
18	helps, you know.
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right. Thanks.
20	Any other questions? Okay. Moving on. Fish
21	pingers?
22	PARTICIPANT: Find where I can start.

Good morning. I just went right from a U.S. Coast 1 Guard headquarters, the Office of Navigation 2 3 Equipment and Navigation of Standards. 4 And I'm here on the agenda to talk about fish pingers and to talk about those requirements. 5 So those are the two things that I need to check 6 7 off. But there's also the AIS expert in the Office of the Coast Guard of the United States. 8 If you have anything involved in the 9 10 AIS, I was probably involved in it. I've been involved with AIS since 1999. 11 I participated in 12 all the international bodies that deal with the 13 AIS, and so I'm looking forward to this opportunity to address any AIS issues with you, besides the 14 two that are on the agenda. 15 16 And walk us through some stuff that we 17 have on the slides to give you some places to go 18 for resources to get further information on that. 19 Let me tackle the first one right off the bat, 20 which is the GMTSS requirement, which in an FCC 2.1 requirement, not a Coast Guard requirement.

So if you have interests with that, I

would relay them to the FCC, but it's not really one of ours so go ahead counter.

And what is currently going on and what we see and you probably have packets of is that all of those vessels that were granted a waiver of their GMTSS requirements, Global Maritime Transportation System Service.

And requirements for VHF radios particularly and NF radios that were granted back in 1998 that were granted an exemption and until such time that the United States Coast Guard can clear up what is known as A1 and A2 for doing the assessment, which what you did about three years ago.

So therefore those exemptions according to their regulations would go ahead cease if you have registered. Anyone who has an exemption waiver should have got the letter right now telling them that, that is the case and that their exemption will no longer be valid January 1st -- excuse me, January 31st, 2021.

So that's the issue with the GMTSS.

So are there any questions on that so that I can 1 run through other lists? Okay. All right. 2 3 now as if we run to the AIS and particularly, how 4 do I get to the -- all right. Well for those of you who do not know 5 AIS is, AIS is automatic identification system. 6 7 Ιt is an international requirement and U.S. requirement pretty much to have onboard all 8 9 commercial vessels over 65 feet, 27 feet, eight 10 meters if you're a towing vessel. 11 That's been in place and 12 internationally since 2002 for all vessels over 13 300 gross tons and passenger vessels. It's made a very successful ruling even of to date, but it's 14 not good. 15 16 PARTICIPANT: Oh yeah, something got 17 to be standing out to here. 18 PARTICIPANT: I saw it in 2016, they 19 extended that requirement to all commercial vessels 20 over 65 feet in U.S. common waters. We currently 21 check about 100 fishing vessels a day on the 13,000

a vessels that we track a day, it would be close

to 110,000 vessels that we've tracked since 2004. 1 Unfortunately, not all our users meet 2 3 the requirements and don't broadcast correct 4 information authority that I was referring to. Also as we've seen with gas technology 5 is the great digital technology is that people and 6 7 particularly manufacturers have taken advantage of that technology to bring in new services, new 8 equipment into those particular channels. 9 10 Unfortunately they're doing so without 11 any supervision and without maintaining consistent standards, which brings us to the infamous fish 12 13 pinger, which we have an example here. And so what we're seeing with these fish 14 pingers, number one, they have not been FCC type 15 16 certified, which does mean that their use, purchase 17 and marketing is illegal in the United States. 18 They have not been test complied, so 19 they have not tested by any test laboratory to 20 ensure that they meet with the United Standard, which is a major, major issue, and why we have some 21

major concerns about them.

And from what we've been hearing have 1 the ability of why we need to make sure we get these 2 off the water as soon as best that we can. 3 For 4 those who are not intimately familiar with what makes AIS very, very unique, it operates with 5 constant that's one of the self-organized 6 7 time-division multiple access protocol. Which really means that it kind of 8 operates just like your cell phone does, particular 9 10 first generation cell phones, but instead of having a cell tower that we're connected to for our cell 11 12 phones, your ship is the cell tower. 13 And as it moves, it self-organizes itself amongst all the other users there are in 14 the waterway to ensure that all transmission are 15 16 being brought forth are covered. 17 So what happens when you come in and 18 your gas box is turned on, it listens for two 19 minutes, goes hey, who's out there. And then it 20 finds out who's out there and where they're 21 broadcasting.

And then it tells the world that, hey,

I want to come in and I'm going to be broadcasting 1 in this spot. And by the way, I'm going to be using 2 3 the subsequent slot for the next eight minutes. So don't use that slot. 4 So what's critical and what makes AIS 5 successful is that this self-organizing is 6 7 happening all the time, unbeknownst to you and ensures that your transmission will always go out 8 because everybody knows who you are and that you're 9 10 using that slot and you're moving forward. 11 So what's happening with these fish 12 pingers is that these fish pingers aren't listening 13 to anybody and they're going, hey, I'm here. Pop, So they start using these consoles. 14 pop, pop. And so as they these consoles, you kind 15 16 of go, oh, you're using my slot. But if they're 17 using a slot that you were using to tell the rest 18 of the world that I'm using again, well then the 19 rest of the world doesn't know to not use that slot

transmission because this pinger stepped on it.

they did

not

hear

because you had reserved it.

Because

20

21

22

that

So now you have the whole discombobulation of the network where this little pinger was sniffing in the cold to go ahead and tell you where your net's at and now affecting all the other users here. And tapping on our, are in our range and your possibility for receiving other units. We can't have that.

So we are very, very vehemently opposed to these devices and we're working to the FCC to do our best to get them shut down. Unfortunately, they're widely available on Amazon and eBay.

We're working those two institutions to stop the sale of those particular items. Hopefully that will happen here relatively soon, and we'll start having marketing education campaign to tell everybody to not go ahead and purchase these.

So kind of that's where we're at with the fish pingers. And it's not only us. This is all the time. Half of those dots that you see on there are fish pingers. It pretty much makes your AIS useless because you can't distinguish what

| these are.

And then unfortunately the other thing about these pingers is that they're identifying themselves with a message that's allocated for a vessel. So when you see it, you think it's a vessel just like any other vessel.

You don't know it's a pinger for a fish van, except for maybe possibly hopefully they have the word "net" in the name of the device. But other than that it kind of looks at your AIS.

It appears to you just like any other vessel would appear to you, which makes things very, very disconcerting and very, very difficult ascertain what your situational awareness is when you're confronted with all these pingers out here that are pinging at you.

So I said, this is all China. So it's not a situation that's unique to us. It's a situation that is being addressed right now as we speak internationally.

And we're, the international community is calling these now is autonomous marine radio

devices, which is a kind of catch-all for all these devices that operate autonomously that have not been tested or certified to operate on our particular frequency or our particular protocol that we currently have published.

And so we're capturing all those, looking at how we can go ahead and regulate them, because we do see that there is some value to having some fish markers out there to help the fishermen be able to relocate this industry to know where those guys are at.

Depending on where you're operating then, that we see some validity to that type of functionality all around there, but it needs to be done and regulated and particularly in a manner that abides by standards so we know how they operate.

And so we know, you all know how they operate so we can make digital and decision making as to when you come upon it. So the international technical communication unit which is the body international UN body that controls everything

1	regarding radio, has this on their agenda.
2	We've been working on the site now for
3	about two-and-a-half years. It hopefully will get
4	finalized into law next year in 2019 at the World
5	Radio Council that will meet in the fall, which
6	is the major body that decide on how all radios
7	operate, at what frequencies, et cetera, et cetera.
8	That trickles down, everything else
9	that we'll go into. Right. So hopefully by next
10	year we will have a decision made on that to
11	determine what these devices are, how these devices
12	should be regulated and then by 2021, we can start
13	working on policy standards for them and moving
14	forward with that.
15	So that's kind of where we're at with
16	the pingers. Any questions on the pingers?
17	PARTICIPANT: This is Parrot Roosevelt
18	(phonetic). Currently it's not against the law
19	to use an AIS movement tracker. Correct?
20	PARTICIPANT: Excuse me?
21	PARTICIPANT: It's not against the law
22	to use an AIS device to track the movement.

1	PARTICIPANT: That's correct. An AIS
2	AtoN station and you go ahead and use, which is
3	designed to do that purpose as AtoN.
4	PARTICIPANT: But we do
5	PARTICIPANT: And we don't currently
6	have, we don't currently have any provision, any
7	prohibitions on using an AIS AtoN to track a network
8	and for that matter, I was at risk classes that
9	we have to ask for cover as a navigation permit
10	from us to be able to go to duty.
11	PARTICIPANT: So it's not just that
12	it's FCC approved?
13	PARTICIPANT: No. That much so the
14	results have to be industry approved.
15	PARTICIPANT: So if not FCC approved,
16	who would regulate it?
17	PARTICIPANT: The movement tracker is
18	not FCC approved in that current, in that current
19	software design. Okay? This is a SR 22. So
20	there's the company, the parent company makes this
21	less, this is our two, the UK at England.
22	Their primary provider for 50 percent

1	of the AIS market is out there. That next one's
2	in three forms. There's an AIS A-type of poly cover
3	that is not approved, that we have not approved
4	that you can't by in the United States. That was
5	a tall version.
6	Then there's another one they call the
7	SRT identifier, which is also used as a pinger type
8	of thing, and there's the Apple vendor marketing
9	as a move tracker, which it appears that it allows
10	you do some customization with your vessel and how
11	it's programmed.
12	That particular format and version of
12 13	That particular format and version of it is now illegally sold in the U.S.
13	it is now illegally sold in the U.S.
13 14	it is now illegally sold in the U.S. PARTICIPANT: Even though it says FCC
13 14 15	it is now illegally sold in the U.S. PARTICIPANT: Even though it says FCC approval and they have a whole nice accessory for
13 14 15 16	it is now illegally sold in the U.S. PARTICIPANT: Even though it says FCC approval and they have a whole nice accessory for it?
13 14 15 16 17	it is now illegally sold in the U.S. PARTICIPANT: Even though it says FCC approval and they have a whole nice accessory for it? PARTICIPANT: That's right.
13 14 15 16 17	it is now illegally sold in the U.S. PARTICIPANT: Even though it says FCC approval and they have a whole nice accessory for it? PARTICIPANT: That's right. MR. DERIE: Are you through?
13 14 15 16 17 18	it is now illegally sold in the U.S. PARTICIPANT: Even though it says FCC approval and they have a whole nice accessory for it? PARTICIPANT: That's right. MR. DERIE: Are you through? PARTICIPANT: Yeah.

1	PARTICIPANT: We're working with them
2	to get it approved.
3	PARTICIPANT: So even though the
4	information's available that says FCC approval
5	PARTICIPANT: And it's not hard to
6	believe. It isn't hard to believe.
7	PARTICIPANT: Even with the little
8	piece of paper that comes from the FCC, it's still
9	not?
LO	PARTICIPANT: Right. And it has to be
L1	because it's not the paper. So and we'll go through
L2	this, too, is that the FCC ID number, okay, so it
L3	gives you some semi-assurances that it's been
L4	tested, fine.
L5	But when you go to look at the FCC ID
L6	number, it will point you to an AIC comm unit, and
L7	there's no letter adding this unit to that
L8	certification process.
L9	MR. DERIE: Yeah. You said you were
20	approving these as private AtoNs. Is that under
21	33 C.F.R. 66 or
22	PARTICIPANT: That's true, yes.

1	MR. DERIE: These are on the high seas,
2	aren't they?
3	PARTICIPANT: I recently had to go,
4	okay what happens with this one is that because
5	that's not broadcasted on the official maritime
6	mobile safety identity telephone number for your
7	AIS, it's custom programming if you needed it, which
8	just means that it's an illegal call sign and so
9	to your regular computer, you have to have a dial
10	a legal call sign for the operation, which you have
11	to get from the FCC and the FCC is now delegating
12	that to us to provide that number as well. So that's
13	the extra security.
14	MR. DERIE: And then you approve them
15	under 33 C.F.R. 62?
16	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
17	MR. DERIE: Even though they're on the
18	high seas?
19	PARTICIPANT: Well I'm not. I'm
20	programming it.
21	MR. DERIE: Because I thought 33 CFR
22	66 only applied to the U.S. waters.

1	PARTICIPANT: That's correct.
2	MR. DERIE: Okay.
3	PARTICIPANT: What's next? It's a
4	Catch 22. Yes. The FCC though denies you're
5	official on the spot unless you have that number
6	and not just an official. I would not issue a
7	letter of non-deterrence to Coast Guard unless I
8	know where the authority comes from to request AtoN
9	approval.
10	So we have addressed that in that
11	approval. Or did we answer that?
12	MR. DERIE: Yes, thank you.
13	PARTICIPANT: Any other questions?
14	All right. So now I'm going to talk to you about
15	compliance and things that hopefully will convince
16	you to improve compliance on your fleets.
17	Here's the numbers. These are numbers
18	from last month to give you a general idea. About
19	40 percent of all of us that's out there are
20	transmitting from AIS have some type of static data
21	error to them regarding their MSI number or IO
22	number call sign, a name plus a length.

And Jack mentions that I put here. 1 Fishing vessels are on top of the list as our number 2 3 one offenders. To kind of give you a general 4 breakdown, MSIs are a big issue and particularly a big issue for fishing in our boating community. 5 Because FCC wants us to go ahead and 6 7 do that. That will cost you about 150 bucks so they warned you not to go ahead and do that and 8 9 call me whatever number they want you to be locked. 10 And so therefore either we've lost or 11 are testing a non-official and sign number so that's 12 kind of where we see that percentage there, too. 13 Also some of you have expired licenses. You know, most of them aren't really aware of places. 14 You know, so kind of interesting that 15 16 we have, we're trying to do it from. Okay. We 17 did some concerted enforcement action or really an education effort. If you're going out there, 18 you're going to do this. 19 We were in the double-digits for most 20 of these about three months ago. We had another 21

that was similar to this where on that 85 percent

of error rate for the -- all around the United States.

And now we're down to the 40, so we think our education campaign is kind of working out pretty good. And we've done that, and we're expanding upon that.

Now the one that has serious safety concerns with, for myself and the office, which is, you know, the primary purpose of the AIS is for commercial voyages, it's for vessels out there to have a better situational awareness of other vessels that are out there.

Being able to ID a target on your radar, you know who they are, you know what they are and you know what they're doing so you can make a decision making, how do you pass a rig with those pre-load vessel.

We have a pretty high rate of vessels out there that are broadcasting the serial numbers, which kind of defeats the whole purpose of having the AIS. So the fishing, that kind of concern is not the big vessels for the Coast Guard.

1	And that totally messes out there,
2	they're pushing 1,000 feet of barges ahead of them,
3	and now telling the world that, hey, I'm not here.
4	I'm really over here 1,000 feet in front of you.
5	You know, so when you come upon me,
6	around the bend, they would prefer to be able to
7	see you rather than figure out that you're back
8	here when your partners are approaching the bend.
9	So that's a major safety issue that
10	we're working on trying to get this number down
11	to zero, and that's kind of where we're at on that
12	whole thing right now. We have not had any active
13	penalty action on anybody.
14	We're kind of just doing this for
15	informing you, educating you and trying to get you
16	up to speed. But I can assure that you we hope
17	to see some further improvements on these numbers.
18	Now to assist you in doing and assuring
19	that your device is probably coded just a second.
20	(Pause.)
21	PARTICIPANT: All right. So now this
22	is our frequently asked questions page at the

Navigation Center website. I'm going to walk you through some things that I hope will be helpful to you, and some materials that you can go ahead and download to go ahead and help you with complying with regulations. Pretty much if you Google AIS FAO, this will be the first thing that pops up in that Google You can go ahead and find these things. search. If you go to that, our second question about MSI registering and things of that nature. We have a link to our encoding guide, which walks you through how to go ahead and program every single parameter of your AIS device and it tells you what we want to see in your overview. And it tells you what vessel type code you're supposed to use for your particular vessel. For everybody here, Code 30 is dedicated for fishing vessels. We have appropriated all fishing 19 industry vessels under that same code name. So if you're a catcher, a tender or

processor, we would like you to go ahead and use

name

for

our

this

same

code

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

purposes.

Unfortunately these devices weren't designed around our policies.

So it's supposedly tagging going toward cargo ships, not necessarily vessels, certainly we have for fishing vessels. So until we actually make a revision to this we're just asking you to go ahead and use that same type could be for all your fishing industry vessels, go ahead and do that.

One of the other things under the regulations is recognizing the impact on small entities of these regulations. When we wrote up the regulations, we allowed the use of AIS Class B devices instead of Class A devices for fishing vessels and passenger vessels appearing under less than 150 passengers.

These devices are 50 percent cheaper in cost. They last in functionality, which we'll go ahead and talk about later in a bit to kind of give you a general idea of, you know, what you want to see in each of them.

We have a comparison chart that you may also download on the website, and it goes through

1	them individually and tells you what's going on.
2	A major big difference between the As and the Bs
3	are the output power.
4	Twelve-and-a-half watts for Class A.
5	Two watts for the two various on the Class B, and
6	the reporting rate. The reporting rate for the
7	Class A varies by speed and course changes, it does
8	so organizing.
9	And so it operates any time it has to,
10	the most cheapest Class B device out there is known
11	as CarrierSense. And what they that's a thing
12	like it listens to see if anyone's broadcasting.
13	And if it doesn't find a slot that's
14	being broadcasted on a broadcast, but it doesn't
15	ever since.
16	So it's very slow, pinging at the same
17	rate as a Class A would do. So that's major
18	difference, or major difference between the two
19	devices is that there's more interfacing and output
20	ports for the Class A device as the Class B physical
21	card.

If you have any of those so you can,

almost all of them kind of do have ports so you can go ahead and output the information on to a slide so you can see this information to do that. And so that's a major cost savings between them. And then the whole issue about being able to output it onto a display is one of the other things that I also talked to you about today to kind of give you a general idea of where we're headed with AIS. So since 2014 the Coast Guard has been using our nationwide AIS network to broadcast ace and navigation reports, the same as the ace navigation station to provide you a different aid to navigation to automate our existing physical network for navigation. So under the AIS AtoN nomenclature there's three variants of AIS AtoN, that's known as a physical, synthetic and virtual. A physical AIS AtoN is an actual station that's code dated on the aid itself, so it's on

the buoy, or it's on the A board, or it's on the

beacon and broadcasting from that location, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

gives new information from that particular aid and able to report to you when the heading is off position and give you the other pertinent information about the status of that particular aid.

We've got the two areas of AIS AtoN station are broadcast from some external location to give you information about an aid that exists in that physical location, which would be a synthetic.

Or to go ahead and give you an electronic warning for an aid that does not exist, that you would not visually see with your eyes, but then you will be able to visually see on your radar to guide and assist you with your navigation. So those are the three variants.

The big difference among them that are regular physical aids is this ability to be able to see them in navigation systems before your radar systems. So this is the Oakland Bay Bridge. We constantly saw them. The motion happened a few years back. At time only one of those Raycons was in

the operation. Well as you can see right there, 1 2 that Raycon was in operation. 3 The other three Raycons were not. was not on the ocean at all at the time or the vessel. 4 that caused some confusion on 5 And so the situational awareness of those having to go through 6 7 based on that mark. As you can see from our Raycon, the rate 8 9 time is a transponder. It needs to be pinged on 10 the radar and then responds back to that ping. 11 So you had to be within range to be able to ping 12 that. 13 And then it puts out an electronic coding from that transmission. 14 It's some type of Morse coding that will go ahead and occupy real 15 16 points on your radar as you can see here. 17 And at the same time, as you see the 18 blue diamonds inside of the Raycon circles, all 19 those are AtoN, control AtoN station broadcasts 20 that are being made from a panel shoreside to denote 2.1 the abutments on a bridge.

And so that's, as you can see there that

one's intrusive. It gives a general valid position 1 for the abutments that you want to go ahead and 2 3 avoid, as it appears to the Raycon, which makes it kind of a little bit harder to determine exactly 4 what it is that you're trying to go ahead and avoid. 5 And we have being doing this since from 6 7 2014. As of last week, I think we probably have 600 that we'll broadcasting. A vast percentage 8 of those are being broadcast just on bridges. 9 10 Τf you go ahead and look at the information on bridges, we work very closely with 11 12 the local authorities and entities involved with 13 many of the pilots. And we worked with the companies in the rivers for them to come to us to 14 tell us what they want. 15 16 That's really what we put in these 17 anywhere that's wet. They come to us. We use the validation. We run through the process with them. 18 19 We keep them broadcasted, and we've been very, 20 very successful with this. 21 And so the economy of a Class A to be

able to manage this is a process I'll now show you.

But we had this for -- so not only are we doing 1 that with the AtoNs, the ability to look at the 2 is broadcast 3 AtoNs can also do additional 4 information from that particular station to give information about other 5 vou further recent information and activity as far as the weather. 6 7 So we, this is a project that we've been working on with the NOAA reports, that this was 8 9 an oceanographic Grifton system that NOAA operates. 10 These are providing few that has ATON station that measure a live weather information for the south 11 12 Chesapeake Bay that we're using. 13 We've also have got these from other We have one location that we've done locations. 14 excessive testing and now we're going to go ahead 15 16 and go operational with is work that we have done in conjunction with Alaska, we're working that 17 18 closely. 19 We cooperative had research а 20 development agreement within the last three years 21 or four years?

PARTICIPANT:

Five years.

PARTICIPANT: Five years. Okay. 1 the last five years testing at through there. 2 have an extensive AIS network out in Alaska which 3 4 was primarily a receive network. And that they were moving toward a 5 translator network. And so we've also been doing 6 7 a weather broadcast for a weather station that they have with their particular sites to go ahead and 8 broadcast that information and that we told to go 9 10 ahead and do so for all their weather site locations 11 here starting hopefully next month to go ahead and 12 do that. 13 So we're very game on that whole process to be able to provide more real time weather where 14 we have it available. 15 16 The Army Corps of Engineers has also 17 deployed AIS comm stations at all their locks and 18 the inlet rivers they have 118 and they're also 19 They're getting it from the National starting. Weather Service. 20 21 We'll be getting sensors from Alaska, 22 go ahead and do that. So those are all things that

1	we're moving forward. I explained the whole use
2	of AIS provides you more real time with safety
3	information through that system. That's kind of
4	where we're at. Yes, sir?
5	MR. DERIE: Are you the office that put
6	out that, what is it a letter last summer that said,
7	50 percent of all towing vessels, their AIS didn't
8	work properly or were reporting properly?
9	PARTICIPANT: No.
10	MR. DERIE: Okay. You not that, you
11	aren't the office that put that out?
12	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: So we're going to
14	break for lunch at 11:30, which is in a few minutes.
15	So Mr. Arroyo, would you be available to answer
16	question afterwards?
17	MR. ARROYO: Sure.
18	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay. We'll take
19	what we can until then, but the cafeteria has
20	requested that we break 11:30 so they can do their
21	calculating.
22	PARTICIPANT: And I'll just take one

1	more minute here though. So I guess one of the
2	officers will be brought up to assist you in
3	applying, what did I ask requirements is that we
4	have this announcements that's called best
5	information for case of service.
6	So where you can go ahead and search
7	for your vessel and we'll tell you whether or not
8	it's in compliance or not. Does anybody want to
9	volunteer one of their vessels as is?
10	MR. LONDRIE: Adamant, A-D-A-M-A-N-T.
11	PARTICIPANT: What?
12	MR. LONDRIE: The Adamant,
12	MR. LONDRIE: The Adamant, A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T.
13	A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T.
13	A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T. PARTICIPANT: Adamant?
13 14 15	A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T. PARTICIPANT: Adamant? MR. LONDRIE: At the top one.
13 14 15 16	A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T. PARTICIPANT: Adamant? MR. LONDRIE: At the top one. PARTICIPANT: Having two messengers.
13 14 15 16 17	A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T. PARTICIPANT: Adamant? MR. LONDRIE: At the top one. PARTICIPANT: Having two messengers. And yours?
13 14 15 16 17	A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T. PARTICIPANT: Adamant? MR. LONDRIE: At the top one. PARTICIPANT: Having two messengers. And yours? MR. LONDRIE: The bottom one is mine.
13 14 15 16 17 18	A-D-A-M-A-N-T. A-N-T. PARTICIPANT: Adamant? MR. LONDRIE: At the top one. PARTICIPANT: Having two messengers. And yours? MR. LONDRIE: The bottom one is mine. PARTICIPANT: You're good.

1	up. I couldn't quite figure that out.
2	PARTICIPANT: We only had those listed
3	that we had.
4	PARTICIPANT: Yeah. Well it's in
5	Alaska. Same as the Intangible doesn't show up
6	but
7	PARTICIPANT: No?
8	PARTICIPANT: No.
9	PARTICIPANT: Is it in here?
10	PARTICIPANT: Yes. Well try
11	Intangible.
12	PARTICIPANT: This is cool.
13	PARTICIPANT: It was up there in the
14	last three. The other one.
15	PARTICIPANT: Ible I-B-L-E.
16	A-N-G-I-B-L-E. I-B-L-E.
17	PARTICIPANT: Right.
18	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, go ahead.
19	PARTICIPANT: A-N-G-I-B-L-E.
20	I-B-L-E.
21	PARTICIPANT: Sorry. Big fingers.
22	PARTICIPANT: Is that an E or an A on

1	
2	PARTICIPANT: I-N-T that's correct.
3	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
4	PARTICIPANT: I'm not saying but it
5	looks like an E.
6	PARTICIPANT: Let me just see. No
7	results.
8	PARTICIPANT: And I'm pretty sure this
9	
10	PARTICIPANT: It's not on the list
11	here.
12	PARTICIPANT: Really?
13	PARTICIPANT: Yeah.
14	PARTICIPANT: Did he say that I-N-T?
15	PARTICIPANT: Yeah.
16	PARTICIPANT: No. I looked the other
17	day and I couldn't find it.
18	PARTICIPANT: We won't list there for
19	a second.
20	PARTICIPANT: So hopefully this is not
21	anyone's, but just to give you some idea what we
22	will show you.

1	PARTICIPANT: If I'm correct, then
2	most of these AISs have to be set up by the vendor.
3	PARTICIPANT: You must use
4	assessments.
5	PARTICIPANT: Pardon me?
6	PARTICIPANT: Class A is what you want
7	to do.
8	PARTICIPANT: Class A, which is a five
9	watt?
10	PARTICIPANT: No, they're 12 watts.
11	PARTICIPANT: Oh, Class A is the big
12	one. Class B is the small one?
13	PARTICIPANT: Yeah. Class As have to
14	be, cannot be used in
15	PARTICIPANT: I think what tripped a
16	lot of people up was not knowing that it needed
17	to be in meters and it wouldn't feed it. So that
18	kicked a lot of boats into the warning class.
19	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, that's an easy go.
20	PARTICIPANT: Pardon?
21	PARTICIPANT: That's an easy go.
22	PARTICIPANT: Well a lot of them, in

1	Petersburg they got the \$20,000 fine warning letter
2	for a fee.
3	PARTICIPANT: It's not good.
4	PARTICIPANT: Pardon me?
5	PARTICIPANT: \$37,000.
6	PARTICIPANT: Well the Coast Guard
7	sent the letter out last year.
8	PARTICIPANT: He's giving you a
9	discount.
10	(Simultaneous speaking)
11	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Well let's break
12	for lunch and then we'll come back and entertain
13	any additional questions.
14	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
15	went off the record at 11:29 a.m. and resumed at
16	12:31 p.m.)
17	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, so we'll
18	start off with any questions or comments you have
19	for him and then we have another presentation after
20	that that we skipped over. Let me put my glasses
21	on. Chris, did you have -
22	MR. BENNING: Thank you, Chairman and

members of the Committee. I'm Bill Benning with the Marine Exchange of Alaska. I just had a few comments about the use of the buoy pingers or buoy beacons that you're talking about. We see a proliferation of these in Alaska. We see the day-to-day effect of these devices that are being used.

We want to go on record as saying the Marine Exchange of Alaska does support the development and use of AIS buoy beacons and the use of identified deployed commercial fishing gear, not fishing gear on the back of somebody's boat, but deployed fishing gear for enhanced safety and ID'ing hazards to navigation to other vessels, and for aiding the efficiency in retrieving of deployed gear.

It's important. You know, we want to emphasize deployed fishing gear, not fishing gear on the pier or fishing gear on the back of a vessel.

It's got to be deployed.

Some of the issues we see every day are the illegal beacons flooding the market as Jorge

had mentioned. We see - you know, we run the 1 largest private AIS network in the world within 2 3 Alaska. 130 4 We have over AIS receiving and combine that with our satellite 5 stations, partners, we see everything from the Panama Canal 6 7 to the North Pole. These beacons, because of the way they 8 operate, and Jorge talked about the slots where 9 10 each one, you know, an AIS unit transmits, they 11 saturate the VHF datalink that these things use, 12 so they are taking up time slots for legitimate 13 vessels in the aids to navigation and for collision avoidance. 14 The other thing we see is the improper 15 16 use of the MMSIs, a nine-digit phone number. 17 are uncontrolled. We've seen duplicates. So 18 we'll see these beacons show up in two or three 19 different locations at one time seconds apart from

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

operator and these things are transmitting out and

Can you imagine if you're a vessel

each other.

20

21

identifying themselves as a vessel, but you see 1 the same vessel move locations quickly in the course 2 3 of a five-minute period? 4 The other problem we see is not shutting the gear down when it's not in the water. If you 5 were to look at Homer Harbor right now, you would 6 7 see that there are about 35 AIS-V vessels on the back of another fishing vessel right now. 8 9 Well, the problem is these things don't 10 have a very stable GPS receiver inside, so they're 11 moving around the harbor. So if you were to look 12 at an AIS screen, you would see 35 vessels moving 13 around Homer Harbor right now. And what it does is now these tankers, 14 these pilot vessels that come into Homer to exchange 15 16 pilots, they interfere with the operation of those 17 vessels. 18 We've got some recommendations and one

We've got some recommendations and one of them is the U.S. government has to have a clear use policy and a clear enforcement policy. I think Jorge stated it, that there's a fine for the improper use of AIS equipment. Everybody needs

19

20

21

1	to know this. It's \$37,500 per incident, \$37,500
2	per incident. The industry needs to know that.
3	There needs to be an education program,
4	and this coming weekend, the Pacific Marine Expo
5	is probably a great forum to have some kind of an
6	educational program on the proper use of these
7	devices.
8	There are legal devices to be used, and
9	this is for a recommendation for the commercial
10	industry, use the approved devices, not the
11	unapproved devices, and that's all I've got to say
12	about that. Does anybody have any questions of
13	me?
14	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, thank
15	you. Any questions? I have a question. Oh, go
16	ahead, Tom.
17	MR. DAMERON: So my question is what
18	is defined as an incident? Is it that somebody
19	leaves it on or somebody turns it off? What's an
20	incident?
21	MR. BENNING: Those are all incidents.
22	MR. DAMERON: Okay.

1	MR. BENNING: Any violation is an
2	incident.
3	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Any violation, you
4	could be charged.
5	MR. BENNING: And \$37,500 is the max.
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: The max, okay.
7	All right, Tom, do you still have -
8	MR. BENNING: And so far we find an
9	estimate of us since 2003, I think we've fined one
10	vessel.
11	MR. DAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12	Thank you for your presentation. So do you feel
13	that the Coast Guard does not have a clear use and
14	education and enforcement policy for AIS devices?
15	MR. BENNING: Is that directed to me?
16	Right now, to find out, especially for these buoy
17	beacons, it's very difficult to find out which are
18	authorized and which are not.
19	You have to drill down through a lot
20	of information, through the Coast Guard NavCen
21	website, and that refers you to an FCC site, which
22	you have to go through an FCC website to figure

1	out which device may or may not be approved.
2	In the case of the one we have right
3	here, the manufacturer stipulates that it's FCC
4	type approved. You've got to go through the
5	documentation to find out that that's one of three
6	different types. This particular one is not.
7	It's not very easy for the average Joe
8	to figure out which is approved for use and which
9	is not. And I've been doing this for 17 years and
10	I still have difficulty figuring out which device,
11	which devices are authorized for use.
12	But NavCen does a good job of putting
13	information out, but this is a changing technology
14	and this is one we've seen over the last two years.
15	
16	A lot of commercial fishing vessels are
17	now buying these off of Amazon or Alibaba and
18	they're attaching them. They're useful, but they
19	cause all kinds of problems because they're not
20	managed correctly.
21	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you. Mr.
22	Boehmer?

MR. BOEHMER: I'm Kris Boehmer. 1 looking at Eric's issue, and Bill said 2 something that I didn't know if it exists. 3 Is it 4 possible or is there a list already of approved ones that you guys can, that an owner can look at 5 real quickly without having to go through all of 6 7 those things and look and see if the listing says it's FCC only to find out now that it's not? 8 9 MR. ARROYO: Mr. Arroyo, yes, there is 10 a listing and there's also unfortunately two issues 11 here, right? So those devices that are required for 12 13 you to have for the Coast Guard, Class Bs and Class AAs, will not only have an FCC number on it, but 14 they'll have a Coast Guard type approval number 15 16 on it which will start out with 165,155XXXXX, which 17 in that comparison chart that I showed you about 18 As and Bs, the numbers are down there. So you'll 19 see on the label itself that it has to have a Coast

Now, when we get into this world, this

Guard approval number for it to be Coast Guard care

assurance.

20

21

1	is another unique nuance of that world in that these
2	are not required devices, so they're not Coast Guard
3	required, so therefore there's no Coast Guard type
4	approval number for it, but because they are a
5	radiating device, all radiating devices, i.e.,
6	radios in the United States have to have an FCC
7	approval number.
8	And then I fully agree with Bill in
9	that, well, you can have an FCC approval number,
10	but what is it that you're approved for?
11	Well, you have to be a little bit more
12	nuanced to kind of understand what that is, and
13	then even more nuanced with this particular buoy
14	tracker product in the sense that that product,
15	that same product harbor-wise has been approved
16	as an ATON by the U.S. Coast Guard and by the FCC.
17	
18	However, once they did manipulations
19	to the software of that original approval, well,
20	that violates the approval for the original device,
21	so it's a catch-22.

I fully get it, particularly for the

vendor that's purchasing it and God forbid for somebody who's just trying to buy them off of Amazon rebate, and we're very empathetic about that, and so that's why we're not going hard on anybody, but so this is our first volley to start that education process.

The FCC who really owns that particular issue because it's a violation of FCC rules, because to me, that is not an AIS legally. Although it transmits as an AIS, it's not an AIS legally to me because I don't recognize that device as being an AIS. So it's an FCC rule or regulation, so then you've got the morass of bureaucracy like, "Well, whose rules are we violating?"

Now, it puts out, that particular unit puts out an AIS aids to navigation report which then is part of our requirements, and for you to be able to put out that report, you'd need a proper MMSI and an approval as an ATON to go ahead and operate.

So now you're in a catch-22 that you're violating my rules as an ATON and you're violating

the FCC rules as not being properly marked, and so how do we educate that to the common user?

First of all, we're going to hopefully shut down the purchasing vehicle at Amazon and eBay, so to get them off the market so a person can't just buy this. We pretty much have to shut down any retailer in the United States that's trying to sell them and we've been very cooperative. They've been very cooperative with us.

So we're going to shut the flow of the devices and now it's a matter of educating the users to understand, you know, what these devices are doing, particularly the detrimental ones. That was a pretty legitimate device and we can work something out, and we hope to work it out in combination to somehow permit their use as we move forward.

But it is a challenge for us on how do you get the word out? And you heard me. I had to tell you a convoluted story. How do I tell that convoluted story to somebody who doesn't even understand what the hell we're talking about?

Well, is it feasible for 1 PARTICIPANT: somebody like yourself to back up and distribute 2 3 a public service announcement that could be put 4 up to the Coast Guard websites and -Yes, and we'll do that, 5 MR. ARROYO: It has a number of 18 that tells you and I have. 6 7 that you can't use these devices, but the deal is that nobody really knows that I have the device, 8 9 right? I bought it on Amazon. What's wrong with 10 t.hat.? I mean, I get it. You know, so that's 11 12 a challenge. We have a challenge, but, yes, noted. 13 We look forward to any recommendation that comes out of this Committee that we will take back and 14 to be further evidence for the FCC to put out some 15 16 more joint education information on it. And then we'll also work with our 17 18 commercial vessel inspectors and examiners at the 19 districts who are also getting smarter and I hope 20 to get them more materials so when they do their 21 safety aid inspections, they can inform their

fishermen of what's going on here.

1	Like I said, this has now become a real
2	big issue for us in the United States. So just
3	about six months ago, I had not seen quite a few
4	of them, but then just in the last year, we saw
5	400 pop up, so now we're actively engaged.
6	But noted, and we look forward to any
7	resolution that comes out of this meeting to
8	continue moving this ball forward as we move
9	forward. Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Can you be
11	specific on what you're looking for from this
12	Committee?
13	MR. ARROYO: That the Coast Guard
14	should do a better job of educating the users of
15	this.
16	PARTICIPANT: Marine safety alert?
17	MR. ARROYO: Yeah, that we're working
18	on, but, yes.
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, thank
20	you. Mr. Dameron?
21	MR. DAMERON: Yes, thank you, Mr.
22	Chairman. Captain Edwards, would this be a subject

1	that would be appropriate for a NAVIC to be put
2	out?
3	CAPT. EDWARDS No.
4	MR. DAMERON: No?
5	CAPT. EDWARDS So if you're - for
6	outreach, a safety alert, or a marine safety
7	information bulletin are probably the two best
8	means to get that out, but again, those are still
9	relying on someone getting it, like physically
10	reaching out.
11	I guess one avenue we can explore, and
12	we encourage people to subscribe is our maritime
13	comments blog. So if you don't already subscribe
14	to that, I'll do a little public service
15	announcement here.
16	That has become kind of one of the
17	primary means of which the prevention world, marine
18	safety world uses to put outreach out and it's
19	across a wide variety of issues from waterways,
20	inspections.
21	And so probably what we'll do is we can
22	look to team up with folks with the AIS and put

out a maritime comments blog that then may link to a marine safety information bulletin or something of that manner, but those are the two primary means we would work with this.

MR. ARROYO: This is Mr. Arroyo again.

And we already have those in the works, and we're ready to go with a maritime comments blog entry and a safety alert now in MSIB that we're going to go ahead and do.

But we're waiting for the FCC to put out their public notice so we can point to it to tell you that it's illegal because right now you're not violating Coast Guard regulations, right, so I need to point to the FCC notice to go ahead and get the ball rolling to close the loop. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, thank you. I put out a daily newsletter and I put all of the safety alerts that are linked on the fishing vessels in my group, which was several hundred people, and I know Richard also has a pretty good network for disseminating information, so there is a safety alert we can - there are avenues whereby

industry perpetuates those. Mr. Woodley? 1 WOODLEY: Good afternoon, 2 MR. 3 I'm Chris Woodley of the Groundfish 4 I just wanted to talk and follow up on some of the comments that were made regarding the AIS 5 transponders as to mark fishing gear and the GMDSS 6 7 issue. With regards to the AIS transponders, 8 as Mr. Benning said, there's been a proliferation 9 10 of this use, particularly in Gulf of Alaska 11 fisheries. A lot of that is being driven by fishery 12 management changes right now which are starting 13 to create gear conflicts on the ground. You're starting to have a lot more use 14 of pot gear intermixed with long line gear for 15 16 sablefish fisheries, and as a result, there's been 17 a desire to better mark their gear, so that these 18 guys are trying to do the right thing. 19 And so I feel like the Coast Guard's focus on this should not be to make it an enforcement 20 21 issue, but to figure out ways, as Mr. Benning said,

figure out a way to make this, you know, use this

technology legally so that they can address their fishery management concerns, avoid gear conflicts, and not cause the side board problems that are being associated with, you know, improper use of the equipment at this time.

On the issue of the GMDSS exemptions, back in September of 2017, a large section of the fishing industries submitted comments to the public docket regarding the regulatory forums that, you know, that the Coast Guard had requested information on.

It was docket number USCG 2017-0480 and there was a laundry list of things from the fishing industry about where we wanted to see regulatory reform.

And one of those was the issue of the GMDSS and specifically the policy change that we requested was that it was the fishing industry's contention that GMDSS technology continues to be more obsolete while remaining extremely expensive, and given that there are more cost effective and reliable emergency communication options, that the

exemptions that the FCC was giving, you know, be
allowed to continue, and the Coast Guard just
continue to enforce NAVIC 399 as a requirement for
fishing vessels.
I don't know. I'm not a tech person.
I don't know a lot about the technology, but my
understanding is it is old technology. It's 1990s

expensive.

I think it's questionable as to whether or not having that equipment onboard improves safety, quite frankly. If you look at the vessels that it's going to apply to, they are boats that are over 300 gross ton, which are primarily the larger catcher vessels and fish processing vessels.

technology, and I know for a fact it's very, very

Those boats are all electronic marvels.

There is so much electronic information and communication onboard those vessels that I don't see why it's not possible to come up with an alternative way to duplicate what GMDSS can already do within the fishing fleet.

1	Quite frankly, because so many of the
2	boats in the Bering Sea, the fishing vessels, which
3	are the other users that are out there are less
4	than 300 gross tons, those boats are not going to
5	receive a GMDSS callout.
6	So you're going to have 20 percent of
7	the boats that have the capability, 80 percent of
8	the boats that don't, and that's not, you know,
9	that's not optimal in terms of safety. If you're
10	trying to get emergency information out
11	immediately, only hitting 20 percent of your
12	desired target isn't very good.
13	Again, I'm not an electronics wizard,
14	but I am quite certain that there are ways that,
15	using the existing technology that's on these boats
16	and in all of those wheelhouses, to come up with
17	something that would duplicate what GMDSS currently
18	does, but it does so at a much lesser or lower cost.
19	
20	So those are my comments. Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, thank you,
22	Chris, appreciate it. Any comments? All right,

1	Mr. Garcia?
2	LCDR GARCIA: Good afternoon, Mr.
3	Chairman. I'm Lieutenant Commander Garcia with
4	PACAREA. I just wanted to provide the Committee
5	a brief.
6	My office in PACAREA, we're responsible
7	for inputting a third-party survey of exams into
8	MISLE, and that's per Coast Guard policy letter
9	04-07, so just an update.
10	So far we have data over the past three
11	years and we've inputted over 150 vessels into
12	MISLE, and then these are completed vessel exams
13	conducted by third-party surveyors.
14	Some of the challenges that we're
15	seeing right now is that the reports that we receive
16	are coming in late. Per the policy letter, they're
17	supposed to be submitted within 10 business days.
18	We've usually been seeing them coming in three
19	months later after the fact, six months, sometimes
20	a year.
21	Another challenge is that we had to
22	remind surveyors that when they ask for the decals,

they have to go through headquarters and not through the local sector office.

And one other thing too is that when we receive the exams, we usually receive, we receive exams that's completed. We don't have a history of any deficiencies.

So we're trying to reach out to the surveyors that, you know, if you have to visit the vessel more than once or there were deficiencies that had to be corrected, please put that on the exam so that way we can provide or show a little bit of the vessel's history in MISLE.

Again, our role is more of an administrative role. That's what our office was assigned to do. I can only speak on behalf of PACAREA. I, unfortunately, can't speak on behalf of LANTAREA, and versus serving or helping the vessels within our four districts, D11, D13, D14, and D17, and that's all I have to pass.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you very much. Any questions for the Commander? Thank you very much, appreciate it.

1	Okay, that concludes the presentations
2	that we have. The time - is there something else?
3	Yeah, the time is now yours as Committee members
4	to advance any questions, or concerns, or topics,
5	motions. Now is your last chance to do so, so Mr.
6	Dameron?
7	MR. DAMERON: So with the Senate
8	passing a bill that will move the classification
9	of new built from 79-foot to 180-foot, I'm worried
10	that vessels that complied with the regulations
11	as they were written and built fishing vessels to
12	class, the current regulations state that they will
13	have to stay in class, and I feel that this is an
14	unnecessary disadvantage to these boats.
15	If Congress said that, "Hey, we've
16	required you to build to class over 79-foot," but
17	five years later, they put that back, they obviously
18	are admitting that that may have been a mistake.
19	
20	So I would like to propose the motion
21	that the Coast Guard advises the United States House

Guard

Subcommittee on Coast

22

and Maritime

Transportation and the United States Senate
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, and Fisheries
that the Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory
Committee does not favor the requirement to
continue to remain in class for fishing vessels
that were required to be built to class, but would
no longer be required to be built to class under
subsequent U.S. Code.
CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Is there a second?
MR. HOCKEMA: Second.
CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema is the
second. All right, would you like to speak to your
motion, Mr. Dameron, or you just did?
MR. DAMERON: Yeah, I think that's
pretty self-explanatory. If there's any questions
for me, I'd be more than happy to answer.
CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, Mr. Woodley?
MR. WOODLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I
apologize. I forgot to talk with Mr. Dameron about
this. I understand his intent behind it. My
concern would be when you're talking about vessels
being built to class. You know, fish processing

vessels have been required to be built to class 1 since the early 1990s. 2 Mr. Davis' fleet, a large number of my 3 4 vessels, and a number of freezer long liners, fish processing vessels were all built to class. 5 owners have invested tens of millions of dollars 6 7 in the construction of those boats. So I believe what Mr. Dameron is getting 8 at are more the smaller vessels that were built 9 10 to class in the last couple of years as a result 11 of the changes in the Authorization Act post 2010. 12 And I think you have to figure out a 13 way to thread the needle so you're not throwing fish processing vessels into that broader group 14 of vessels because that's, again, fish processing 15 16 vessels have a much higher risk. They have a large 17 group of members that operate in remote areas, and 18 those vessels all warrant the standards of 19 classification. 20 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yeah, thanks, 2.1 I think Tom was referring to probably three Chris.

Mr. Dameron?

or four vessels.

MR. DAMERON: So, yeah, thank you very much, Chris. So if I could address that, so the last part of the motion says that, "but would no longer be required to be built to class under subsequent U.S. Code," so if they change the code, and I'm sure they're not going to change the code for these large fish processors.

They're just - the ones that they do

They're just - the ones that they do change the code for, those are the ones that we're asking that they consider this.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Boehmer?

MR. BOEHMER: I think what we were hoping is that if this motion passes, that there still be some sort of existing requirement to maintain these guys to a certain level of standard or compliance.

But maybe we should amend that motion a little bit, Tom, to say that boats under the - the new boats that were built to these new regulations only, that now won't be required to be classed, so it doesn't affect the ones that are out there. We were just talking about these ones

that have happened since 2013.

2.1

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yes, I think that was the intent, yeah, thank you. Just a minute, Joe. This will be a very heavy lift because you're asking the Coast Guard to go to these Congressional committees and ask them to do something about a law that doesn't exist or exists in a different form really.

So it will be a heavy lift anyway, but I'm not saying that it can't be done, but the recommendation, there should also be in conjunction with this recommendation an effort to establish a new law about these vessels. Joe, did you have a comment?

MR. DERIE: Yeah, I'm curious how many vessels are we talking about and what are their sizes? Do we have a real feel for this problem?

MR. DAMERON: So I have a real feel for

it as far more as a member of the surf clam and ocean quahog industry that built a 160-foot new clam vessel and he built that to class at a substantially increased cost over a neighbor that

1	did a major conversion and built a similar vessel.
2	
3	He was disadvantaged in the building
4	stages where I'm hesitant to say how much more it
5	cost him, but it cost him a lot more, and he is
6	going to have the ongoing expenses of keeping this
7	vessel in class, where if Congress no longer
8	requires that that size vessel is built to class,
9	I don't see the reason why he should have to have
10	the expense of keeping it in class.
11	MR. DERIE: Yeah, I'm sorry. I didn't
12	make myself clear. I understand your concerns.
13	What I'm wondering is how many vessels are we
14	talking about and how big are they? You've
15	mentioned one, a 160-foot. How many more do we
16	have?
17	I mean, the way to go about that if it's
18	just that vessel is get your Congressman to pass
19	a public law exempting it. If we're only talking
20	a couple of vessels here, that's the best way to
21	handle it.

If we're talking 40 or 50, this may be

the best way to handle it, but I note that we're going back to Congress for something, so that's what I meant by do we have a handle on the problem.

How many vessels are we talking about and how big are they?

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Yeah, thanks, Joe, and that's what I was suggesting is that there needs to be some lawmaking activity in conjunction with this and that could be a Congressman slipping something into a bill exempting the vessel.

So that could be done in conjunction with this, but it needs other activity besides the recommendation from this Committee which I don't think would go very far. Tom?

MR. DAMERON: And the purpose of the recommendation was just to let these two subcommittees know that, "Hey, if you're no longer going to require a classification on these fishing vessels, there's a group of fishing vessels that did comply with this law when you added an effect and that this Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory Committee does not support the requirement to keep

2.1

them in class."

It was just the Coast Guard notifying these two committees that say, "Hey, we had this subcommittee on fishing vessel safety and they don't agree that this handful of vessels should be required to remain in class."

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thanks, Tom. Any other questions or comments? Mr. Hockema?

MR. HOCKEMA: Mr. Hockema. Just to further what Mr. Dameron was saying, I think our motive here is just to give the Coast Guard a tool for when they are in committee hearing.

It's common in these hearings for Congressmen to ask the Coast Guard what their current concerns are and these kind of things, and it's just to bring up a concern. We understand that the Coast Guard cannot change legislation.

We also understand that another avenue, I consider it another avenue, probably the most effective is what Mr. Derie was saying, or just approach your Congressman and ask them. Write a letter and ask them to rescind this part of the

ll law.

Rescinding the law is a little more complicated than what Mr. Dameron's motion is. It wasn't intended to hit every, dot every I and cross every T there.

But in any case, it's just a matter of we realize the Coast Guard is periodically in Congressional hearing meetings with committees, and if it's within the scope of the Committee, we'd like to arm them with an opinion from the Committee for those hearings. If it's not, then we don't have that capability, but I think we do.

One other thing though is I noticed something here and it was brought up in Mr. Woodley's comments. If we pass this motion, I think it should state "fishing vessels and fish tender vessels." It specifically excludes fish processors. They're not in there.

But the three types of vessels we have in the fishing industry are fishing vessels, fish tender vessels, and fish processing vessels. So we're not asking this of fish processing vessels

1	at all, but fishing vessels and fish tender vessels
2	would probably be appropriate. Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, Tom, do you
4	want to revise your motion?
5	MR. DAMERON: I would revise my motion
6	to read, "fishing vessels and fish tender vessels."
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, would you
8	like to read the restated motion?
9	MR. DAMERON: The motion, that the U.S.
10	Coast Guard advises the United States House
11	Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime
12	Transportation and the United States Senate
13	Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, and Fisheries
14	that the Commercial Fishing Safety Advisory
15	Committee does not favor the requirement to
16	continue to remain in class for fishing vessels
17	and fish tender vessels that were required to be
18	built to class, but would no longer be required
19	to be built to class under subsequent U.S. Code.
20	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema is the
21	second. Are you okay with that language?
22	MR. HOCKEMA: I second.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Any other comments
2	or questions? Okay, all in favor, raise your hand.
3	Any opposed? I'm sorry, I didn't give Karen
4	enough time. Okay, any opposed? All right, the
5	motion passes. Is there anything else? Mr.
6	Boehmer?
7	MR. BOEHMER: Okay, I'm a man of many
8	motions. Kris Boehmer. All right, I'd like to
9	make a motion. The Coast Guard fishing vessels,
10	Fishing Safety Advisory Committee would ask the
11	U.S. Coast Guard to look back at the core concepts
12	of the original ASCP program and renew their efforts
13	to look at the data region by region, fishery by
14	fishery.
15	Fishing vessel safety coordinators
16	from each region then should meet with the industry
17	leaders from the various fisheries to review this
18	data with the goal of creating best practices that
19	are specific to the needs of their regions,
20	fisheries, and gear types.
21	The goal is to work locally to the best

practice agreements that can be used as the guides

1	to specifics in their areas.
2	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, is there a
3	second?
4	MR. DAMERON: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Dameron has
6	seconded. Would you like to speak to the motion?
7	MR. BOEHMER: I just think that we've
8	put a lot of work into creating these, into the
9	old boats currently built with no classification
10	or standards in mind, and we put a lot of time into
11	identifying a lot of areas, and we made the mistake
12	of labeling that an alternate compliance program,
13	and I'd like to kind of go back to that.
14	Pull it back and get it back on the table
15	with the idea that we can use some logical
16	approaches to make this industry a lot safer.
17	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, thank you.
18	Any questions or comments? Mr. Dameron?
19	MR. DAMERON: I have a question for the
20	Coast Guard. How did this specific - how did this
21	kind of disappear? I mean, we worked on it for
22	a while.

It seemed like that they were starting 1 to work with individual regions. It was supposed 2 3 to be region-wide, and then all of a sudden, it turned into just a suggested checklist and it went 4 5 away. How did that go away, the alternative 6 7 safety compliance program that was supposed to be regional in nature? It was supposed to address 8 specific regional safety issues. 9 10 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: So Ι quess in 11 fairness to both Mr. Myers and Captain Edwards, 12 they are fairly new to the process and might not 13 be familiar with what transpired. Yeah, Mr. Chair, thank you. 14 MR. MYERS: Well, I would say I think to give a fair response, 15 16 I personally would have to look back at what transpired back in 2016, that there's a little bit 17 18 of a spread. 19 And so, again, I can't formally respond to your question right here and now. 20 That's not 21 to say that we can't get some background history

and then do a follow-up. That's all I have on that.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Captain, any
2	additional comments?
3	CAPT. EDWARDS: I mean, I think the
4	comment that I'd provide is we've kind of gone
5	public, and I can pull up our statement on why we
6	went with the alternative, the enhanced oversight
7	program.
8	I mean, that's - I can pull that up for
9	you. I wasn't here when it was made, the statement
10	was made, but I think the Coast Guard has gone on
11	record as to why and we'd be more than happy to
12	supply that to you.
12 13	supply that to you. CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema?
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema?
13 14	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema? MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 14 15	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema? MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I've mentioned in private conversations here,
13 14 15 16	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema? MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I've mentioned in private conversations here, and it's been discussed, I think the reason we are
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema? MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I've mentioned in private conversations here, and it's been discussed, I think the reason we are where we are at on this is the word "alternate,"
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema? MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I've mentioned in private conversations here, and it's been discussed, I think the reason we are where we are at on this is the word "alternate," and the Coast Guard's legal department has
13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Hockema? MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I've mentioned in private conversations here, and it's been discussed, I think the reason we are where we are at on this is the word "alternate," and the Coast Guard's legal department has determined that the alternate safety compliance

of Congress when they passed this law, but they misnamed the section in the law, and so here we stand with a situation where the intent was to develop standards for, regional standards for existing fishing vessels which Mr. Dameron and Mr. Boehmer had mentioned, but we're at a standstill because of this word "alternate," and of course it's an issue of statute.

And so I personally will be writing a letter to my Congressman about maybe modifying that, and the committees that Mr. Dameron mentioned in our motion earlier.

It's frustrating to see this, to put so much emphasis on the title of a section of the code when the content is really what the intent is. The title is one line. The content is several paragraphs, but the title seems to have disqualified the content of the statute, and I don't understand that, but I'm not an attorney, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, thank you. Any other comments or questions? Yes?

1	LT. DUFFETT: Lieutenant Jonathan
2	Duffett. I would just, in response to Mr.
3	Dameron's question, refer you back to the marine
4	safety information bulletin 11-16 which gives some
5	of the background as to why the alternate safety
6	compliance program development was suspended in
7	lieu of the enhanced oversight program. I have
8	a copy if anyone wants to look at it.
9	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you,
10	Lieutenant. Okay, any objection to voting? Kris,
11	could you read your motion again?
12	MR. BOEHMER: The Commercial Fishing
13	Safety Advisory Committee would ask that the U.S.
14	Coast Guard look back at the core concepts of the
15	original ASCP program and renew their efforts to
16	look at the data region by region, fishery by
17	fishery.
18	The fishing vessel safety coordinators
19	from each region should then meet with the industry
20	leaders in the various fisheries to review this
21	data with a goal of creating best practices that
22	are specific to the needs of the regions, fisheries,

1	and gear types.
2	The goal is to work locally towards best
3	practice agreements that can be used as guides to
4	specific, guides specific to their area.
5	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you. All in
6	favor by raise of hand? Any opposed? The voting
7	appears unanimous. Thank you.
8	MR. BOEHMER: I have one more.
9	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Go ahead.
10	MR. BOEHMER: I would like to make a
11	motion to move to have the U.S. Coast Guard issue
12	a marine safety information bulletin regarding the
13	use of unregistered and/or unapproved AIS devices
14	that we then can distribute to our fleets.
15	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Is there a second?
16	PARTICIPANT: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Who was that? So
18	would you like to address your motion?
19	MR. BOEHMER: I think it's reasonably
20	self-explanatory. It sounds to me like there's
21	a lot of people that, for good reason, thought that
22	they may be in violation and create safety concerns,

1	and I think the sooner we can get that out there
2	to clarify that, the better our industry will be
3	served.
4	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: I think they would
5	be uncomfortable knowing that the use of the device
6	could lead them to a \$37,500 fine. Any comments,
7	questions? Okay, by raise of hands, all in favor?
8	PARTICIPANT: I appreciate hands.
9	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Any opposed? The
LO	voting is unanimous. Thank you.
L1	MR. BOEHMER: My last one, okay, I
L2	think. I'm not promising, but I'm thinking. All
L3	right, I move to have the Coast Guard work with
L 4	the FCC and others to create a viable process and
L5	guide to proper AIS use, use and registration for
L6	gear marking so that we can use this technology
L7	as a navigational aid on operating a failure point
L8	for the proper operation of the AIS system.
L9	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Is there a second?
20	MR. DENNEHY: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Dennehy.
22	Would you like to speak to the motion?

1	MR. BOEHMER: The same idea as before.
2	It seems like there's some good technology out
3	there. It's being used improperly it sounds like
4	or we've got some of the wrong product out there,
5	but we want to, I think, have people use this, but
6	in the right way so it does not create unintended
7	consequences.
8	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you. Any
9	discussion or questions? All in favor, please
10	indicate by the raising of your hand. Any opposed?
11	The voting is unanimous.
12	MR. BOEHMER: I just want to say I had
13	two-word motions. I had somebody help pretty it
14	up. Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right,
16	anything else? Captain, it looks like we've
17	reached the conclusion.
18	PARTICIPANT: Do we want to
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: If it's okay with
20	the Captain, that's fine. Any comments from the
21	public, last chance. Mr. Woodley? Thank you.
22	MR. WOODLEY: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

just one parting thought on this or on the advisory committee. Once every three years isn't enough for this group to meet in person. It's been - the last time that this group met in person was September of 2016. That was three fiscal years ago.

Other advisory committees within the

Other advisory committees within the Coast Guard meet on a much regular basis, and so I was hoping that the advisory committee could again make a recommendation to the Coast Guard that this body meet at a minimum of two times a year in person and consistent with other advisory committee meetings, and further, that the Committee request that the Coast Guard adjust the budget to support meeting twice a year. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Mr. Woodley. Mr. Boehmer?

MR. BOEHMER: I forgot I had an extra motion. I actually talked about this with somebody else. I'd like to make a motion that we have at least quarterly meetings via teleconference and more meetings, at least one face-to-face meeting.

1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, thanks.
2	Yeah, we're kind of getting into the last thing
3	in the agenda about next meeting plans and suggested
4	locations, and I'll turn it over to -
5	MR. BOEHMER: So we don't need a motion
6	to have quarterly meetings?
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: We can do that,
8	yeah. So is there a second?
9	MR. DAMERON: Second.
LO	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Mr. Dameron has
L1	seconded. Would you like to speak to your motion?
L2	MR. BOEHMER: I just think as Mr.
L3	Woodley clearly pointed out, we need to keep this
L 4	ball rolling. I think at least a quarterly
L5	teleconference is a cost-effective way of talking
L6	about issues and moving the ball forward, and, you
L7	know, we've got important work to do.
L8	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you. Mr.
L9	Davis, do you have a comment?
20	MR. DAVIS: Yes, please. Alan Davis.
21	I have an echo for what Mr. Woodley just said.
2.2	Having served on other federal advisory committees

that are able to meet more often, and knowing that the Coast Guard has advisory committees that meet more often, I believe that the work that this Committee does is important and I've seen that we lose our synergy.

We lose our energy. We lose our forward motion if we are not meeting on a frequent, regular basis. So I would recommend quarterly phone calls as was just voted on, and meeting twice a year face-to-face because that is how you keep things going.

Another thing that I would like everybody to think about, while classification of vessels and new construction is something that's very scary and freaked a lot of people out, perhaps understandably, I think this is one of those situations where the baby is getting thrown out with the bath water because of the economic concerns, but losing sight of the safety concerns.

In my area, if I build a 10 by 20 toolshed in my backyard, I have to have permitting. I have to have inspections. I have to have somebody

coming and looking at it to make sure that I'm putting it together right.

But in some ways, in some of our areas, it's been reported to me that people can go out in their backyard basically and build a fishing boat, and push it down into the water and go fishing with it.

So I would challenge the Committee and the Coast Guard to try and make sure that what may be political machinations in the 2018 Coast Guard Authorization Bills doesn't throw the baby out with the bath water, and we make sure that classification or maintaining construction standards, and maintaining a vessel as it was originally designed and constructed remain vitally important.

When we did the alternative compliance safety agreement, one of the things that they found were people are doing something. They're making a modification. They need to run a conveyor from here to there.

Get out the torch, cut a two-foot by two-foot hole, shove the conveyor through a

watertight bulkhead, run new wires, drill holes 1 in a watertight bulkhead, and don't do the proper 2 3 procedures. 4 Those are the things that classification or some similar system helps a 5 vessel owner maintain, and I would encourage the 6 7 Committee, the Coast Guard, and the industry to all try to find a way that we can attain those 8 objectives economically and safely. 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you, Mr. Mr. Hockema? 11 Davis. 12 MR. HOCKEMA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 13 and thank you, Mr. Davis. I'd like to echo Mr. Davis' comments verbatim. 14 He was spot-on on everything he said. In addition, we know that 15 16 standards save money in the long run. Everywhere 17 around us, we have standards. They save money in 18 the long run. 19 And so right now, our fishing industry with a lack of standards is building to different 20 21 - it may be a builder's standard in Coos Bay, Oregon

or in Bayou La Batre, Alabama that are wildly

different, but they may have a similar customer 1 2 base. And it's confusing to, when you go back 3 to repair these vessels, aside from safety, it's 4 confusing to work on some older vessels that have 5 been built to no standard really, just someone 6 7 else's preference at the time. Standards save money in the long run. It's not just a safety 8 It is an economic issue too. 9 issue. 10 Your home that you live in, if you have a home that's built in the last 30 years, it's highly 11 12 regulated, and aside from that, we know that real 13 estate costs in general in this country are very high, but the home itself, it enables builders to 14 build to a standard and they don't have to reinvent 15 16 the wheel every time they build a new home. 17 just want to say, you know, Ι 18 standards do save money and standards can be 19 reasonable if well thought out. Thanks. 20 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you. Mr. 21 Boehmer, could you read your motion again? 22 MR. For the Commercial BOEHMER:

1	Fishing Safety Advisory Committee to have quarterly
2	teleconference meetings and at least one
3	face-to-face meeting per year each year.
4	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, thank you.
5	Any other comments or questions on the motion?
6	PARTICIPANT: I think we should meet
7	at least twice a year.
8	MR. BOEHMER: I wouldn't have a
9	problem. I'll change it to that if it's - am I
LO	able to change that?
L1	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: You can change it
L2	as long as it's okay with the second.
L3	PARTICIPANT: Then it will echo a 2016
L 4	motion.
L5	MR. BOEHMER: Okay, all right, so I
L6	will change once a year to twice a year, so I'll
L7	read it again, for the Fishing Vessel Safety
L8	Advisory Committee to have quarterly
L9	teleconference meetings and to meet at least twice
20	a year face-to-face.
21	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, is that
22	okay with the second?

1	PARTICIPANT: Yeah, I don't know who
2	seconded.
3	MR. DAMERON: I think I seconded.
4	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Did you second it,
5	Tom?
6	MR. DAMERON: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Okay, is that okay
8	with you?
9	MR. DAMERON: It is okay.
10	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, okay,
11	we vote then if there is no other comments or
12	questions. All in favor, please raise your hand.
13	Any opposed? It looks like it's unanimous.
14	Thank you very much.
15	And sometimes these things, even though
16	it was voted on before and passed and has been talked
17	about, I'm reminded of the fact that we voted for
18	many years every year on the classing issue, and
19	so, you know, sometimes we just have to be patient
20	and persistent, and we'll see where it goes.
21	All right, any other comments or
22	questions from the Committee or the public? Yes,

1	please state your name.
2	MR. ARCENEAUX: My name is Stewart
3	Joseph Arceneaux. I represent the National
4	Observer Program and Safety Advisory Committee,
5	and I really just wanted to present a thanks to
6	the whole Committee here for the opportunity to
7	attend this meeting.
8	I come from a slightly different world
9	in some ways, but then, you know, my observer
10	background, you know, in a way, we're all kind of
11	working on the boats, and we look forward to this
12	meeting as a way to see kind of what some of the
13	big issues are that might intersect with our world
14	so we can be kind of pre-prepared to develop some
15	of our policies and things like that.
16	So anyway, thanks a lot. I've learned
17	a lot and I hope to attend the next meeting whenever
18	that is.
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you very
20	much. Closing remarks?
21	CAPT. EDWARDS So I'd just like to say
22	a few things. First, thanks to the Chair and the

Vice Chair for leading the meeting, and thanks for all the Committee members and the public at large for the comments that you made.

We'll take those back. I think there's definitely some items here that we can turn around and provide some past statements to the Committee to start to work on, and then set up some sort of a more regular phone call schedule or virtual meeting so that we can keep the pace on those.

I think collectively, we'll need to we have finite resources in terms of money and the
people that we have available to work on a project,
so these are some items that we'll collectively
have to prioritize, you know, what are some of the
ones that are good to work on now and what are some
of the ones that we can chip away or do incremental
improvement on? So I look forward to working with
that.

Like I said in the beginning, I thank you for your work that you did today and I'm going to go ahead and thank you for the work that you're going to do in the future. Like I say, we'll take

1	these minutes back and review them and go from
2	there.
3	So with that, I'm going to hand it back
4	over to you as the Chair to close it out.
5	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: All right, thank
6	you very much. Yes, Mr. Kampnich?
7	MR. KAMPNICH: Yes, Michael Kampnich.
8	I'm curious on the terms. My term, I think, will
9	be up in June, and I'm not real familiar with what
10	will be the process for reconsideration?
11	CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: There will be - oh,
12	go ahead, Mr. Myers.
13	MR. MYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
14	will begin - we are actually currently working on
15	packaging up an announcement because we do
16	recognize that there will be six, I believe,
17	vacancies that come up in June.
18	And we will be putting out an
19	announcement by way of the Federal Register, and
20	we'll let you know when that's about to come out,
21	and that is going to detail the application process
22	for those who wish to reapply and for anyone else

who wishes to reapply. 1 2 CHAIRMAN JACOBSEN: Thank you very All right, well, I really appreciate 3 much. everybody's attendance here, your contributions. 4 I'm a little bit disappointed that we didn't have 5 any tasks to work on here as you are, and hopefully 6 that will change in the future and this Committee 7 8 will continue to make a lot of progress. So with that, save travels and it's good to see everybody, 9 10 and I hope to see you again very soon, so thank 11 you. 12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter 13 went off the record at 1:28 p.m.)